CHAPTER 5.0 MANDATORY CEQA SECTIONS: CONSEQUENCES OF PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

This Chapter contains required discussions and analysis of various issues mandated by CEQA. Section 15128 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR contain a statement briefly indicating the reasons that various possible new significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant, and were therefore not discussed in detail in the EIR. CEQA Guidelines Section 15130 requires that an EIR shall discuss cumulative impacts of a project when the project's incremental effect is cumulatively considerable. In addition, CEQA requires assessment of significant environmental effects that cannot be avoided if the project is implemented, growth-inducing impacts, and irreversible environmental changes and irretrievable commitment of resources. This section discusses the following topics specifically related to this project:

- 5.1 Effects Not Found to be Significant
- 5.2 Unavoidable Impacts
- 5.3 Irreversible Impacts
- 5.4 Cumulative Impacts
- 5.5 Growth-Inducing Impacts

5.1 <u>EFFECTS NOT FOUND TO BE SIGNIFICANT</u>

As noted above, Section 15128 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR contain a statement briefly indicating the reasons why various possible new significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant, and were therefore not discussed in detail in the EIR. For this project, those effects were determined based on initial analysis in the Initial Study/Environmental Checklist, the discussion contained in the Notice of Preparation, and the evaluation of impacts undertaken as part of this EIR process. Effects of this project not found to be significant are presented in this section.

- Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project.
- Disruption or division of the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community).
- Increase the population in the Plan area beyond what has been anticipated in the 20 year horizon.
- Non-compliance with the Housing Element of the Placer County General Plan and failure to meet housing needs in the Plan area.

- Displacement of existing housing, especially affordable housing.
- Development of incompatible uses and/or creation of land use conflicts within the FDCP area.
- Conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use.
- The destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features.
- Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements.
- Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater.
- Creation of objectionable odors.
- Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site.
- Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists.
- Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks).
- Rail, waterborne, or air traffic impacts.
- Impacts to important spawning areas for anadromous fish.
- Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans.
- Use of non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner.
- The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard.
- A need for or substantial alterations to solid waste materials recovery or disposal.
- Cumulative adverse impacts on common resident plant and animal species including mixed coniferous forest, montane hardwood, and oak trees in the Plan area.
- Impacts of the Foresthill Divide Community Plan (FDCP) with, and without, inclusion of the Forest Ranch Concept Plan on greenhouse gas emissions and global climate change, including the effect of global climate change on long term water supply (see Section 5.4 Cumulative Impacts for discussion).

In addition, effects of this project not found to be significant if the proposed Forest Ranch Concept Plan is approved as part of the FDCP and development is carried out as proposed include:

- Disruption or division of the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community).
- Displacement of existing housing, especially affordable housing.
- Development of the Plan area in accordance with the FDCP would promote an imbalance of jobs and housing in the Plan area.
- Conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use.
- Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater.
- Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies.
- Rail, waterborne, or air traffic impacts.
- Impacts to important spawning areas for anadromous fish.
- Cumulative adverse impacts on common resident plant and animal species including mixed coniferous forest, montane hardwood, and oak trees in the Plan area due to development in accordance with the proposed FDCP.

5.2 <u>SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS THAT CANNOT BE AVOIDED</u>

Since the phrase "significant effect on the environment" occupies such a critical role in the preparation and review of an EIR, the following definition, as contained in Section 15382 of the State CEQA Guidelines, is provided for reference:

"Significant effect on the environment" means a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project including land, air, water, mineral, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance. An economic or social change by itself shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment. A social or economic change related to a physical change may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant.

Section 15126.2(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that the EIR describe any significant impacts, including those which can be mitigated but not reduced to a level of insignificance. Where there are impacts that cannot be alleviated without imposing an alternative design, their

implications and the reasons why the project is being proposed, notwithstanding their effect, should be described.

The environmental effects of the proposed project on selected aspects of the environment are discussed in detail in Chapter Three of this EIR. Significant or potentially significant effects that cannot be avoided if the proposed project is approved and development is carried out as proposed are presented below. Other unavoidable impacts attributable to implementation of the proposed project have either been determined to be less than significant, or are capable of being mitigated to less than significant levels by measures recommended in this EIR.

- Loss of open space resulting from development in accordance with the FDCP (Impact 3.2-3). Development of the Plan area in accordance with the proposed FDCP would allow conversion of lands currently in undeveloped open space to residential, commercial, industrial or public uses. While the proposed FDCP will allow for less conversion of open space than the existing (1981) Foresthill General Plan, impacts must be measured in comparison to existing conditions rather than future planned uses. The majority of the Plan area is designated for Public Ownership (53%), Agricultural/Timberland (23%), and Forestry (12.4%). The remaining lands (less than 12%) are designated for Rural Residential (parcel sizes ranging from 2.3 acres to 10 acres), Low and Medium Density Residential, Industrial, Development Reserve, Mixed-Use Areas and Historic Outlying Commercial Areas. Portions of these areas are already developed, and the policies of the FDCP are designed to discourage "leapfrog" development and concentrate development within or near the Core Area of Foresthill. The FDCP includes policies to protect existing agricultural lands, forest and timber resources. Nevertheless, the loss of open space resources through conversion to developed uses represents a significant, unavoidable impact of the proposed FDCP that cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level.
- Provision of adequate fire protection services and facilities to serve the Plan area (Impact 3.4-4). The Foresthill Fire District has concluded that full buildout of the Plan area will require additional fire stations and facilities and full-time paid fire fighter coverage. A development fee is currently assessed upon new development in the Plan area to support fire protection services. The FDCP includes policies that address this impact. Many of these policies involve working with other agencies, including the Foresthill Fire District. The goals and policies do not address the provision of additional fire stations and converting from a volunteer to a full-time paid fire protection service. Although fees are collected from new development, it is not clear whether these will be adequate to fund new stations, equipment and paid personnel. Although the County has the ability to deny projects that do not provide for adequate fire protection, providing the facilities, equipment and personnel are outside the control of the County and cannot be assured. Therefore, this impact is considered potentially significant, and can not be mitigated to a level that is less than significant.
- Alteration of views from scenic highways in the Plan area due to development in accordance with the proposed FDCP (Impact 3.3-2). The FDCP designates certain road segments as local scenic highways. Implementation of the FDCP will alter some views from the proposed local scenic highways. The forest vegetation and topography of the Plan area will limit the visibility of new development. The FDCP includes numerous goals and policies on the topic

of community design that address the promotion, preservation and enhancement of the forested natural and rural atmosphere of the Plan area by requiring high aesthetic quality in all new development. All new development (including major remodeling and reconstruction) must comply with the Foresthill Community Design Guidelines (which are included in the FDCP), the Placer County Rural Design Guidelines, the Placer County Design Guidelines Manual, and the Placer County Landscape Design Guidelines. All new development must be designed to be compatible with the scale and character of the area. The gateway and scenic corridors that bring residents and visitors into the area must be protected and enhanced. Compliance with the FDCP goals and policies, the Foresthill Community Design Guidelines, and other Placer County design guidelines will reduce the contribution of development to adverse impacts upon scenic vistas and views from scenic highways in the Plan area. It will assure that new development meets an aesthetic standard and open space retention that is not currently required along these roadways segments in the Plan area. Nevertheless, new development in the Plan area will contribute to long-term changes in views from these scenic highways from rural, forested views to views that encompass a greater level of development. This represents a potentially significant impact. No additional mitigation measures are available to reduce this impact to a less than significant level, therefore it will remain potentially significant.

- Adverse impacts on wildlife movement corridors/deer migration corridors in the Plan area due to development in accordance with the proposed FDCP (Impact 3.6-18). Wildlife movement corridors are essential to the distribution of wildlife, providing a means of movement throughout ranges that are encroached with human disturbances. Because a majority of the habitats within the Plan area is relatively undisturbed, these areas provide a means for wildlife movement throughout the Plan area. Further development within these areas will fragment this habitat and may result in obstructing this movement corridor. The effect on deer migration and wildlife movement should be analyzed prior to the approval of any proposed development within the Plan area. The analysis should include consultation with the CDFG and local resources agencies to properly evaluate the current wildlife movement and deer migration patterns in the Plan area. The FDCP includes Policies 4.A.1-7, 4.A.3-1, 4.A.3-2, 4.A.3-4, 4.A.3-10 and 4.A.3-11 that address this impact. Implementation of these policies will reduce impacts on wildlife movement corridors/deer migration corridors in the Plan area. However, because new development will occur that may affect wildlife movement corridors, this impact is considered potentially significant and unavoidable. No additional mitigation measures are available that would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.
- New stationary and mobile sources of air pollutants caused by buildout of the proposed FDCP, resulting in increased emissions of ROG, NOx and PM₁₀ (Impact 3.8-1). Upon FDCP buildout, operation of new uses developed in accordance with the proposed Plan would cause increased emissions by generating new motor vehicle trips and by causing additional energy use and operation of other stationary sources of emissions. These are stationary- and areasource emissions that would be produced either directly in the Plan area, or indirectly through increased use of utilities located elsewhere. Motor vehicle use, energy use, and other stationary sources would cause emissions of ROG, NOx and PM₁₀ that would contribute to existing violations of state-level and/or federal ambient air quality standards. Although the

goals and policies of the FDCP will assist in reducing emissions, development within the Plan area will contribute to regional emissions of these pollutants. Because the Plan area is currently within a nonattainment area for PM_{10} and ozone and emissions will exceed PCAPCD thresholds, impacts are considered significant and unavoidable.

• Construction activities associated with development under the proposed FDCP, which will cause emissions of dust and contaminants from construction equipment exhaust that may contribute substantially to existing air quality violations or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations (Impact 3.8-2). Construction activity often produces high levels of fugitive dust, including PM₁₀ particulate matter. Construction-related fugitive dust is generated primarily by grading activities and heavy equipment travel over temporary roads on-site. Although the goals and policies of the FDCP and Placer County Air Pollution Control District Rules and Regulations will assist in reducing emissions, because the Plan area is currently within a nonattainment area for PM₁₀ and ozone, and construction-related emissions may at times exceed PCAPCD thresholds, impacts are considered potentially significant and unavoidable.

In addition, significant effects that cannot be avoided if the proposed Forest Ranch Concept Plan is approved as part of the FDCP and development is carried out as proposed include:

- Alteration of views of the project site from roadways along and through the site, and from surrounding properties.
- Development of the proposed project would increase the population in the community of Foresthill (growth-inducing impact).
- Development of the proposed project would promote an imbalance of jobs and housing in the community of Foresthill.
- Cumulative contribution of the proposed project to the loss of habitat and forage lands, habitat degradation due to encroaching urbanization, direct impacts to sensitive species, habitat fragmentation, and obstruction of movement corridors, and harassment of wildlife by humans and pets.
- Loss of timber production land due to proposed development of the project site.
- Exhaust and fugitive dust emissions generated by construction activities at all phases of the proposed project, including excavation and grading, construction vehicle traffic, and wind blowing over exposed earth.
- Operation of the proposed Forest Ranch project will result in the generation of both mobile and stationary source air pollutants.
- Exposure of people to hazards associated with abandoned mines on the project site

Notwithstanding these significant unavoidable effects, adoption of the FDCP and rezoning is still proposed to implement the Vision and General Goals formulated by the FDCP Team, which were developed through public meetings and the input of the community.

5.3 IRREVERSIBLE IMPACTS

The following excerpt from Section 15126.2(c) of the State CEQA Guidelines defines the nature of this analysis:

Uses of non-renewable resources during the initial and continued phases of the project may be irreversible since a large commitment of such resources makes removal or nonuse thereafter unlikely. Primary impacts and, particularly secondary impacts (such as highway improvement which provides access to a previously inaccessible area), generally commit future generations to similar uses. Also irreversible damage can result from environmental accidents associated with the project. Irretrievable commitments of resources should be evaluated to assure that such current consumption is justified.

Approval and implementation of the proposed project will commit non-renewable resources during construction and ongoing utility services provided to the Plan area. During construction, the use of energy resources and building materials will essentially be irreversible and irretrievable. Construction will require the commitment of a variety of non-renewable or slowly renewable natural resources such as lumber and other forest products, sand and gravel, asphalt and metals. Development will result in an increase in regional energy consumption not only during construction, but also relating to lighting, heating and cooling of buildings, and other industrial/manufacturing uses. Fossil fuels are the principal source of energy, and the project will increase consumption of available supplies of petroleum products.

As noted in Chapter Three, degradation of ambient air quality is also an irreversible impact of the proposed project. Furthermore, with inclusion of the Forest Ranch Concept Plan the proposed FDCP will provide additional residential, recreational and professional office development and employment opportunities in the community, at the expense of commercial timber production on the project site, as well as the other adverse impacts reported in this EIR.

5.4 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Cumulative impacts are two or more effects that, when combined, are considerable or compound other environmental effects. Each cumulative impact is determined to have one of the following levels of significance: less than significant, significant, or significant and unavoidable.

Section 15130 of the State CEQA Guidelines calls for the following discussion of the cumulative impacts of a proposed project:

(a) An EIR shall discuss cumulative impacts of a project when the project's incremental effect is cumulatively considerable, as defined in Section 15065(a)(3). Where a lead agency is examining a project with an incremental

effect that is not "cumulatively considerable," a lead agency need not consider that effect significant, but shall briefly describe its basis for concluding that the incremental effect is not cumulatively considerable.

- (1) As defined in Section 15355, a cumulative impact consists of an impact which is created as a result of the combination of the project evaluated in the EIR together with other projects causing related impacts. An EIR should not discuss impacts which do not result in part from the project evaluated in the EIR.
- (2) When the combined cumulative impact associated with the project's incremental effect and the effects of other projects is not significant, the EIR shall briefly indicate why the cumulative impact is not significant and is not discussed in further detail in the EIR. A lead agency shall identify facts and analysis supporting the lead agency's conclusion that the cumulative impact is less than significant.
- (3) An EIR may determine that a project's contribution to a significant cumulative impact will be rendered less than cumulatively considerable and thus is not significant. A project's contribution is less than cumulatively considerable if the project is required to implement or fund its fair share of a mitigation measure or measures designed to alleviate the cumulative impact. The lead agency shall identify facts and analysis supporting its conclusion that the contribution will be rendered less than cumulatively considerable.
- (b) The discussion of cumulative impacts shall reflect the severity of the impacts and their likelihood of occurrence, but the discussion need not provide as great a detail as is provided for the effects attributable to the project alone. The discussion should be guided by standards of practicality and reasonableness, and should focus on the cumulative impact to which the identified other projects contribute rather than the attributes of other projects which do not contribute to the cumulative impacts. The following elements are necessary to an adequate discussion of significant cumulative impacts:

(1) Either:

- (A) A list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, including, if necessary, those projects outside the control of the agency, or
- (B) A summary of projections contained in an adopted general plan or related planning document, or in a prior environmental document which has been adopted or certified, which described or evaluated regional or areawide conditions contributing to the cumulative impact. Any such planning document shall be referenced and made available to the public at a location specified by the lead agency;

- (2) When utilizing a list, as suggested in paragraph (1) of subdivision (b), factors to consider when determining whether to include a related project should include the nature of each environmental resource being examined, the location of the project and its type. Location may be important, for example, when water quality impacts are an issue since projects outside the watershed would probably not contribute to a cumulative effect. Project type may be important, for example, when the impact is specialized, such as a particular air pollutant or mode of traffic.
- (3) "Probable future projects" may be limited to those projects requiring an agency approval for an application which has been received at the time the notice of preparation is released, unless abandoned by the applicant; projects included in an adopted capital improvements program, general plan, regional transportation plan, or other similar plan; projects included in a summary of projections of projects (or development areas designated) in a general plan or a similar plan; projects anticipated as later phase of a previously approved project (e.g., subdivision); or other public agency projects for which money has been budgeted.
- (4) Lead agencies should define the geographic scope of the area affected by the cumulative effect and provide a reasonable explanation for the geographic limitation used.
- (5) A summary of the expected environmental effects to be produced by those projects with specific reference to additional information stating where that information is available; and
- (6) A reasonable analysis of the cumulative impacts of the relevant projects. An EIR shall examine reasonable, feasible options for mitigating or avoiding the project's contribution to any significant cumulative effects.
- (c) With some projects, the only feasible mitigation for cumulative impacts may involve the adoption of ordinances or regulations rather than the imposition of conditions on a project-by-project basis.
- (d) Previously approved land use documents such as general plans, specific plans, and local coastal plans may be used in cumulative impact analysis. A pertinent discussion of cumulative impacts contained in one or more previously certified EIRs may be incorporated by reference pursuant to the provisions for tiering and project EIRs. No further cumulative impacts analysis is required when a project is consistent with a general, specific, master or comparable programmatic plan where the lead agency determines that the regional or areawide cumulative impacts of the proposed project have already been adequately addressed, as defined in section 15152(f), in a certified EIR for that plan.

(e) If a cumulative impact was adequately addressed in a prior EIR for a community plan, zoning action, or general plan, and the project is consistent with that plan or action, then an EIR for such a project should not further analyze that cumulative impact as provided in Section 15183(j).

The area of cumulative effect associated with the FDCP is described as the FDCP Plan area, which encompasses the entire area (approximately 109 square miles) covered by the proposed FDCP. One major development is currently proposed within the Plan area: the proposed Forest Ranch project, a General Plan Amendment on $2,615\pm$ acres north and east of the community of Foresthill. The project site is located north and east of Foresthill Road, and is also crossed by Blackhawk Lane and Yankee Jim's Road. It is referred to in the FDCP as the "Pomfret Estate" property. The proposed project would be an amendment to the 1981 Foresthill General Plan, and would allow development of 2,213 residential units, of which 1,700 would be age-restricted; an 18-hole golf course and associated uses; a 100-unit recreational vehicle park; an equestrian center; professional offices; and open space $(1,128\pm$ acres of the $2,615\pm$ acres).

The proposed Forest Ranch Concept Plan is not consistent with the land use designations, zoning and standards applicable to the site under the current Foresthill General Plan. If the forest Ranch Concept Plan is not adopted as part of the proposed FDCP, the project site would be designated for Development Reserve (1,300± acres); Forestry/160 acre minimum on most of the remainder of the site; and small areas designated Ag/Timberland (1 dwelling unit/160 acres) and Low Density Residential (1 dwelling unit/1 acre). Absent inclusion of the Forest Ranch Concept Plan, the FDCP will provide for a maximum of 533 dwelling units to be considered for the subject property, trails, golf course improvements, equestrian boarding stables and staging areas, mountain bike courses, fitness circuits and related facilities. A recreational vehicle park or professional office uses would not be allowed unless the Forest Ranch Concept Plan is approved as part of the FDCP. If the Forest Ranch project is approved as proposed, it would add 1,680 dwelling units to the estimated total of 2,380 new dwelling units that could be developed under the proposed FDCP without the Forest Ranch Concept Plan, as well as the recreational vehicle park and professional offices. It is anticipated that this would, at a minimum, result in a cumulative increase in impacts related to traffic, air quality, water quality, and public services and facilities.

In accordance with Section 15130(d) of the State CEQA Guidelines, this EIR incorporates by reference the cumulative impacts analysis contained in the Placer County General Plan EIR.

Based on the identified region and the nature of the projects described above, Chapter Three of this EIR has identified the following potentially significant cumulative impacts associated with the project and the region:

• Loss of open space resulting from development in accordance with the FDCP (Impact 3.2-3). Development of the Plan area in accordance with the proposed FDCP would allow conversion of lands currently in undeveloped open space to residential, commercial, industrial or public uses. While the proposed FDCP will allow for less conversion of open space than the existing (1981) Foresthill General Plan, impacts must be measured in comparison to existing conditions rather than future planned uses. The majority of the Plan

area is designated for Public Ownership (53%), Agricultural/Timberland (23%), and Forestry (12.4%). The remaining lands (less than 12%) are designated for Rural Residential (parcel sizes ranging from 2.3 acres to 10 acres), Low and Medium Density Residential, Industrial, Development Reserve, Mixed-Use Areas and Historic Outlying Commercial Areas. Portions of these areas are already developed, and the policies of the FDCP are designed to discourage "leapfrog" development and concentrate development within or near the Core Area of Foresthill. The FDCP includes policies to protect existing agricultural lands, forest and timber resources. Nevertheless, the loss of open space resources through conversion to developed uses represents a significant, cumulative impact of the proposed FDCP that cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level.

- Introduction of new sources of light and glare within the Plan area (Impact 3.3-2). As described in the "Setting" section above, the primary sources of light in the Plan area include headlights on the roadway system (particularly Foresthill Road), commercial development, and industrial facilities. A lighting district has been established in Foresthill, which is limited to the historic downtown area. Residential areas do not have street lights, but some individual residences have security lighting. The Placer County Rural Design Guidelines include a goal that encourages the minimization of artificial lighting on residences, other structures, and along roadways to limit the amount of light pollution. The Guidelines also recommend techniques designed to minimize light pollution. The proposed FDCP includes Policies 3.C.3-6, 3.C.5-1, and 3.C.2-3 related to lighting. Implementation Measure #29 for Natural Resources/Conservation/Open Space calls for adoption of a "dark sky" ordinance to protect important nighttime visual resources in the Plan area. Lighting is also addressed in the proposed Foresthill Community Design Guidelines. Compliance with the goals, policies, implementation measures and Design Guidelines will reduce the contribution of new development to substantial changes in the lighting environment, and improve some existing conditions. However, in comparison to existing conditions, additional development will contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact on the ambient light conditions in the Plan area. No additional mitigation measures are available to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.
- Conversion of timber lands to non-timber production use (Impact 3.6-2). Coniferous forest represents the dominant vegetation community within the Plan area. The Plan area contains an interface between exclusive Placer County land use jurisdiction and the jurisdiction of the U.S. Forest Service, which is responsible for managing land uses and timber resources in the Tahoe National Forest. Additionally, the California Department of Forestry (CDF) has regulatory authority over timber harvest activities on privately held timber land under the Z'Berg Nejedly Forest Practices Act of 1973. Since the Plan area lies within an area designated as Very High Fire Hazard Area, CDF is also actively engaged in fuel reduction programs to reduce the high levels of brush and timber fuel loading that contribute to wildland fire hazard in the area. The goals and policies of the proposed FDCP are designed to protect and preserve existing forest and timber resources. A majority of the Plan area is designated for Public Ownership (53%), Agricultural/Timberland (23%) and Forestry (12.4%). Policy 4.A.6-2 calls for the County to discourage development that conflicts with timberland management and to protect significant timber production lands from incompatible development. Policy 4.A.6-8 requires the County to maintain a low mathematical density of

allowable development in Forestry areas in order to protect major areas of potential timber resources on the Divide from conversion to other more intensive uses. Policy 4.A.6-9 calls for the County to encourage clustering of development in timberland areas within the Forest Residential land use designation to preserve timber resources for productive use, and Policy 4.A.6-10 encourages the use of the Timberland Production Zone for those lands which have significant commercial timber value. Finally, Policy 4.A.6-12 calls for the provision of public facilities and services to be limited in important timber areas on the Foresthill Divide. The proposed FDCP land use designations and zoning are designated to avoid conversion of productive timber lands to non-timber uses, and to allow other development to occur in a manner that does not conflict with timber-related uses. Nevertheless, the loss of productive or potentially productive timber resources through conversion of lands to developed uses represents a potentially significant cumulative impact of the proposed FDCP. No additional mitigation measures are available to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

- New stationary and mobile sources of air pollutants caused by buildout of the proposed FDCP, resulting in increased emissions of ROG, NOx and PM₁₀ (Impact 3.8-1). Upon FDCP buildout, operation of new uses developed in accordance with the proposed Plan would cause increased emissions by generating new motor vehicle trips and by causing additional energy use and operation of other stationary sources of emissions. These are stationary- and areasource emissions that would be produced either directly in the Plan area, or indirectly through increased use of utilities located elsewhere. Motor vehicle use, energy use, and other stationary sources would cause emissions of ROG, NOx and PM₁₀ that would contribute to existing violations of state-level and/or federal ambient air quality standards. Although the goals and policies of the FDCP will assist in reducing emissions, development within the Plan area will contribute to regional emissions of these pollutants. Because the Plan area is currently within a nonattainment area for PM₁₀ and ozone and emissions will exceed PCAPCD thresholds, impacts are considered significant and cumulative, and cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level.
- Construction activities associated with development under the proposed FDCP, which will cause emissions of dust and contaminants from construction equipment exhaust that may contribute substantially to existing air quality violations or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations (Impact 3.8-2). Construction activity often produces high levels of fugitive dust, including PM₁₀ particulate matter. Construction-related fugitive dust is generated primarily by grading activities and heavy equipment travel over temporary roads on-site. Although the goals and policies of the FDCP and Placer County Air Pollution Control District Rules and Regulations will assist in reducing emissions, because the Plan area is currently within a nonattainment area for PM₁₀ and ozone, and emissions may at times exceed PCAPCD thresholds, impacts are considered potentially significant and cumulative, and may not always be mitigated to a less than significant level.
- Buildout of the proposed FDCP will contribute to greenhouse gas emissions and global climate change. Various gases in the Earth's atmosphere, classified as atmospheric greenhouse gases (GHGs), play a critical role in determining the Earth's surface temperature. Solar radiation enters Earth's atmosphere from space, and a portion of the radiation is absorbed by the Earth's surface. The Earth emits this radiation back toward space, but the properties of the

radiation change from high-frequency solar radiation to lower-frequency infrared radiation. GHGs, which are transparent to solar radiation, are effective in absorbing infrared radiation. As a result, this radiation that otherwise would have escaped back into space is now retained, resulting in a warming of the atmosphere. This phenomenon is known as the greenhouse effect.

Among the prominent GHGs contributing to the greenhouse effect are carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), ozone (O₃), water vapor, nitrous oxide (N₂O), and chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs). Human-caused emissions of these GHGs in excess of natural ambient concentrations are responsible for enhancing the greenhouse effect (Ahrens 2003). Emissions of GHGs contributing to global climate change are attributable in large part to human activities associated with the industrial/manufacturing, utility, transportation, residential, and agricultural sectors (California Energy Commission 2006a). In California, the transportation sector is the largest emitter of GHGs, followed by electricity generation (California Energy Commission 2006a). A byproduct of fossil fuel combustion is CO₂. Methane, a highly potent GHG, results from offgassing associated with agricultural practices and landfills. Processes that absorb and accumulate CO₂, often called CO₂ "sinks," include uptake by vegetation and dissolution into the ocean.

As the name implies, global climate change is a global problem. GHGs are global pollutants, unlike criteria air pollutants and toxic air contaminants, which are pollutants of regional and local concern, respectively. California is the 12th to 16th largest emitter of CO₂ in the world and produced 492 million gross metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents in 2004 (California Energy Commission 2006a). Carbon dioxide equivalents is a measurement used to account for the fact that different GHGs have different potential to retain infrared radiation in the atmosphere and contribute to the greenhouse effect. This potential, known as the global warming potential of a GHG, is also dependent on the lifetime, or persistence, of the gas molecule in the atmosphere. For example, CH₄ is a much more potent GHG than CO₂. As described in Appendix C, "Calculation Referenced," of the General Reporting Protocol of the California Climate Action Registry (2006), one ton of CH₄ has the same contribution to the greenhouse effect as approximately 21 tons of CO₂. Expressing GHG emissions in carbon dioxide equivalents takes the contribution of all GHG emissions to the greenhouse effect and converts them to a single unit equivalent to the effect that would occur if only CO₂ were being emitted. Consumption of fossil fuels in the transportation sector was the single largest source of California's GHG emissions in 2004, accounting for 40.7% of total GHG emissions in the state (California Energy Commission 2006a). This category was followed by the electric power sector (including both in-state and out-of-state sources) (22.2%) and the industrial sector (20.5%) (California Energy Commission 2006a).

At the time of this writing, there are no regulations setting ambient air quality emissions standards for greenhouse gases; however, it is anticipated that such will be developed in the near future in accordance with the following recently enacted California legislation and Executive Order S-3-05 as described below.

Assembly Bill 1493

In 2002, then-Governor Gray Davis signed Assembly Bill (AB) 1493. AB 1493 requires that the California Air Resources Board (ARB) develop and adopt, by January 1, 2005, regulations that achieve "the maximum feasible reduction of greenhouse gases emitted by passenger vehicles and light-duty truck and other vehicles determined by the ARB to be vehicles whose primary use is noncommercial personal transportation in the state."

Executive Order S-3-05

Executive Order S-3-05, which was signed by Governor Schwarzenegger in 2005, proclaims that California is vulnerable to the impacts of climate change. It declares that increased temperatures could reduce the Sierra's snowpack, further exacerbate California's air quality problems, and potentially cause a rise in sea levels. To combat those concerns, the Executive Order established total greenhouse gas emission targets. Specifically, emissions are to be reduced to the 2000 level by 2010, the 1990 level by 2020, and to 80% below the 1990 level by 2050.

The Executive Order directed the Secretary of the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) to coordinate a multi-agency effort to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to the target levels. The Secretary will also submit biannual reports to the governor and state legislature describing: (1) progress made toward reaching the emission targets; (2) impacts of global warming on California's resources; and (3) mitigation and adaptation plans to combat these impacts. To comply with the Executive Order, the Secretary of the CalEPA created a Climate Act Team (CAT) made up of members from various state agencies and commissions. CAT released its first report in March 2006. The report proposed to achieve the targets by building on voluntary actions of California businesses, local government and community actions, as well as through state incentive and regulatory programs.

Assembly Bill 32, the California Climate Solutions Act of 2006

In September 2006, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed AB 32, the California Climate Solutions Act of 2006. AB 32 requires that statewide GHG emissions be reduced to 1990 levels by the year 2020. This reduction will be accomplished through an enforceable statewide cap on GHG emissions that will be phased in starting in 2012. To effectively implement the cap, AB 32 directs ARB to develop and implement regulations to reduce statewide GHG emissions from stationary sources. AB 32 specifies that regulations adopted in response to AB 1493 should be used to address GHG emissions from vehicles. However, AB 32 also includes language stating that if the AB 1493 regulations cannot be implemented, then ARB should develop new regulations to control vehicle GHG emissions under the authorization of AB 32.

AB 32 requires that ARB adopt a quantified cap on GHG emissions representing 1990 emissions levels and disclose how it arrives at the cap; institute a schedule to meet the emissions cap; and develop tracking, reporting, and enforcement mechanisms to ensure that the state achieves reductions in GHG emissions necessary to meet the cap. AB 32 also

includes guidance to institute emissions reductions in an economically efficient manner and conditions to ensure that businesses and consumers are not unfairly affected by the reductions.

Senate Bill 1368

SB 1368 is the companion bill of AB 32 and was signed by Governor Schwarzenegger in September 2006. SB 1368 requires the California Public Utilities Commission (PUC) to establish a greenhouse gas emission performance standard for baseload generation from investor owned utilities by February 1, 2007. The California Energy Commission (CEC) must establish a similar standard for local publicly owned utilities by June 30, 2007. These standards cannot exceed the greenhouse gas emission rate from a baseload combined-cycle natural gas fired plant. The legislation further requires that all electricity provided to California, including imported electricity, must be generated from plants that meet the standards set by the PUC and CEC. No air district in California, including the Placer County Air Pollution District, has identified a significance threshold for GHG emissions or a methodology for analyzing air quality impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions. The state has identified 1990 emission levels as a goal through adoption of AB 32. To meet this goal, California would need to generate lower levels of GHG emissions than current levels. However, no standards have yet been adopted quantifying 1990 emission targets. It is recognized that for most projects there is no simple metric available to determine if a single project would help or hinder meeting the AB 32 emission goals. In addition, at this time AB 32 only applies to stationary source emissions. Consumption of fossil fuels in the transportation sector accounted for over 40% of the total GHG emissions in California in 2004. Current standards for reducing vehicle emissions considered under AB 1493 call for "the maximum feasible reduction of greenhouse gases emitted by passenger vehicles and light-duty trucks and other vehicles," and do not provide a quantified target for GHG emissions reductions for vehicles.

Emitting CO₂ into the atmosphere is not itself an adverse environmental affect. It is the increased concentration of CO₂ in the atmosphere resulting in global climate change and the associated consequences of climate change that results in adverse environmental affects (e.g., sea level rise, loss of snow pack, severe weather events). Although it is possible to generally estimate a project's incremental contribution of CO₂ into the atmosphere, it is typically not possible to determine whether, or how, an individual project's relatively small incremental contribution might translate into physical effects on the environment. Given the complex interactions between various global and regional-scale physical, chemical, atmospheric, terrestrial, and aquatic systems that result in the physical expressions of global climate change, it is impossible to discern whether the presence or absence of CO₂ emitted by Buildout of the FDCP would result in any altered conditions. On a state wide level, however, global climate change is projected to affect several environmental factors including water resources throughout California. For example, an increase in the global average temperature is projected to result in a decreased volume of precipitation falling as snow in California and an overall reduction in snowpack in the Sierra Nevada. Snowpack in the Sierra Nevada provides both water supply (runoff) and storage (within the snowpack before melting), and is a major source of supply for the state. Although current forecasts vary (Department of Water Resources 2006), this phenomenon could lead to significant challenges in securing an adequate water supply for a growing population and California's agricultural industry. An increase in precipitation falling as rain rather than snow could also lead to increased potential for floods because water that would normally be held in the Sierra Nevada until spring could flow into the Central Valley concurrently with winter storm events. This scenario would place more pressure on California's levee/flood control system.

Because considerable uncertainty remains with respect to the overall impact of global climate change on future water supply in California, it is unknown to what degree global climate change will impact future Placer County water supply and availability, including the 109 square mile FDCP area. However, based on consideration of several recent regional and local climate change studies, and based on an assessment of water supply under both the FDCP with and without the inclusion of the Forest Ranch Concept Plan, it is reasonably expected that the impacts of global climate change on water supply would be less than significant. Because the implementation of the Forest Ranch Concept Plan would create a greater demand for water, however, global climate change poses a greater impact to water supply in the project area under the FDCP with inclusion of the Forest Ranch Concept Plan than under the FDCP without the Forest Ranch Concept Plan.

Given the challenges associated with determining a project specific significance criteria for GHG emissions when the issue must be viewed on a global scale, a quantitative significance criteria is not proposed for the Foresthill Divide Community Plan. For this analysis, the project's incremental contribution to global climate change would only be considered significant if due to the size or nature of the project it would generate a substantial increase in GHG emissions relative to existing conditions state wide.

GHG emissions associated with the FDCP were estimated using CO₂ emissions as a proxy for all GHG emissions. This is consistent with the current reporting protocol of the California Climate Action Registry (CCAR). Calculations of GHG emissions typically focus on CO₂ because it is the most commonly produced GHG in terms of both number of sources and volume generated, and because it is among the easiest GHGs to measure. However, it is important to note that other GHGs have a higher global warming potential than CO₂. For example, as stated previously, 1 lb of methane has an equivalent global warming potential of 21 lb of CO₂ (California Climate Action Registry 2006). Nonetheless, emissions of other GHGs from the Foresthill Divide Community Plan (and from almost all GHG emissions sources) would be low relative to emissions of CO₂ and would not contribute significantly to the overall generation of GHGs from the project.

Although the CCAR provides a methodology for calculating GHG emissions, the process is designed to be applied to a single or limited number of entities or operations where detailed information on emissions sources is available (e.g., usage of electricity and natural gas, numbers and types of vehicles and equipment in a fleet, type and usage of heating and cooling systems, emissions from manufacturing processes). Information at this level of detail is not available for the Foresthill Community Plan. Given the lack of detailed design and operational information available at this time for facilities in the FDCP area, the CCAR

emissions inventory methodology is not appropriate for estimating GHG emissions from the project.

The traffic analysis conducted for the project provides data that can be used to estimate CO₂ emissions from project-generated vehicle trips. The 2030 and Buildout analysis of the Community Plan without Forest Ranch would result in 12,045 and 47,388 vehicle trips per day respectively (see Table 5.4-1). Assuming a trip rate of 7.43 miles per trip which is the standard used by Placer County Air Pollution Control District, motorized vehicle use within the FDCP in 2030 would generate an average of 89,494 vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per day, or approximately 32.6 million VMT annually. At full build out an average of 352,093 VMT per day would be generated, or approximately 129 million VMT annually. Assuming an emissions factor for future CO₂ emissions from vehicles of approximately 366 grams of CO₂ per mile (California Air Resources Board 2002), approximately 13,179 tons of CO₂ per year would be generated by project-generated vehicle trips in 2030 and approximately 51,884 tons of CO₂ per year at full build out. It should be noted that although this projected CO₂ emissions factor does assume certain reductions in vehicle emissions due to future vehicle models operating more efficiently, it does not take into account additional vehicle emission reductions that might take place in response to AB 1493, if mobile source emission reductions are ultimately implemented through this legislation.

Table 5-1 Daily Trip Generation Estimates¹

Scenario	Daily Gross Total of Trips	Internal Daily Trips	External Daily Trips
Year 2030 "Without Forest Ranch"	12,045	7,525	4,520
Year 2030 "With Forest Ranch"	25,632	15,611	10,021
Buildout of the Plan "Without Forest Ranch"	47,388	28,842	18,546
Buildout of the Plan "With Forest Ranch"	54,261	33,259	21,002
Notes: Reference: Institute of Transportation Engineers	a. Trip Generation. Se	eventh Edition, 2003.	

It is also important to note that this CO₂ emission estimate for vehicle trips associated with the FDCP is likely much greater than the emissions that will actually occur. The analysis methodology used for the emissions estimate assumes that all emissions sources (vehicles) are new sources and that emissions from these sources are 100% additive to existing conditions. This is a standard approach taken for air quality analyses. In many cases, such an assumption is appropriate because it is impossible to determine whether emissions sources associated with a project move from outside the air basin and are in effect new emissions sources, or whether they are sources that were already in the air basin and just shifted to a new location. However, because the effects of GHGs are global, a project that merely shifts the location of a GHG-emitting activity (e.g., where people live, where vehicles drive, or where companies conduct business) would result in no net change in global GHG emissions levels.

Although the estimate of 51,884 tons of CO₂ emitted per year from project related vehicle trips is higher than would actually occur, it provides a starting point for further emissions calculations. As discussed above, fossil fuel consumption in the transportation sector was the single largest source of California's GHG emissions in 2004, accounting for 40.7% of total

GHG emissions in the state (California Energy Commission 2006a). Making the general assumption that the proportion of transportation-sector emissions from the 51,884 tons of CO₂ at build out would be similar to the statewide results for 2004, overall CO₂ emissions from the Foresthill Community Plan would be approximately 127,479 tons per year.

Therefore, although the estimate of 127,479 tons of CO₂ emitted annually from within the FDCP area is very general, and is considered high, it is sufficient to support an evaluation of the project's contribution towards GHG emissions.

Applying the same emissions calculation methodology described above to the FDCP area with development of the Forest Ranch Concept Plan, this alternative is estimated to generate approximately 68,907 tons of CO₂ per year in 2030 (25,632 vehicle trips per day, 7.43 VMT per trip, transportation emissions accounting for 40.7% of total emissions) and would generate approximately 145,968 tons of CO₂ per year at build out (54,261 vehicle trips per day, 7.43 VMT per trip, transportation emissions accounting for 40.7% of total emissions). FDCP implementation with inclusion of the Forest Ranch Concept Plan results in higher CO₂ emissions than the proposed project because the increased density of development results in more vehicle trips. Averages used in calculations are based on standard trip generation and mileage rates. On average, retirees make fewer trips for shorter distances than non-retirees.

It should also be noted that the emissions calculations described above do not take into account reductions in GHG emissions resulting from implementation of AB 32. Stationary emissions sources on the project site and stationary sources that serve the project site (e.g., power plants) will be subject to emissions reductions requirements of AB 32. The extent of these reductions has not yet been quantified by ARB. At the time of project build out, overall CO₂ emissions attributable to the FDCP could be substantially less than current emissions assumptions might indicate. Similarly, if GHG emissions reductions for vehicles are enacted, through either the requirements of AB 1493 or AB 32 or a federal regulation, CO₂ emissions from the FDCP would be further reduced. If regulations proposed to comply with AB 1493 survive current legal challenges, by project build out CO₂ emissions from vehicles associated with the project could be 20% to 30% less than under current conditions.

Emissions reduction requirements associated with AB 1493 and AB 32, SB 1368 and Executive Order S-3-5 would apply throughout California. Therefore, beyond the fact that their effect on the FDCP is unclear, their effect on the overall cumulative context relative to all GHG emissions in California is unknown.

In 2003, global emissions of carbon (i.e., only the carbon atoms within CO₂ molecules) solely from fossil fuel burning totaled an estimated 7,303 million metric tons (Marlands et al. 2006). This translates to approximately 29,400 million tons of CO₂. This is only a portion of global CO₂ emissions because it addresses only fossil fuel burning and does not address other CO₂ sources such as burning of vegetation. Total estimated CO₂ emissions from all sources associated with the Foresthill Divide Community Plan would be less than 0.0005% of this partial global total. CO₂ emissions in California totaled approximately 391 million tons in 2004 (California Energy Commission 2006a). Depending on the alternative selected, total

CO₂ emissions from the Foresthill Divide Community Plan, as estimated above, would be 0.033% to 0.037% of this statewide total.

However, as noted above, the emission calculation methodology treats project emissions as if they were new emissions, and does not correct for the fact that many emission sources associated with the Foresthill Divide Community Plan could simply be moving from an existing location to the project site. Therefore, the project's net contribution of CO₂ to global climate change would be much less than 127,479 tons per year estimated for the proposed project and the 145,968 tons per year estimated for the Forest Ranch Concept Plan component of the FDCP. Similarly, the project's proportion of global and statewide emissions would be less than described above.

Although it is clear that the Foresthill Divide Community Plan's net contribution of CO₂ to global climate change will be less than estimate above, a great deal of uncertainty exists regarding what the net CO₂ emissions would actually be. In addition, it is uncertain how current regulations might affect CO₂ emissions attributable to the project and cumulative CO₂ emissions from other sources in the state. Also, as described previously, it cannot be determined how CO₂ emissions associated with the Foresthill Divide Community Plan might or might not influence actual physical effects of global climate change.

In consideration that, at worst case, Buildout of the FDCP is anticipated to generate only .033% (without inclusion of the forest Ranch Concept Plan) or .037% (with inclusion of the Forest Ranch Concept Plan) of statewide total GHGs, the potential impact of GHG emissions resulting from FDCP Buildout is considered less than significant.

Significant cumulative impacts that cannot be avoided if the Forest Ranch Concept Plan is approved as part of the FDCP and development is carried out as proposed include:

- Cumulative contribution of the proposed project to the loss of habitat and forage lands, habitat degradation due to encroaching urbanization, direct impacts to sensitive species, habitat fragmentation, and obstruction of movement corridors, and harassment of wildlife by humans and pets. As proposed, the project, in conjunction with other future developments on the Foresthill Divide, would contribute to the loss of natural, undisturbed open space in the region, resulting in a decline of biological resources and species diversity. The encroachment of urbanized areas into natural, relatively undisturbed open space is a direct threat to wildlife species in Foresthill, and increased human use results in the degradation of natural undisturbed habitats. Road construction, site grading, and the construction of residential and recreational uses directly removes native plant species, removes habitat for wildlife, and increases the fragmentation of open space in the region, effecting wildlife dispersal. Development of the Forest Ranch project, in conjunction with future projects, will result in the restriction of wildlife movement. No mitigation measures are available, and the impact remains significant, cumulative and unavoidable.
- Operation of the proposed Forest Ranch project will result in the generation of both mobile and stationary source air pollutants. Project operation will introduce stationary, area, and mobile sources of criteria air pollutant emissions to the study area. The primary area and stationary

sources will include residential gas heaters, residential fireplaces, residential landscaping equipment, and commercial landscape maintenance equipment. Other area source emissions will include those from residential barbecues and consumer product use; however, emissions from these sources will be minor. Mobile sources will include exhaust emissions from motor vehicles (including recreational vehicles) and re-entrained dust emissions from motor vehicle travel on paved roads. After mitigation, this impact remains significant and cumulative.

Loss of timber production due to proposed development of the project site. Development of the project site will result in the conversion of over 2,000 acres of productive timberland to residential, open space and recreational uses. According to the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF), although most of the property has been logged and most of the merchantable timber removed in accordance with an active timber harvesting plan (THP), proposed helicopter yarding has not been done. According to CDF, the timberland is highly productive and portions of the site could be harvested in less than 20 years. CDF has indicated that in the long term with proper management, the property could grow 1.2 to 1.6 million board feet of timber per year. CDF concludes that converting this timberland to other uses will lower productivity and reduce the timber supply in the region. The applicant had a consulting forester prepare a response to the CDF comments, which is presented in Impact 3.4.23. Notwithstanding the disagreement among experts regarding the potential future productivity of the project site for timber, the project applicants have not expressed interest in continuing to log the project site. The closure of sawmills in the project area, the cost of transporting logs to sawmills out of the area, the long-term timetable of future harvests, and the environmental impacts of timber harvesting on the project site and area waterways make prospects for future timber harvesting questionable, even if the project applicants should decide to pursue it. Nevertheless, development of the project as proposed would result in the loss of this timber resource, and would contribute to the cumulative loss of timber resources in the region. No mitigation measures are available, and the impact remains significant, cumulative and unavoidable.

The following is a summary of other projects in the vicinity of the project site that, together with the proposed project, could contribute incrementally to impacts discussed above that are cumulatively significant:

- Baker Ranch Complex is a proposed mini-mart and a gas station on a parcel that has one
 existing business, totaling 1.67 acres. The project is located on Foresthill Road across from
 Michigan Bluff Road in Foresthill.
- The Dreisbach Parcel Map is a proposal to divide an existing 613 plus/minus acre parcel into eight single-family residential parcels along with a remainder. The project is located ¼ mile east from the intersection of Auburn-Foresthill Road and Ponderosa Road, approximately 5.3 miles westerly of Foresthill and 13.5 miles easterly of Auburn.
- Foresthill Hermitage is a proposed church (3,000 sq. ft), chapel (2,500 sq. ft.), one hall (2,200 sq. ft.), two offices (2,800 sq. ft.), nine residences and guest units (700-2,000 sq. ft.), one caretaker's unit (2,800 sq. ft.), one kitchen/dining/food storage building (2,800 sq. ft.)

each), two maintenance buildings (2,400 sq. ft. each), on a total of 951 acres. The project is located on Elliot Ranch Road and Foresthill Road, 10 miles east of Foresthill.

• Nellie Jo Ranch is a planned residential development containing 80 single family residential lots, ranging in size from 3 to 11.89 acres and averaging 3.73 acres, and 83.08 acres of open space on a total of 403 acres. The project is located northwest of Spring Garden Road, east of Eagle Crest in the Foresthill area.

5.5 GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS

Section 15126.2(d) of the State CEQA Guidelines provides the following direction regarding analysis of growth-inducing impacts:

Discuss the ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Included in this are projects which would remove obstacles to population growth (a major expansion of a wastewater treatment plant might, for example, allow for more construction in service areas). Increases in the population may tax existing community service facilities, requiring construction of new facilities that could cause significant environmental effects. Also discuss the characteristic of some projects which may encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively. It must not be assumed that growth in any area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.

The estimated population of the Plan area for 2000 is 5,702. The population projection for 2030 is 9,620 and the estimated maximum buildout population for the Plan area is 18,272. This is within the context of the population of Placer County, which was 237,145 in 2000, a projected 336,805 in 2010, and a projected 396,785 in 2020. The proposed FDCP represents a substantial reduction in the buildout population of the existing 1981 Foresthill General Plan, which was 14,400 (as stated in the text of the Plan for an area approximately one-half the size).

The need for future housing is based on the community's projected population. These increased population figures would indicate a demand for approximately 1,567 additional housing units by the year 2030. As many as 219 additional mobile home park units will be needed in the Plan area by 2030, and up to 60 units of multi-family housing will be needed as well. Single family housing will continue to be the dominant housing type, and assuming a 2 percent growth rate, 1,282 additional units will be needed.

Within the context of planned population growth in Placer County, population growth in the Plan area will not exceed regional population projections, and will not create substantial unplanned growth or concentration of people in the Plan area. As stated in the "Setting" discussion, Foresthill and other unincorporated areas will absorb a portion of the growth in Placer County, but geographical isolation, rugged terrain, and proactive community planning will slow growth to a rate that will not exceed buildout capacity. This was determined to be less than significant. Additionally, the FDCP does not propose to extend utilities in excess of those needed to serve

the planned population. Absent inclusion of the Forest Ranch Concept Plan, the Plan does not propose a community sewer system, and water service would be extended only to developments that are consistent with the proposed Plan. This potential growth-inducing impact is therefore considered less than significant.