

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 San Juan Water District. Therefore, the project will not violate water quality standards with respect to potable water. Therefore, 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. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion- Item IX-3:

A preliminary drainage report was prepared by the applicant's engineer. The pre development drainage from the site includes overland flows and flows within natural swales. The site runoff generally flows from the north to the south toward the existing pond and Strap Ravine located along the south property boundary. The site is located within the within the Strap Ravine sub watershed of the Dry Creek watershed as identified in the Dry Creek Watershed Flood Control Plan.

The project has analyzed a drainage system that will change the onsite drainage patterns due to the construction of the proposed project improvements. However, the change in direction from existing on site surface runoff is less than significant as the overall on site watershed runoff continues to be conveyed to the same existing discharge points as the pre development condition and ultimately into the same existing pond and watershed leaving the site. Therefore, this impact is less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item IX-4:

The proposed project has the potential to increase the stormwater runoff amount and volume. The potential for increases in stormwater runoff have the potential to result in downstream impacts. A preliminary drainage report was prepared for the project. The existing ten and 100 year peak flows from the site are identified as 3.9 and 7.9 cubic feet per second, respectively. The post project flows identified in the report indicated an increase in flows from pre development levels of 3.3 and 5.5 cubic feet per second for the ten and 100 year storm event, respectively. The project site is not located in an area identified in the Granite Bay Community Plan as recommended for local stormwater detention. Because the project is not recommended for local stormwater detention and the existing pond and Strap Ravine is immediately adjacent to the project site with an anticipated ten and 100 year flow of approximately 600 cfs and 1,000 cfs, no significant off site drainage impacts will occur.

The post development volume of runoff will be slightly higher due to the increase in proposed impervious surfaces; however, this is considered to be less than significant because drainage facilities are generally designed to handle the peak flow runoff.

The property proposed for development is within the Dry Creek Watershed Flood Control Plan area. Flooding along Dry Creek and its tributaries (this property is in the Strap Ravine watershed) is well documented. Cumulative downstream impacts were studied in the Dry Creek Watershed Flood Control Plan in order to plan for flood control projects and set flood control policies. Mitigation measures for development in this area include flood control development fees to fund regional detention basins to reduce flooding on major streams in the Dry Creek watershed. If fees are not collected on a project by project basis to fund regional detention facilities, these types of capital improvements may not be realized and flooding impacts to properties within the Dry Creek Watershed area will persist. Staff considers these cumulative flood control impacts to be potentially significant impacts.

A final drainage report will be prepared and submitted with the site improvement plans for County review and approval in order to monitor the preliminary report drainage calculations and results. The proposed project's impacts associated with increases in peak flow and volumetric runoff can be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures:

Mitigation Measures- Item IX-4:

MM VI.1, MM VI.2 and the following measures:

MM IX.1 The Improvement Plan submittal shall include a final drainage report in conformance with the requirements of Section 5 of the Land Development Manual and the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal, to the Engineering and Surveying Department for review and approval. The report shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and shall, at a minimum, include: A written text addressing existing conditions, the effects of the improvements, all appropriate calculations, a watershed map, increases in downstream flows, proposed on- and off-site improvements and drainage easements to accommodate flows from this project. The report shall identify water quality protection features and methods to be used both during construction and for long-term post-construction water quality protection. "Best Management Practice" measures shall be provided to reduce erosion, water quality degradation, and prevent the discharge of pollutants to stormwater to the maximum extent practicable.

MM IX.2 This project is subject to the one-time payment of drainage improvement and flood control fees pursuant to the "Dry Creek Watershed Interim Drainage Improvement Ordinance" (Ref. Chapter 15, Article 15.32, Placer County Code.) The current estimated development fee is \$1,950 per gross parcel acreage, payable to the Engineering and Surveying Department prior to Building Permit issuance. The fees to be paid shall be based on the fee program in effect at the time that the application is deemed complete.

MM IX.3 This project is subject to payment of annual drainage improvement and flood control fees pursuant to the "Dry Creek Watershed Interim Drainage Improvement Ordinance" (Ref. Chapter 15, Article 15.32, Placer County Code). Prior to Building Permit issuance, the applicant shall cause the subject property to become a participant in the existing Dry Creek Watershed County Service Area for purposes of collecting these annual assessments. The current estimated annual fee is \$252 per gross parcel acreage.

Discussion- Items IX-5,6:

The construction of the proposed improvements has the potential to degrade water quality. Stormwater runoff naturally contains numerous constituents; however, urbanization and urban activities including development and redevelopment typically increase constituent concentrations to levels that potentially impact water quality. Pollutants associated with stormwater include (but are not limited to) sediment, nutrients, oils/greases, etc. The proposed urban type development has the potential to result in the generation of new dry-weather runoff containing said pollutants and also has the potential to increase the concentration and/or total load of said pollutants in wet weather stormwater runoff. The proposed project's impacts associated with water quality can be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures:

Mitigation Measures- Items IX-5,6:

MM VI.1, MM VI.2, MM VI.3, MM VI.4, MM VI.5, and MM IX.1 and the following measures:

MM IX.4 The Improvement Plans shall show that water quality treatment facilities/Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall be designed according to the guidance of the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks for Construction, for New Development / Redevelopment, and for Industrial and Commercial (or other similar source as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD) such as the Stormwater Quality Design Manual for the Sacramento and South Placer Regions.

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 Department (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 include, but are not limited to: Water Quality Inlets (TC-50), Storm Drain Signage (SD-13), Sweeping and Vacuuming Pavement (SE-7), etc. No water quality facility construction shall be permitted within any identified wetlands area, floodplain, or right-of-way, except as authorized by project approvals.

All BMPs shall be maintained as required to insure effectiveness. The applicant shall provide for the establishment of vegetation, where specified, by means of proper irrigation. Proof of on-going maintenance, such as contractual evidence, shall be provided to ESD upon request. Maintenance of these facilities shall be provided by the project owners/permittees unless, and until, a County Service Area is created and said facilities are accepted by the County for maintenance. Contractual evidence of a monthly parking lot sweeping and vacuuming, and catch basin cleaning program shall be provided to the ESD upon request. Failure to do so will be grounds for discretionary permit revocation. Prior to Improvement Plan approval, easements shall be created and offered for dedication to the County for maintenance and access to these facilities in anticipation of possible County maintenance.

MM IX.5 The Improvement Plans shall include the message details, placement, and locations showing that all storm drain inlets and catch basins within the project area shall be permanently marked/embossed with prohibitive language such as "No Dumping! Flows to Creek." or other language /graphical icons to discourage illegal dumping as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD). ESD-approved signs and prohibitive language and/or graphical icons, which prohibit illegal dumping, shall be posted at public access points along channels and creeks within the project area. The Property Owners and/or Property Owners' association are responsible for maintaining the legibility of stamped messages and signs.

MM IX.6 The Improvement Plans shall show that all stormwater runoff shall be diverted around trash storage areas to minimize contact with pollutants. Trash container areas shall be screened or walled to prevent off-site transport of trash by the forces of water or wind. Trash containers shall not be allowed to leak and must remain covered when not in use.

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 a 100-year flood hazard area as defined and mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The ultimate project improvements are not proposed within a local 100-year flood hazard area and no flood flows will be redirected after construction of any improvements. However, there is an existing local 100-year floodplain on and adjacent to (south of) the proposed project site. The project site is not located within any levee or dam failure inundation area.

A final drainage report will be prepared and submitted with the site improvement plans for County review and approval in order to monitor the preliminary report drainage calculations and results and to identify the 100-year floodplain limits. The proposed project's impacts associated with impacts to the existing 100 year floodplain can be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures:

Mitigation Measures- Items IX-8,9,10:

MM VI.1, MM VI.2, and MM IX.1 and the following measures:

MM IX.7 On the Improvement Plans and Informational Sheet(s) filed with the Final Parcel Map, show the limits of the future, unmitigated, fully developed, 100-year flood plain (after grading) for the existing off site pond (Strap Ravine) immediately south of the project site and designate same as a building setback line unless greater setbacks are required by other conditions contained herein.

MM IX.8 On the Improvement Plans and Informational Sheet(s) filed with the Final Parcel Map; show that the finished building pad elevations shall be a minimum of two feet above the 100-year flood plain line (or finished floor -three feet above the 100-year floodplain line). The final pad elevation shall be certified by a California registered

civil engineer or licensed land surveyor and submitted to the Engineering and Surveying Department. This certification shall be done prior to construction of the foundation or at the completion of final grading, whichever comes first. No building construction is allowed until the certification has been received by the Engineering and Surveying Department and approved by the floodplain manager. Benchmark elevation and location shall be shown on the Improvement Plans and Informational Sheet (s) to the satisfaction of Development Review Committee.

MM IX.9 In order to protect site resources, no grading activities of any kind may take place within the 100-year flood plain of the stream/drainage way nor within the watershed of the vernal pool(s), unless otherwise approved as a part of this project. All work shall conform to provisions of the County Flood Damage Prevention Regulations (Section 15.52, Placer County Code). A standard note to this effect shall be included on the Improvement Plans. The location of the 100-year flood plain shall be shown on the Improvement Plans.

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. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion- Item IX-12:

The proposed project is located within the Dry Creek watershed identified in the Granite Bay Community Plan. The proposed project's impacts associated with impacts to surface water quality within this watershed can be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures:

Mitigation Measures- Item IX-12:

MM VI.1, MM VI.2, MM VI.3, MM VI.4, MM VI.5, MM IX.1, MM IX.4, MM IX.5, and MM IX.6.

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- Item X-1:

The project includes the construction of two commercial craftsman loft buildings, a commercial event center, and associated parking and circulation areas. The proposed project will not physically divide an established community

as the project site is currently undeveloped and surrounded by commercial and residential uses. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion- Item X-2:

The proposed project includes the development of three commercial buildings on a parcel, which does not allow for the proposed office development (craftsman loft buildings) due to conflicting land use and zoning designations. The proposed project will conflict with the Granite Bay Community Plan designation of Rural Residential 2.3–4.6 acre minimum and the zoning designation of Residential Agriculture with a building site minimum of 2.3 acres and with a Planned Development Designation of 0.44 dwelling units per acre for parcel 048-142-036. The proposed project will require the approval of a General Plan Amendment to change the land use designation from Rural Residential 2.3-4.6 acre minimum, to Commercial, and a Rezone to change the zoning designation from Residential Agriculture, with a building site minimum of 2.3 acres, with a Planned Development designation of 0.44 dwelling units per acre (RA-B-100, PD=0.44) to Office and Professional (OP).

In addition to being in conflict with the land use designation set forth in the Granite Bay Community Plan, the project also conflicts with section A(2) (c) of the "Design Standards – Guidelines" set forth in Appendix A of the Granite Bay Community Plan, which sets forth a 300 foot setback on "all parcels currently undeveloped, or created after the adoption of the Community Design Element and intended for residential use...". This guideline is intended to establish the 300 foot setback on all applicable parcels on the south side of Douglas Boulevard in order to provide a noise buffer and vegetated screen. Should a General Plan Amendment and Rezone be approved for this project, this guideline will no longer apply, as the parcel will no longer be intended for residential use. Because the depth of the property is less than 500 feet it would be problematic to meet the minimum setback of 300 feet, and because the property is void of any vegetation (within the northern portion) that could provide a noise buffer and screening, any proposed project would have a problem complying with this requirement regardless of the type of development proposed.

The conflicts between the proposed project and the land use and zoning designations and the design guidelines set forth in the Granite Bay Community Plan will not result in a significant environmental impact. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item X-3:

The project site is not located in an area subject to a Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion- Item X-4:

The proposed project could result in the development of incompatible uses and/or the creation of land use conflicts because the project includes two craftsman loft office buildings, the current land use designation and zoning does not support the proposed project. The land use designation and zoning on Assessor's Parcel 048-142-036 allows for residential development. This parcel is adjacent to a commercial development to the west and is adjacent to a single-family residential land use to the east and south. Given the proximity of the proposed project to adjacent residential uses (east and south of the site), the project could create an incompatible use or land use conflicts. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item X-5:

The project site does not include any commercial agricultural use and does not include timber resources. The project proposes the development of a parcel which will not result in significant impacts to agricultural or timber resources. There is no impact.

Discussion- Item X-6:

The proposed project will not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community as it is surrounded by a mix of undeveloped land, commercial uses, and single family residential uses. There is no impact.

Discussion- Item X-7:

The project will result in the substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of a parcel; however, it will not result in the substantial alteration of the planned land use in the area. The project site is located in an area that allows for commercial uses adjacent to residential uses. This portion of the Douglas Boulevard corridor is currently developed with commercial uses to the west and across Douglas Boulevard to the north, as well as single-family residential uses to the east and south. The proposed project would require changing the land use and zoning designation on the 5.2-acre parcel to allow for commercial use rather than residential use. The overall effect of this

will not result in the substantial alteration of the present or planned use in the area. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item X-8:

The proposed project includes the construction of two commercial craftsman loft buildings and a commercial event center and will not cause economic or social changes that would result in significant adverse physical changes to the environment such as urban decay or deterioration. Therefore, 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:

No valuable, locally important mineral resources have been identified by the Department of Conservation's "Mineral Land Classification of Placer County" (dated 1995) on the project site. Development of the project would not result in impacts to mineral resources. There is no impact.

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-1,2:

The Environmental Noise Assessment was conducted by Bollard Acoustical Consultants, Inc. and is dated August 20, 2013. This project proposes two, craftsman loft buildings, a commercial event center at the south end of the parcel, and associated parking. According to the assessment, the existing noise environment at the nearest potentially affected restaurant (Quarry Ponds) and residential land uses (Sheba Court) near the project site is defined primarily by vehicular traffic on Douglas Boulevard and natural sounds. Noise levels for amplified speaking,

64

amplified music, and for guests engaged in conversation and/or cheering with raised voices were evaluated for the Commercial Event Center. Noise generated during the operation of the proposed Ponds Event Center is predicted to satisfy the Placer County daytime noise standards at the project property lines and the nearest existing single-family residences. In order to reduce noise impacts to less than significant, the following mitigation measures are required:

Mitigation Measures- Items XII-1,2:

MM XII.1 The following specific measures are required to minimize the propagation of noise levels generated during events at this facility to the maximum extent feasible: 1). All outdoor noise-generating activities that exceed the nighttime sound level standards as outlined in the Granite Bay Community Plan shall be completed by 10:00 P.M., including amplified speech and music; 2).Speakers used for the amplification of speech or music shall be oriented to the north and located as far as practical from the outdoor dining area of the adjacent restaurant; 3). Amplified speech or music played at the event center shall not exceed maximum sound levels of 85 dBA Lmax at a position 25 feet in front of the speakers, or average sound levels of 80 dB at that same distance. The management of the event center shall procure a sound level meter to ensure that these reference levels, and the county noise standards, are being satisfied during each event. 4).The audibility of amplified music and speech generated by the event center will vary at the nearest residences as atmospheric conditions change. Although audibility is not a threshold for a finding of significant noise impacts, facility representatives are encouraged to work with the neighbors to develop procedures for addressing noise-related concerns with the surrounding outdoor events held at the site.

Discussion- Item XII-3:

The project may result in a moderate temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project resulting from construction of required project improvements that include two craftsman loft buildings, a commercial event center and associated parking. This temporary increase due to limited, short term construction activities will be less than significant. Project related construction noise would need to comply with the Placer County Noise Ordinance. A condition of approval for the project will be recommended that limits construction hours so that early evening and early mornings, as well as all day Sunday, will be free of construction noise. 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 use airport. There is no impact.

Discussion- Item XII-5:

The project is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip 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:

The project will not directly or indirectly result in substantial population growth in the area. There is no impact.

Discussion- Item XIII-2:

The project will not displace existing housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. 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 project could result in a modest incremental increase in the need for fire protection services for the two craftsman loft buildings and commercial event center that would be constructed. Any newly constructed commercial buildings will be required to comply with the California Building Code. Therefore, the project will not require the provision of new or physically altered fire protection facilities nor significantly impair service ratios, response times or other performance objectives. This would result in a less than significant impact to the provision of fire protection services. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XIV-2:

The project could result in a modest incremental increase in the need for sheriff protection services. The addition of the new commercial buildings would result in a less than significant impact to the provision of sheriff protection services. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Items XIV-3,4,5:

The project could result in a modest incremental increase in the need for schools, roads, parks, and other governmental services. This increase would not result in a substantial adverse physical impact from the provision of new or expanded facilities or services. Additionally, the provision of these services would be offset by existing fee programs regulated by ordinance (such as the countywide traffic fee program) that are integrated into the Commercial Building Permit process. No mitigation measures are required.

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:

The project could result in a modest incremental increase in the use of and need for neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. This increase would not result in a substantial physical deterioration of these facilities. This would result in a less than significant impact to the provision of recreational facilities because provision of these services would be offset by collection of Park Preservation Fund fees regulated by county ordinance (Sections 15.34.010, 16.08.100 and/or 17.54.100.D). No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XV-2:

This project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical 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- Items XVI-1,2:

The proposed project will result in the construction of an approximately 7,500 square foot event center and two office/professional buildings totaling approximately 23,662 square feet. A traffic impact analysis was prepared for the project.

The traffic study includes the existing plus project analysis and a cumulative analysis. The proposed project has the potential to generate approximately 1,628 weekday daily trips and approximately 404 trips during the PM peak hour.

The proposed project's traffic was superimposed onto existing background volumes. The following intersections were analyzed: Douglas Blvd./Berg Street; Douglas Blvd./Barton Road; Douglas Blvd./Quarry Pond access; and Douglas Blvd./Fellowship Church access.

Existing Plus Project: The addition of project traffic will increase the length of delays occurring at intersections. However, the addition of project traffic does not result in any analyzed intersection operating at a Level of Service that exceeds the minimum established by the Granite Bay Community Plan (LOS E) during the PM peak hour. The existing plus project Level of Service standards are not exceeded; therefore, the project impacts are less than significant.

Cumulative: The traffic study analyzed the weekday peak hour Levels of Service under the Year 2025 conditions with and without the proposed project. As the background traffic volume at the analyzed intersections increases in the future, the length of delays for motorists will increase. The Level of Service at the Douglas Blvd./Quarry Pond and Fellowship Church accesses remain at LOS A. The Level of Service at the Douglas Blvd./Berg Street intersection will drop to LOS D/E with and without the project. LOS D and E are within the LOS E minimum established by the Granite Bay Community Plan. Therefore, the impacts to these intersections are not significant.

The Douglas Blvd./Barton Road intersection is forecast to drop to a LOS F. LOS F exceeds the minimum requirements of the Granite Bay Community Plan. In this circumstance, the significance of the project's impact is based on the incremental increase in delay associated with the project. In this case, the average delay per vehicle is projected to increase by 3.6 seconds. The Placer County methodology of assessment accepts an increment of 4.0 seconds before making a finding of significance, the project's impact to this intersection is less than significant.

A "worst case" site development scenario was also evaluated for the rezone, although this concept is not proposed at this time. This site development scenario is based on 56,000 square feet of office professional development and has the potential to generate roughly twice the P.M. peak hour traffic as the proposed project. This scenario forecasts a LOS F at the Douglas Blvd/Barton Road intersection. The significance of this scenario's impact is based on the incremental increase in delay associated with the project. In this scenario, the average delay per vehicle is projected to increase by 8.3 seconds. The Placer County methodology of assessment accepts an increment of 4.0 seconds before making a finding of significance; therefore, this scenario's impacts to this intersection are significant and mitigation would be required. The mitigation in this scenario would be the payment of traffic impact fees for the construction of improvements identified in the Granite Bay Community Plan CIP. Upon construction of the identified improvements, the LOS would be reduced to LOS E, which would satisfy the minimum requirements of the Granite Bay Community Plan.

The proposed project's impacts associated with increases in traffic can be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures:

Mitigation Measures- Items XVI-1,2:

MM XVI.1 Prior to issuance of any Building Permits, this project shall be subject to the payment of traffic impact fees that are in effect in this area (Granite Bay), pursuant to applicable Ordinances and Resolutions. The applicant is notified that the following traffic mitigation fee(s) shall be required and shall be paid to Placer County DPW:

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

The current total combined estimated fee is \$468,373.22. The fees were calculated using the information supplied. If the use or the square footage changes, then the fees will change. The actual fees paid shall be those in effect at the time the payment occurs.

Discussion- Item XVI-3:

The traffic impact analysis analyzed the impacts on U-turn volumes, left turn lane storage, and the median design at the project encroachment onto Douglas Blvd. The analysis concluded that there are no significant impacts resulting in U-turn volumes. The left turn lane storage length meets the California Highway Design Manual guidelines. However, with the additional trips from the project accessing the existing left turn lane into the Fellowship Church for U-turn movements to travel westbound on Douglas Blvd., the existing turn lane and deceleration length is impacted. The location of the proposed project's driveway access encroachment onto Douglas Blvd. would allow left turns from the site onto Douglas Blvd. However, this left turn movement onto Douglas Blvd. with a 55 mph design speed creates vehicle circulation safety impacts. The proposed project's impacts associated with vehicle safety can be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures:

Mitigation Measures- Item XVI-3:

MM XVI.2 The Improvement Plans shall show the construction of a raised median at the existing Fellowship Church access onto Douglas Blvd. that will prohibit left turn movements from the proposed project access onto Douglas Blvd. while maintaining inbound and outbound left turns movements from the Fellowship Church access as show

on the Preliminary Frontage Improvement Plan submitted with the project. The design shall be to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works and shall conform to any applicable criteria specified in the latest version of the Caltrans *Highway Design Manual* for a design speed of 55 miles per hour (mph), unless an alternative is approved by the Department of Public Works.

MM XVI.3 The Improvement Plans shall show the construction of an increase in existing turn lane pocket length for the existing turn lane accessing the Fellowship Church site along Douglas Blvd. as show on the Preliminary Frontage Improvement Plan submitted with the project. The design shall be to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works and shall conform to any applicable criteria specified in the latest version of the Caltrans *Highway Design Manual* for a design speed of 55 miles per hour (mph), unless an alternative is approved by the Department of Public Works.

Discussion- Item XVI-4:

The servicing fire district has reviewed the proposed project and has not identified any significant impacts that would result in any physical change to the environment. Therefore, this impact is less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XVI-5:

There is an existing parking easement agreement that is recorded on the subject parcel and identified in the Preliminary Title Report. The parking easement agreement is for the benefit of the Quarry Pond Shopping Center immediately to the west of the subject parcel and the agreement identifies the right of the Quarry Pond project to park on the northern 1/3 portion of the Pond Pavilion and Lofts project site.

A Commercial Event Center requires a parking ratio of one parking space for every 2.5 guests and one parking space for every permanent employees (based on 500 guests and four permanent employees a total of 204 parking spaces would be required). The parking requirements for the craftsman lofts based on the proposed uses would be 86 spaces. Therefore, the total parking spaces required would be 290. A total of 233 on-site parking spaces (181 parking spaces and 52 additional valet parking spaces) would be provided and in addition 57 off-site parking spaces (57 spaces – actual versus required) would need to be made available on an as needed basis depending upon the number of guests attending the Commercial Event Center. A mitigation measure is required.

Mitigation Measures- Item XVI-5:

MM XVI.4 Provide an off-site parking agreement in the amount of 57 spaces. The off-site parking agreement shall be in place prior to Improvement Plan approval and/or recordation of the Parcel Map for the Pond Pavilion and Lofts proposed development.

Discussion- Item XVI-6:

The Douglas Blvd. frontage improvements are proposed to include an approximate eight foot wide shoulder and an eight foot wide concrete sidewalk. The proposed project will be constructing site improvements that do not create any significant hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists. Therefore, this impact is less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XVI-7:

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

Discussion- Item XVI-8:

The proposed 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. 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		

69

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-1,2:

The proposed project is located within the Placer County Sewer Maintenance District 2 (SMD-2). The project proposes to connect to the existing sewer line within Douglas Blvd. The proposed project will contribute additional wastewater flows to the existing conveyance system. Placer County has identified existing downstream conveyance deficiencies that will be impacted by the additional wastewater flows generated by the proposed project. The project is tributary to the Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP). The project will increase wastewater flows to the treatment plant. However, the increase will not require any additional expansion of the treatment plant and is within the current capacity of the treatment plant. With the following mitigation measures, the impact of increased wastewater flows will be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures- Items XVII-1,2:

MM XVII.1 The applicant shall pay their fair share fee per EDU, prior to Improvement Plan approval, toward the cost of the future improvement project (including design and construction management along with actual construction costs) as identified in the RMC Technical Memorandum Trunk Sewer Hydraulic Analysis (TM 3b) dated April 14, 2006; updated January 24, 2008 and September 3, 2009 of the December 2009 South Placer Regional Wastewater and Recycled Water Systems Evaluation (Systems Evaluation). The Environmental Engineering Division will use this money to reduce surcharging within the trunk sewer by replacement, and/or rehabilitation of existing sewer infrastructure. The applicant is notified that the fair share fee per EDU to be approved by the Environmental Engineering Division will be contributed to the cost to construct the recommended improvement projects and such fee will be required prior to Improvement Plan approval.

Discussion- Item XVII-3:

The project will be served by public sewer, and will not require or result in the construction of new on-site sewage systems. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion- Item XVII-4:

The storm water will be collected in the proposed on site drainage facilities and conveyed via a storm drain system into the existing discharge point location and the existing pond and Strap Ravine along the southern boundary of the project site. This project proposes the construction of a storm drain system to Placer County standards. The construction of the drainage facilities will not cause significant environmental effects. Therefore, this impact is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Items XVII-5,6:

The agencies charged with providing treated water, sewer services, and refuse disposal have indicated their requirements to serve the project. These requirements are routine in nature and do not represent significant impacts. The project will not result in the construction of new treatment facilities or create an expansion of an existing facility. Typical project conditions of approval require submission of "will-serve" letters from each agency. No mitigation measures are required.

70

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, Roy Schaefer, Chairperson
 Planning Services Division, Air Quality, Lisa Carnahan
 Engineering and Surveying Division, Phil Frantz
 Environmental Engineering Division, Heather Knutson
 Department of Public Works, Transportation, Amber Conboy
 Environmental Health Services, Mohan Ganapathy
 Flood Control Districts, Andrew Darrow
 Facility Services, Parks, Andy Fisher

Signature  Date January 7, 2014
 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tree Ordinance	
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources Pedestrian Survey
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources Records Search
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lighting & Photometric Plan
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Paleontological Survey
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tree Survey & Arborist Report
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wetland Delineation
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Acoustical Analysis
	Engineering & Surveying Division, Flood Control District	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Title Report
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Grading Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Geotechnical Report
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Drainage Report
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stormwater & Surface Water Quality BMP Plan
		<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Utility Plan
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tentative Map
	Environmental Health Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Contamination Report
		<input type="checkbox"/> Hydro-Geological Study
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
		<input type="checkbox"/> Soils Screening
	Planning Services Division, Air Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> CALINE4 Carbon Monoxide Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Construction Emission & Dust Control Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Health Risk Assessment
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CalEEMod Model Output
	Fire Department	<input type="checkbox"/> Emergency Response and/or Evacuation Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Traffic & Circulation Plan

**Mitigation Monitoring Program -
Mitigated Negative Declaration Plus # PGPA 20120354
Project - Ponds Pavilion & Lofts**

Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code requires all public agencies to establish monitoring or reporting procedures for mitigation measures adopted as a condition of project approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment. Monitoring of such mitigation measures may extend through project permitting, construction, and project operations, as necessary.

Said monitoring shall be accomplished by the county's standard mitigation monitoring program and/or a project specific mitigation reporting program as defined in Placer County Code Chapter 18.28, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

Standard Mitigation Monitoring Program (pre project implementation):

The following mitigation monitoring program (and following project specific reporting plan, when required) shall be utilized by Placer County to implement Public Resources Code Section 21081.6. Mitigation measures adopted for discretionary projects must be included as conditions of approval for that project. Compliance with conditions of approval is monitored by the county through a variety of permit processes as described below. The issuance of any of these permits or county actions which must be preceded by a verification that certain conditions of approval/mitigation measures have been met, shall serve as the required monitoring of those condition of approval/mitigation measures. These actions include design review approval, improvement plan approval, improvement construction inspection, encroachment permit, recordation of a final map, acceptance of subdivision improvements as complete, building permit approval, and/or certification of occupancy.

The following mitigation measures, identified in the Mitigated Negative Declaration, have been adopted as conditions of approval on the project's discretionary permit and will be monitored according to the above Standard Mitigation Monitoring Program verification process:

Mitigation Measures #'s MM I.1, MM III.1, MM IV.1, MM IV.2, MM IV.3, MM VI.1, MM VI.2, MM VI.3, MM VI.4, MM VI.5, MM VII.1, MM IX.1, MM IX.2, MM IX.3, MM IX.4, MM IX.5, MM IX.6, MM IX.7, MM IX.8, MM IX.9, MM IX.12, MM XII.1, MM XVI.1, MM XVI.2, MM VI.3, MM XVI.4, & MMXVII.1.

Project Specific Reporting Plan (post project implementation):

The reporting plan component is intended to provide for on-going monitoring after project construction to ensure mitigation measures remain effective for a designated period of time. Said reporting plans shall contain all components identified in Chapter 18.28.050 of the County code, Environmental Review Ordinance- "Contents of project specific reporting plan."

The following reporting plan has been adopted for this project and is included as conditions of approval on the discretionary permit.