

## 2 SUMMARY

### 2.1 INTRODUCTION

This Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) is an informational document intended to inform the public and decision-makers about the environmental consequences of the proposed Placer Retirement Residence development project (proposed project). This Draft EIR is a “Project EIR” as defined in Section 15161 of the CEQA Guidelines. The Draft EIR considers the environmental impacts of the proposed project as well as the additive effects of growth throughout the Placer County area and the region. These latter impacts are referred to as cumulative impacts. The Draft EIR also evaluates a range of alternatives, including different development densities for the project site. This Draft EIR has been prepared for Placer County, pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The proposed project was reviewed in an Initial Study in accordance with the significance criteria developed by Placer County based on criteria presented in Appendix G, “Environmental Checklist Form,” of the CEQA Guidelines. The Initial Study is attached to this Draft EIR in Appendix A. The Initial Study was used to determine potential for project-related impacts for each of the topics listed in the environmental checklist. These criteria were used to determine “no impact”, “less than significant impact”, “less than significant with mitigation measures”, or potentially significant impact”. This Draft EIR only addresses those criteria for which the Initial Study found that the proposed project could cause a potentially significant impact. All other impacts that were analyzed and determined to be less than significant or less than significant with the incorporation of mitigation measures in the Initial Study and will not be addressed further in this Draft EIR. A table of these impacts and any associated mitigation measures is included at the end of this summary in *Table S-1: Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures*. Further detail can be found in the Initial Study, which is attached to this Draft EIR in Appendix A.

This Draft EIR describes the existing environmental resources in the vicinity of the project site, analyzes potential impacts on those resources due to the proposed project, and identifies mitigation measures that could avoid or reduce the magnitude of those significant impacts. The environmental impacts evaluated in this Draft EIR concern several subject areas, including aesthetics/light and glare, air quality, biological resources, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise, public services, transportation and traffic, as well as potential impacts on energy conservation effects. As noted in the preceding paragraph, an Initial Study was prepared for the proposed project which determined that there were areas where either no impacts would occur, less-than-significant

impacts would occur, or the impacts would be less-than-significant with mitigation, it was determined that certain topics would not require further consideration in the Draft EIR. Those topics include agricultural and forest resources, cultural resources, paleontological resources, tribal cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, mineral resources, population and housing, utilities and service systems, and recreation.

Initially, this EIR is being published as a Draft EIR. The Draft EIR will be subject to review and comment by the public, as well as responsible agencies and other interested jurisdictions, agencies, and organizations for a period of 45 days. During the public review period, a hearing will be held before the Placer County Planning Commission at a date to be determined to receive comments on the Draft EIR. The public may comment on the Draft EIR by testifying at the public hearing or may submit written comments at any time during the 45-day public review period.

Following the public review period, written responses will be prepared to all comments received on the Draft EIR. Those written responses, and any other necessary changes to the Draft EIR, will constitute the Final EIR and will be submitted to the Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors for their consideration. If Placer County finds that the Final EIR is “adequate and complete” in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, the County may certify the EIR. The Placer County Board of Supervisors would also consider adoption of Findings of Fact pertaining to the EIR, specific mitigation measures, a Statement of Overriding Considerations (if needed), and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan. Upon review and consideration of the Final EIR, the hearing body may take action concerning the proposed project.

## **2.2 PROJECT LOCATION**

The proposed project is located within the Granite Bay community in the unincorporated area of Placer County. Regionally, the project site is located approximately 22 miles northeast of downtown Sacramento. Interstate 80 (I-80) is located approximately 2.5 miles northwest of the project site, U.S. Highway 50 (US-50) is located approximately 6.5 miles to the south, and Folsom Lake is located approximately 3 miles to the east. Locally, the project site is located at 3905 Old Auburn Road and is generally bounded by Sierra College Boulevard to the east, undeveloped parcels and Haskell Way to the north, residential uses to the west, and Old Auburn Road to the south. Regional access to the project site is provided by I-80 via East Roseville Parkway and Old Auburn Road.

## **2.3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The project proposes a Residential Care Home for seniors. The project would consist of a single, three-story building with a height of 34'-4", containing 145 congregate living suites with two

manager dwelling units and an overall building footprint of approximately 51,000 square feet. The project includes a change to the existing zoning classification from Residential Single-Family (RS-AG-B-100) to Residential Agriculture (RA-B-100) and removing the Agricultural combining district.

The three-story building layout is designed to minimize travel distances from residential suites to shared common areas. This is achieved by minimizing distances from suites to the elevators that lead to common areas on the first and second floor. This building design minimizes the building footprint and provides increased building setbacks from the property lines. The project provides the following increased setbacks:

| Property Boundary                                | Proposed Setback | Required Setback |
|--|------------------|------------------|
| Eastern property line - Sierra College Boulevard | 222 feet         | 50 Feet          |
| Southern property line - Old Auburn Road         | 144 Feet         | 50 Feet          |
| Western property line                            | 75 Feet          | 30 Feet          |
| Northern property line                           | 85 Feet          | 30 Feet          |

The design of the building includes shared common space central to the building layout with private suites extending out from the central core. The square footage of suites varies from a minimum of 350 square feet for smaller studios to over 1,000 square feet for larger two bedrooms. Each private suite contains a full bathroom, a sleeping area, and an area with a sink and a small refrigerator. Two-bedroom suites have an additional sleeping area and a second full bathroom. The private suites do not have cooking facilities or dishwashers and are not apartments or dwelling units.

Shared common areas are in the central core of the building. On the main floor, the shared space contains the main entry, reservation office, marketing office and managers units. As the suites do not provide cooking facilities, a commercial kitchen on the first floor serves three chef-prepared meals daily. Meals are served restaurant style in the adjacent central dining room. A private dining room is also available for residents to accommodate visiting family and friends. The main floor is also proposed to include amenities such as a coffee lounge, activity area, beauty salon, and a media room. The main floor core provides direct access to the outdoor amenity space on the northeast side of the building. The main building entry would be open from 8:00 am to 8:00 pm and otherwise access controlled by keypad. Other entrances and exits are available at all hours for residents and their guests with key cards. For resident's safety and security, exiting the building would always be possible without a key card.

The project is a residential care home for seniors proposed to meet a growing demand for senior housing in Placer County and the Granite Bay area in particular.<sup>1</sup> The proposed project would be managed by two teams who reside onsite and oversee the daily operations of the facility. The manager and co-manager teams consist of two couples who work together to manage the residential care home. The manager team would be an experienced couple brought in from an existing operating facility owned by the applicant. The co-manager team and all other employees would be hired locally. Approximately 80 percent of the residents (approximately 128 persons) are expected to come from the surrounding community. As such, with the one management team coming from outside the area, the total expected population increase is approximately 34 persons.

The proposed project would employ approximately 30 people, 18 of which are full time staff. A typical shift would have 8 to 12 staff on shift at one time. This would usually be the manager on duty, kitchen staff, cleaning staff and activity directors.

---

#### **EMPLOYEES & SHIFT SCHEDULE**

The proposed facility does not include medical services, only the services as specified in the project description. A member of management staff would be on the premises 24 hours a day.

Weekday staffing is anticipated as follows based on similar projects:

- 4 managers permanently reside on-site.
- Chef – 6:00 am to 2:30 pm
- Kitchen Helper – 7:00 am to 3:30 pm
- Housekeepers (3 average) – 8:00 am to 4:30 pm
- Maintenance Person – 8:00 am to 4:30 pm
- Activity Coordinator – 8:30 am to 5:00 pm
- Bus Driver – 9:00 am to 4:00 pm
- Evening Chef – 10:30 am to 7:00 pm

---

<sup>1</sup> Placer County, California, Senior Overview and Demand Analysis – September 2018, prepared by the Davis Company. This report is included as Appendix M of this EIR.

- Kitchen Helper – 11:30 am to 8:00 pm
- Evening servers (average 3) – 5:30 pm to 7:30 pm

Weekends would have the same kitchen help but no housekeepers, maintenance, bus driver or activity staff. Weekend staff includes:

- 3 servers from 8:00 am to 10:00 am
- 3 servers from 12:30 pm to 2:30 pm, and
- 3 servers from 5:30 pm to 7:30 pm.

---

#### DELIVERIES

Deliveries via van or truck would generally take place during business hours. Deliveries would be scheduled during these hours in consideration for both onsite residents and the surrounding community. Standard delivery activity typically consists of the following:

- Food deliveries – Twice per week, normally a 20 to 30-foot truck;
- Trash – Typically one pick-up per week, regular garbage truck;
- Bread Delivery – Twice a week, panel truck; and,
- UPS delivery – Standard Monday thru Friday schedule.

---

#### RESIDENT SHUTTLE

A private 21-seat luxury minibus would be provided for the residents. The shuttle operation would generally consist of the following:

- The shuttle service runs a minimum of four days per week. Additional trips may be scheduled for activities such as movies, plays, sporting events, and other local events. Weekend outings are scheduled as requests are submitted;
- The shuttle serves an approximate 15-mile radius;
- Trips are typically scheduled between 9:00 am to 11:00 am and 2:00 pm to 4:00 pm. These trips are typically to doctor's offices, banks, and shopping;
- The minibus accommodates up to 20 residents per trip;

- The Manager and Co-Manager of the facility are required to have a bus driver's license in the event residents need transportation beyond the shuttle driver's schedule; and,
- The shuttle service is privately funded through the project. The cost of the shuttle service is covered by the monthly rent.

---

#### **ONSITE AND OFFSITE ACTIVITIES**

Residential activities would typically occur between 7:00 am - 8:00 pm. The proposed residential care home would provide a wide variety of activities, including meals, wellness and fitness programs, seasonal and holiday celebrations, in-house movies, group outings, and transportation for appointments and shopping. The following activities are typical of this type of development based on projects previously developed Hawthorn projects:

- Meals are served in the central dining room where residents can share a social environment with family and friends. Residents may also reserve the family dining room for a special event or an intimate meal among loved ones.
- Physical fitness programs are offered to promote strength, balance, flexibility, endurance, and overall well-being. The programs accommodate a variety of fitness levels.
- Group outings are planned regularly where residents may visit museums and galleries or attend concerts and theater performances.
- Onsite facilities supporting the proposed project include outdoor recreational areas and amenities. These include a multi-use trail, formal garden areas, fire pit with raised seating wall, raised garden beds, and multiple patio areas for gathering and activities. These outdoor spaces encourage residents to be active and to socialize with other residents and staff.

---

#### **ACCESS AND PARKING**

Primary access to the project site would be off Old Auburn Road. A secondary, gated emergency access is proposed off Sierra College Boulevard near the northwest corner of the project site. The proposed project includes 101 parking spaces including 5 ADA accessible spaces, 28 covered spaces, and 68 open spaces that are located around the perimeter of the proposed buildings. The 28 covered spaces are provided in two detached garage buildings, each with parking for six vehicles, plus 16 carport spaces. The minimum number of parking spaces required by the County is 82 spaces for the proposed project.

---

## LANDSCAPING

The project site plan concentrates new improvements (retirement residence, parking, and access roads) near the center of the site to maximize setbacks to property lines. The project's landscaping includes patios, walkways, and undeveloped open space areas. Trees and other ornamental vegetation would be planted throughout the project site with special attention paid to buffer areas. The landscape plan includes three bioretention basins designed to collect and treat surface water runoff.

---

## PROJECT GRADING AND DRAINAGE

Project grading activities would be completed in one phase. Grading activities are anticipated to occur over a three to four-month timeframe. Grading would consist of approximately 50,700 cubic yards of cut and 13,600 cubic yards of fill. Approximately 37,000 cubic yards of soil would be required to be exported offsite to a location that can legally accept the exported soil.

The site would be graded to ensure the finished floor elevation is free from inundation during a 100-year storm event. The project site would be graded to ensure that perimeter landscaped areas and drive aisles would drain away from the building. Onsite flows would be conveyed overland to valley gutters in the drive aisles, where they would be captured in drain inlets, and piped to bioretention basins (water quality basins) to treat the stormwater before discharging to the Linda Creek Treelake Tributary.

---

## PROJECT PHASING

The proposed project would be constructed in a single phase. Site grading and excavation, construction of the proposed main building, site improvements, multi-use trail, outbuildings, frontage improvements, and landscaping would be completed in approximately 18-20 months.

---

## ROADWAY FRONTAGE IMPROVEMENTS

For this project, two roadway frontage improvement options have been evaluated in equal detail throughout the EIR; however, the proposed project includes the option with the least environmental impact. Specifically, Option 2: Modified Frontage Improvements, has the least environmental impact based on the impact analysis provided in the resource chapters of this EIR. The first option, the Full Frontage Improvements, proposes to construct the roadway frontage improvements along Old Auburn Road based on the design recommendations of the Granite Bay Community Plan. The second option, Modified Frontage Improvements, proposes to restripe and make improvements within the available right-of-way of Old Auburn Road with the intent of avoiding impacts to the existing Linda Creek Treelake Tributary and associated riparian habitat

located adjacent to the roadway. Under both options, all other components of the project remain the same.

The development of the two options is the result of over two years of collaboration between County staff and the applicant to identify a way to balance the roadway improvement recommendations for Old Auburn Road as stated in the Granite Bay Community Plan with the other goals and policies in the Plan to minimize impacts on natural resources, maintain a rural character, and minimize aesthetic impacts associated with new development.

### **Option 1: Full Frontage Improvements**

The Full Frontage Improvements are based on roadway network improvements for Old Auburn Road as envisioned in the Granite Bay Community Plan. The Granite Bay Community Plan identifies completion of the north side of Old Auburn Road west of Sierra College Boulevard to the City of Roseville as a prioritized road and intersection improvement. The Granite Bay Community Plan recommended improvements include widening Old Auburn Road to four lanes with an 88-foot right-of-way, a 40-mph speed limit, lane widths of 12 feet, Class II bike lanes, four-foot shoulders, and a piped storm drain. Additional details of this improvement include:

- Widen the westbound lanes of Old Auburn Boulevard and make roadway improvements to accommodate a new westbound through-lane west of the intersection with Sierra College Boulevard, approximately 600 feet to the western property line of the proposed project.
- Widen the existing Old Auburn Road right-of-way approximately 36 feet north including grading, removal of the guard-rail, and removal of existing trees and riparian vegetation within the southerly boundary of the Linda Creek Treelake Tributary.
- Closest to the intersection with Sierra College Boulevard, the roadway would consist of a five-foot sidewalk, 3-foot curb and gutter, 4-foot bike lane, and two thru lanes in each direction. Temporary striping will provide a five-foot sidewalk, curb and gutter, a nine-foot buffer to a seven-foot bike lane, and one thru lane. Further west, the new improvements would include a new concrete headwall and extension of existing box culverts, a 5-foot sidewalk, 3-foot curb and gutter, 7-foot bike lane, and two twelve-foot westbound thru lanes, and a twelve-foot two way left turn lane.
- The existing right-turn-lane from southbound Sierra College Boulevard to westbound Old Auburn Road, would not be altered.

The Full Frontage Improvements would include revegetation of disturbed areas of the Linda Creek Treelake Tributary. All revegetation and landscaping would comply with the Placer County Landscape Design Guidelines including use of native species and compliance with the State's Water Efficiency Landscape Ordinance standards.

### *Offsite Improvements*

Offsite improvements associated with this option include frontage improvements on the two adjacent properties to the west. The improvements consist of features to accommodate the roadway transition from the full roadway cross section width that terminates at the western property boundary, back down to the existing single-lane configuration. The improvements include a 600-foot transitional taper or "lane drop" from two lanes down to one lane. This transition also includes a bike lane and asphalt curb. To construct these offsite improvements, an existing electrical utility pole and telecommunication box would be relocated outside of the proposed right-of-way. The two existing driveways on the adjacent properties to the west would be reconfigured as a result of offsite improvements. Existing trees within this proposed right-of-way would be removed, and a small wetland area on the adjacent property would need to be filled in as part of these offsite improvements.

An existing fence on the property immediately to the west of the proposed project site would be removed and relocated. Prior to any of these improvements being constructed, the applicant would be required to obtain easements from the adjacent property owners in order to acquire the necessary right of way.

### **Option 2: Modified Frontage Improvements**

The Modified Frontage Improvements option was developed with the intent to reduce disturbance to the Linda Creek Treelake Tributary and reduce the environmental impacts of the project overall. The objective of this option was to modify the roadway design to avoid impacting the creek while still providing the level of service required at the intersection based on projected traffic needs of the project.

Under the Modified Frontage Improvements, the westbound lanes of Old Auburn Road would not be widened. Instead, the project would expand the roadway on the south side of Old Auburn Road within the existing right of way. The eastbound lanes would be restriped to extend the left turn lane and add a bike lane. The single eastbound thru-lane and right turn lanes would remain. The Modified Frontage Improvements option would avoid the Linda Creek drainage area located along the northerly project frontage of Old Auburn Road.

The Modified Frontage Improvements include a multi-use trail on the northerly side of the Linda Creek Treelake Tributary between the proposed water quality features and the landscaped areas of the proposed project. The trail would include an approximately 40-60-foot bridge span crossing in an east-west orientation over the tributary. The trail would connect with the proposed westbound bike lane on Old Auburn Road near the southern project driveway into the proposed project. The multi-use trail would be accessible to members of the public and would connect to the existing sidewalk on the western side of Sierra College Boulevard.

### *Offsite Improvements*

- The southerly curb, gutter, and sidewalk portion of Old Auburn Road would be modified to incorporate the Class II Bike Lane within the available right-of-way. The existing sound wall on the south side of Old Auburn Road would remain in place and would not be altered.
- Eastbound improvements would include curb, gutter, and sidewalk modifications to the southern portion of Old Auburn Road and restriping to accommodate an 11-foot turn lane, 12-foot through lane, 4-foot bike-lane, 11-foot right turn lane, 3-foot curb and gutter, and five-foot sidewalk.
- This option would require relocation of two existing drain inlets, on the south side of Old Auburn Road and one at the northwest corner of the intersection near the existing traffic pole.
- The existing traffic signal poles on the west leg of the intersection would be relocated, and a new crosswalk connection would be installed on the westerly side of the intersection at the corner with Sierra College Boulevard.
- All revegetation and landscaping would comply with the Placer County Landscape Design Guidelines including use of native species and compliant with the State's Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance standards.

## **2.4 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Chapter 4 of the EIR presents a description of the existing environmental setting, an analysis of environmental impacts resulting from development of the proposed project and required or proposed mitigation measures. These impacts and mitigation measures are summarized in Table S-1. Impacts are identified as either "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated," "Less Than Significant," or "No Impact." If an impact is Less Than Significant With Mitigation, mitigation

measures are identified to reduce the potentially significant impact to less than significant levels. Within Chapter 6 of the EIR, Table 6-2 compares which alternatives to the proposed project would reduce potentially significant effects associated with the proposed project.

Table S-1 (at the end of this Summary Chapter) summarizes each potential impact of the proposed project and the corresponding mitigation measures proposed to minimize or avoid significant impacts.

---

#### **SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS**

Section 15126.2 (b) of the CEQA Guidelines requires an EIR to “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 specific mitigation measures summarized in Table S-1 would reduce the level of project-specific significant impacts to a less than significant. Similarly, many impacts are identified that would be less than significant without the need for additional mitigation measures. Significant and unavoidable impacts were identified in the analysis.

#### **Significant Project-Level Effects**

The proposed project, which includes the Modified Frontage Improvements Option, would not have any significant impacts.

Direct visual impacts were identified as **significant and unavoidable impacts** associated with the development of the Full Frontage Improvements option.

#### **Significant Cumulative Effects:**

Cumulative visual impacts were identified as **significant and unavoidable impacts** only under the Full Frontage Improvements option.

## **2.5 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES EVALUATED**

Chapter 6 of this EIR evaluates alternatives to the proposed project in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6. The analysis of project alternatives takes into consideration the base assumption that all applicable mitigation measures associated with the project would be implemented with the appropriate alternatives. However, applicable mitigation measures may

be scaled to reduce or avoid the potential impacts of the alternatives under consideration, and may not precisely match those identified for the project. If a specific impact is not raised within the discussion of an alternative, it is because the effect is expected to be the same as that associated with the implementation of the proposed project. Detailed descriptions and analyses of the project alternatives can be found in Chapter 6 (Alternatives). The following is a summary of the alternatives evaluated in this EIR.

### **Alternative 1: No Project/No Build**

Alternative 1 is the No Project alternative as required by CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(e). Under the No Project alternative, no building or development would occur on the project site. The site is assumed to remain in its existing condition, with no development, as a vacant field.

### **Alternative 2: Existing Zoning**

Alternative 2 would develop the project site under the existing zoning for Residential-Single-Family within an Agriculture combining district and Building Site combining district with a minimum lot size of 100,000 square feet (RS-AG-B-100). Under the existing zoning the project site could be subdivided into 3 single family lots.

Access to and from the project site would likely be off Old Auburn Road in a location similar to the proposed project due to the site's location to the Old Auburn Road/Sierra College Boulevard intersection, access onto Old Auburn Road or Sierra College Boulevard may be limited due to concerns about providing adequate sight distance for the proposed driveways. No intersection improvements at Old Auburn Road would be proposed or required, but some limited frontage improvements may be required to ensure driveways are improved to County standards. No pedestrian-bike pathway would be constructed connecting Sierra College Boulevard and Old Auburn Road.

### **Alternative 3: Two Story Alternative**

Alternative 3 would develop the project site with a 145-unit residential care facility, but as a two-story building rather than a three-story building. Alternative 3 would include the same number of project amenities and parking spaces as the proposed project. Under this alternative, access off of Old Auburn Road with emergency vehicle access onto Sierra College Boulevard would be the same. The building footprint would be 17,770 square feet larger under this alternative. The total building coverage would be 68,845 square feet, which amounts to approximately a 35% increase in building coverage with two stories. Under this alternative the maximum building height would be 32 feet, 9 inches, a difference of 1 foot, 7 inches between the two-story

alternative and the proposed project. Because of the larger building footprint, two additional 10-foot high retaining walls totaling 440 linear feet would be required (the proposed project and Alternative 3 each have proposed retaining walls around the transformer and generator enclosure). The bigger building footprint would result in the parking area shifting closer to the riparian area which would require retaining walls in order to lessen the impacts to sensitive habitats. A 10-foot high retaining wall would be required along the northern edge of development area, and a 10-foot high retaining wall would be located along the southern edge of the development area. With the larger footprint the building setbacks would be reduced as well compared to the proposed project and less area would be available for landscaping and detention basins and more impervious surface area would be onsite.

## 2.6 MITIGATION MONITORING

CEQA Guidelines Section 15097 requires public agencies to set up monitoring and reporting programs to ensure compliance with mitigation measures, which are adopted or made as a condition of project approval and designed to mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effects identified in environmental impact reports. A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) incorporating the mitigation measures set forth in this EIR will be considered and acted upon by County of Placer decision-makers concurrent with adoption of the findings of this EIR and prior to approval of the proposed project.

## 2.7 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY AND ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15123, this EIR acknowledges the areas of controversy and issues to be resolved that are known to the County of Placer and/or were raised during the EIR scoping process. These issues were identified during the Notice of Preparation (NOP) review period. Nine comment letters were received from agencies, organizations, and individuals in response to the NOP comment period (October 17, 2017 through November 15, 2017). These comments on the NOP are included in Appendix A.

The following list, categorized by issue, summarizes the concerns brought forth in the comment letters:

| Issue Area:                                    | Concerns Related To:  |
|--|---|
| <b>Aesthetics</b><br><b>(EIR Chapter 4.1)</b>  | Visual impacts associated with height, bulk and scale of building; nighttime lighting impacts |
| <b>Air Quality</b><br><b>(EIR Chapter 4.2)</b> | Project impacts on air quality  |

| Issue Area:  | Concerns Related To:   |
|--|--|
| <b>Biological Resources</b><br><b>(EIR Chapter 4.3)</b>                                    | Wetland impacts, impacts on birds and wildlife; impacts on the creek   |
| <b>Cultural and Tribal Resources</b><br><b>(Initial Study, Section V; Appendix A)</b>      | Impacts on cultural, historical, or tribal resources   |
| <b>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b><br><b>(Initial Study, Section VIII; Appendix A)</b> | Agricultural pesticides in the soils   |
| <b>Hydrology and Water Quality</b><br><b>(EIR Chapter 4.6)</b>                             | Drainage concerns and water quality impacts  |
| <b>Land Use</b><br><b>(EIR Chapter 4.7)</b>  | Land use compatibility, consistency with Granite Bay Community Plan, building height, consistency with zoning, disrupt an established single-family residential community, population growth; impacts on rural nature of community |
| <b>Noise</b><br><b>(EIR Chapter 4.8)</b>   | Noise from emergency vehicles responding to project  |
| <b>Public Services</b><br><b>(EIR Chapter 4.9)</b>   | Emergency responsiveness to Granite Bay residents, impacts on public safety, impacts on South Placer Fire District response times  |
| <b>Transportation and Traffic</b><br><b>(EIR Chapter 4.10)</b>                             | Trip generation, traffic congestion, safe ingress, and egress; parking capacity  |
| <b>Energy</b><br><b>(EIR Chapter 4.11)</b>   | Use of solar and rain catchments for irrigation, electrical extension utilities  |

All of these issues are addressed in the relevant chapters identified in the first column.

## 2.8 SUMMARY TABLE

Table S-1 (Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures), has been organized to correspond with the environmental issues discussed in Chapter 4 of this Draft EIR. The summary table is arranged in four columns:

- Environmental impacts (“Impact”).
- Level of significance without mitigation (“Significance Before Mitigation”).
- Mitigation measures (“Mitigation Measure”).

- The level of significance after implementation of mitigation measures (“Significance After Mitigation”).

If an impact is determined to be significant or potentially significant, mitigation measures are identified, where appropriate and feasible. More than one mitigation measure may be required to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. This Draft EIR assumes that all applicable plans, policies, and regulations would be implemented, including, but not necessarily limited to, County General Plan policies, laws, and requirements or recommendations of Placer County.

Applicable plans, policies, and regulations are identified and described in the Regulatory Setting of each issue area and within the relevant impact analysis. A description of the organization of the environmental analysis, as well as key foundational assumptions regarding the approach to the analysis, is provided in Chapter 1.0, Introduction.

As noted in the introductory paragraphs of this Executive Summary, the proposed project was reviewed in an Initial Study in accordance with the significance criteria developed by Placer County based on criteria presented in Appendix G, “Environmental Checklist Form,” of the CEQA Guidelines. Impacts that were analyzed and determined to be less than significant in the Initial Study were not addressed further in the Draft EIR. For the convenience of the reader, these previously-evaluated impacts and any associated mitigation measures are included at the end of Table S-1. Further detail can be found in the Initial Study, which is attached to this Draft EIR in Appendix A.

**Table S-1: Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

| Impact  | Level of Significance Before Mitigation  | Mitigation Measures   | Level of Significance After Mitigation  |
|---|--|---|---|
| <b>Chapter 4.1 – AESTHETICS</b>   |  |   |   |
| <p><b>Significance Criteria 4.1-1:</b> Implementation of the proposed project would not potentially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.</p>                      | <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p> <p><b>Option 1: Full Frontage Improvements:</b> Significant Impact</p> <p><b>Option 2: Modified Frontage Improvements (the Proposed Project):</b> Less Than Significant Impact</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p> <p>No mitigation measures were identified for the Option 1: Full Frontage Improvements option that would reduce significant visual impacts (both direct and cumulative) to less than significant.</p>   | <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p> <p><b>Option 1: Full Frontage Improvements:</b> Significant and unavoidable.</p> <p><b>Option 2: Modified Frontage Improvements:</b> Less Than Significant Impact</p> |
| <p><b>Significance Criteria 4.1-2:</b> Implementation of the proposed project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare, which could adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.</p> | <p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>  | <p><b>VIS-1: Outdoor Lighting.</b> Prior to the approval of final Improvement Plans, the applicant shall submit to the satisfaction of the Development Review Committee, a lighting plan (separate or as part of the Improvement Plans) that demonstrates that all outdoor lighting installed as part of the proposed project is limited to the minimum amount needed for public safety, is high efficiency, and is shielded and directed downward to limit upward and sideways spillover and protect the night sky, which also would minimize light effects on the adjacent neighboring properties. All exterior lighting shall be mounted within applicable height limitations and would not exceed maximum allowable lumens. All light standards would be finished in a color that would blend into the landscape and prevent glare (i.e., black, bronze, or dark bronze). The Improvement Plans shall show the location of all outdoor lighting in compliance with this mitigation measure.</p> | <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>   |
| <p><b>Significance Criteria 4.1-3:</b> Implementation of the proposed project could contribute to a</p>   | <p>Less Than Significant</p>   | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>   | <p>Less Than Significant</p>  |

**Table S-1: Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

| Impact  | Level of Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures   | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|--|
| cumulative impact related to the creation of a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.                                       |   |   |  |
| <b>Chapter 4.2 - AIR QUALITY</b>  |   |   |  |
| <b>Significance Criteria 4.2-1:</b> Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.                               | Less Than Significant Impact            | No mitigation measures are required.  | Less Than Significant Impact           |
| <b>Significance Criteria 4.2-2:</b> Implementation of the proposed project could violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. | Potentially Significant Impact          | <b>AQ-1: Prohibition of Wood-Burning Fireplaces.</b> The installation of wood-burning fireplaces shall be prohibited within the development. This prohibition shall be noted on the deed for future property owners to obey. Natural gas fireplaces are acceptable. | Less Than Significant Impact           |
| <b>Significance Criteria 4.2-3:</b> Project implementation would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.  | Less Than Significant Impact            | No mitigation measures are required.  | Less Than Significant Impact           |
| <b>Significance Criteria 4.2-4:</b> Project implementation would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial toxic air contaminant concentrations during project operations.                  | Less Than Significant Impact            | No mitigation measures are required.  | Less Than Significant Impact           |
| <b>Significance Criteria 4.2-5:</b> Implementation of the proposed  | Less Than Significant Impact            | No mitigation measures are required.  | Less Than Significant Impact           |

**Table S-1: Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

| Impact  | Level of Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures  | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|--|--|
| <p>project would not result in construction-related and operational criteria pollutant emissions that could conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Plan.</p>  |   |  |  |
| <p><b>Significance Criteria 4.2-6:</b> Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors).</p>  | <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>     | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>  | <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>    |
| <p><b>Chapter 4.3 - Biological Resources</b></p>  |   |  |  |
| <p><b>Significance Criteria 4.3-1:</b> The proposed project could have a substantial effect, either directly or through habitat modification, including riparian habitat, on any natural community, or species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries.</p> | <p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>   | <p><b>BIO-1a: Preconstruction Survey – Sanford’s Arrowhead.</b> Prior to initiation of ground-disturbing activities, the applicant shall submit to the satisfaction of the Development Review Committee, evidence that the following measures have been completed:</p> <p>A focused plant survey according to USFWS, CDFW, and CNPS protocols shall be performed by a qualified biologist to the satisfaction of the Placer County Planning Services Division. The plant survey shall occur during the blooming period for Sanford’s arrowhead (May through November). If Sanford’s Arrowhead is not found, no further action is needed. However, if grading does not begin within three years after the survey is complete, a second survey must be completed prior to grading.</p> | <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>    |

**Table S-1: Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

| Impact | Level of Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures  | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--------|---|--|--|
|        |   | <p>If Sanford’s arrowhead is found, avoidance zone(s) shall be established around the plant(s) to demarcate the areas not to be disturbed. The USFWS, CDFW, and Placer County Planning Services Division shall be notified immediately, and specific avoidance zones shall be determined by a qualified biologist in consultation with USFWS and CDFW.</p> <p>If Sanford’s arrowhead or any other special status plant species is found and avoidance is not possible, a plan to incorporate additional measures such as seed collection and/or translocation shall be developed and implemented to the satisfaction of CDFW or USFWS personnel prior to additional work within the established avoidance zone.</p> <p>In the event the Placer County Conservation Program is adopted prior to submittal of Improvement Plans for this project, then the above mitigation measure may be replaced with standard mitigation fees and conservation protocol to address this resource impact as set forth in the PCCP implementation document. If PCCP enrollment is chosen as mitigation for one or more biological resource area impacts, then the Program must apply to all biological resource mitigation for the project.</p> <p><b>BIO-1b: Preconstruction Survey –Western Pond Turtle.</b> Prior to initiation of ground-disturbing activities, the applicant shall submit to the satisfaction of the Development Review Committee, evidence that the following measures have been completed:</p> <p>Within 48 hours of the start of any ground disturbing activities, a pre-construction survey for western pond turtle or their nests shall be conducted by a qualified biologist and to the satisfaction of the Placer County Planning Services Division. If western pond turtle is not found, no further action is needed.</p> |  |

**Table S-1: Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

| Impact | Level of Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures   | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--------|---|---|--|
|        |   | <p>If western pond turtles are found within an area that is proposed to be disturbed, a qualified biologist, in coordination with CDFW, shall relocate the western pond turtle to a suitable location away from the proposed construction area.</p> <p>In the event the Placer County Conservation Program is adopted prior to submittal of Improvement Plans for this project, then the above mitigation measure may be replaced with standard mitigation fees and conservation protocol to address this resource impact as set forth in the PCCP implementation document. If PCCP enrollment is chosen as mitigation for one or more biological resource area impacts, then the Program must apply to all biological resource mitigation for the project.</p> <p><b>BIO-1c: Preconstruction Surveys – Nesting Birds.</b> Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans, the applicant shall submit to the satisfaction of the Development Review Committee, evidence that the following measures have been completed:</p> <p>A pre-construction clearance survey for nesting birds shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to the satisfaction of the Placer County Planning Services Division. The survey shall be conducted in all suitable habitats on the project site within 14 days (30 days for raptor nesting) of the commencement of construction. If construction is scheduled to begin during the nesting season, the bird survey shall be conducted between February 1st and August 31st and will extend 300 feet beyond the proposed project boundary. The monitoring biologist shall use binoculars to visually determine whether bird nests occur within the 300-foot survey area if access is denied on adjacent properties.</p> |  |

**Table S-1: Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

| Impact | Level of Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures   | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--------|---|---|--|
|        |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If construction is scheduled to begin outside the nesting season, a pre-construction nesting bird survey is not required.</li> <li>• If active nests are found, a no-disturbance buffer around the nest shall be established by a qualified biologist in coordination with CDFW. Identified nests shall be surveyed during the first 24 hours prior to any construction-related activities to establish a behavioral baseline and the nests shall continue to be monitored to detect any behavioral changes. If behavioral changes are observed, work that is causing the behavioral change shall halt until coordination with CDFW. The buffer shall be maintained until the fledglings are capable of flight and become independent of the nest tree. Once the young are independent of the nest, no further measures are necessary.</li> <li>• All vertical pipes and fencing poles should be capped to prevent bird death and injury and no pesticides or rodenticides shall be used on the project site.</li> </ul> |  |
|        |   | <p>In the event the Placer County Conservation Program is adopted prior to submittal of Improvement Plans for this project, then the above mitigation measure may be replaced with standard mitigation fees and conservation protocol to address this resource impact as set forth in the PCCP implementation document. If PCCP enrollment is chosen as mitigation for one or more biological resource area impacts, then the Program must apply to all biological resource mitigation for the project.</p>   |  |
|        |   | <p><b>BIO-1d: Preconstruction Survey – Swainson’s Hawk.</b> Prior to initiation of ground-disturbing activities, the applicant shall submit to the satisfaction of the Development Review Committee, evidence that the following measures have been completed:</p>  |  |

**Table S-1: Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

| Impact | Level of Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures  | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--------|---|--|--|
|        |   | <p>All tree removal activities shall occur outside of the nesting season (September 16 through February 28). Alternatively, prior to the commencement of ground-disturbing activities during the nesting season for Swainson’s hawk (between March 1 and September 15), a qualified biologist shall conduct a minimum of one protocol-level pre-construction survey during the recommended survey periods for the nesting season that coincides with the commencement of construction activities, in accordance with the Recommended Timing and Methodology for Swainson’s Hawk Nesting Surveys in California’s Central Valley. The biologist shall conduct surveys for nesting Swainson’s hawk within 0.25-mile of the project site where legally permitted. The biologist shall use binoculars to visually determine whether Swainson’s hawk nests occur within the 0.25-mile survey area if access is denied on adjacent properties. If active Swainson’s hawk nests are not identified on or within 0.25-mile of the project site within the recommended survey periods, a letter report summarizing the survey results should be submitted to the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency within 30 days following the final survey, and further avoidance and minimization measures for nesting habitat are not required.</p> <p>In the event the Placer County Conservation Program is adopted prior to submittal of Improvement Plans for this project, then the above mitigation measure may be replaced with standard mitigation fees and conservation protocol to address this resource impact as set forth in the PCCP implementation document. If PCCP enrollment is chosen as mitigation for one or more biological resource area impacts, then the Program must apply to all biological resource mitigation for the project.</p> <p><b>BIO-1e: Active Swainson’s Hawk Nests.</b> Prior to initiation of ground-disturbing activities, the applicant shall submit to the satisfaction of the Development Review Committee,</p> |  |

**Table S-1: Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

| Impact | Level of Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures   | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--------|---|---|--|
|        |   | <p>evidence that the following measures have been completed if active Swainson’s Hawk nests are found within 0.25-mile of the project site:</p> <p>If active Swainson’s hawk nests are found within 0.25-mile of ground disturbing activities, the biologist shall contact the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency and CDFW within one day following the preconstruction survey to report the findings. For the purposes of this avoidance and minimization requirement, construction activities are defined to include heavy equipment operation associated with construction (use of cranes or draglines, new rock crushing activities) or other project-related activities that could cause nest abandonment or forced fledging within 0.25-mile of a nest site between March 1 and September 15. If an active nest is present within 0.25-mile of construction areas, CDFW shall be consulted to establish an appropriate noise buffer, develop take avoidance measures, determine whether high visibility construction fencing should be erected around the buffer zone, and implement a monitoring and reporting program prior to any construction activities occurring within 0.25-mile of the nest. If the biologist determines that the construction activities are disturbing the nest, the biologist shall halt construction activities until CDFW is consulted. The construction activities shall not commence until CDFW determines that construction activities would not result in abandonment of the nest site. If the biologist determines that the nest has not been disturbed during construction activities within the buffer zone, a letter report summarizing the survey results should be submitted to the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency and CDFW within 30 days following the final monitoring event, and further avoidance and minimization measures for nesting habitat are not required.</p> |  |

**Table S-1: Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

| Impact | Level of Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures  | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--------|---|--|--|
|        |   | <p>In the event the Placer County Conservation Program is adopted prior to submittal of Improvement Plans for this project, then the above mitigation measure may be replaced with standard mitigation fees and conservation protocol to address this resource impact as set forth in the PCCP implementation document. If PCCP enrollment is chosen as mitigation for one or more biological resource area impacts, then the Program must apply to all biological resource mitigation for the project.</p> <p><b>BIO-1f: Preconstruction Survey – Pallid Bat.</b> Prior to initiation of ground-disturbing activities, the applicant shall submit to the satisfaction of the Development Review Committee, evidence that the following measures have been completed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Prior to the removal or significant pruning of trees and the demolition of buildings, a qualified bat biologist shall assess them for the potential to support roosting bats. Suitable bat roosting sites include trees with snags, rotten stumps, and decadent trees with broken limbs, exfoliating bark, cavities, and structures with cracks, joint seams and other openings to interior spaces. If there is no evidence of occupation by bats, work may proceed without further action.</li> <li>b. If suitable roosting habitat is present, the bat biologist shall recommend appropriate measures to prevent take of bats. Such measures may include exclusion and humane eviction (see “c” below) of bats roosting within structures during seasonal periods of peak activity (e.g., February 15 - April 15, and August 15 - October 30), partial dismantling of structures to induce abandonment, or other appropriate measures.</li> <li>c. If bat roosts are identified on the site, the following measures shall be implemented:</li> </ol> |  |

**Table S-1: Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

| Impact  | Level of Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures   | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|--|
|   |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If non-breeding/migratory bats are identified on the site within a tree or building that is proposed for removal, then bats shall be passively excluded from the tree or building in coordination with California Department of Fish and Wildlife. This is generally accomplished by opening up the roost area to allow airflow through the cavity/crevice, or installing one-way doors. The bat biologist shall confirm that the bats have been excluded from the tree or building before it can be removed.</li> <li>• If a maternity roost of a special-status bat species is detected, an appropriate non-disturbance buffer zone shall be established around the roost tree or building site, in consultation with the CDFW. Maternity roost sites may be demolished only when it has been determined by a qualified bat biologist that the nursery site is not occupied. Demolition of maternity roost sites may only be performed during seasonal periods of peak activity (e.g., February 15 - April 15, and August 15 - October 30).</li> </ul> <p>In the event the Placer County Conservation Program is adopted prior to submittal of Improvement Plans for this project, then the above mitigation measure may be replaced with standard mitigation fees and conservation protocol to address this resource impact as set forth in the PCCP implementation document. If PCCP enrollment is chosen as mitigation for one or more biological resource area impacts, then the Program must apply to all biological resource mitigation for the project.</p> |  |
| <p><b>Significance Criteria 4.3-2:</b> The proposed project could substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop</p> | <p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>   | <p>Implement Mitigation Measures BIO-1a through BIO-1f, BIO-6 and BIO-7.</p>  | <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>    |

**Table S-1: Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

| Impact   | Level of Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures   | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|---|--|
| <p>below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number of restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species?</p> |   |   |  |
| <p><b>Significance Criteria 4.3-3:</b> The proposed project could have a substantial adverse effect on the environment by converting oak woodlands.</p>                                      | <p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>   | <p><b>BIO-2: Tree Replacement.</b> Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans, the applicant shall submit to the satisfaction of the Development Review Committee, evidence that the following measures have been implemented:</p> <p>The applicant shall obtain a Tree Permit and shall provide mitigation for the loss of the on-site, native oak trees protected under the Placer County Tree Ordinance which are five inches or greater diameter at breast height as single stemmed trees, or 10 inches DBH or larger in aggregate for multiple stemmed trees. The project applicant shall compensate for the loss of such trees either through implementation of a revegetation plan or payment of fees, as determined by the Placer County Tree Preservation Ordinance.</p> <p>If the applicant chooses to implement a revegetation plan, the plan shall identify the seed or seedling source of the trees to be propagated, the location of the plots, the methods to be used to ensure success of the revegetation program (e.g., irrigation), an annual reporting requirement, and the criteria to be used to measure the success of the plan. Mitigation shall include planting of replacement native trees of the same species as were removed at a 1:1 ratio for the total inches (DBH) of native trees removed (i.e., the total DBH of replacement trees will be equal to the total DBH of removed trees at an “inch-for-an-inch” replacement). Successful replacement includes:</p> | <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>    |

**Table S-1: Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

| Impact | Level of Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures   | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--------|---|---|--|
|        |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trees shall be specimens in at least 1-gallon sized pots and planted in accordance to industry standards.</li> <li>• A 3-year maintenance schedule shall be implemented to ensure planted saplings are established.</li> <li>• If any five-gallon size tree or greater that was replanted or relocated that is dead after three years, the tree must be replaced in kind with equal sized healthy replacements.</li> <li>• Revegetated areas or areas where trees smaller than five-gallon size were replanted must have at least seventy-five (75) percent of the trees still alive after three years.</li> </ul> <p>Alternatively, the applicant may choose to mitigate for removal of native trees by paying into the Placer County Tree Preservation Fund prior to approval of the Improvement Plans. The amount shall equal 100 dollars for each inch of protected trees removed, or the current market value as established by a qualified arborist.</p> <p>In the event the Placer County Conservation Program is adopted prior to submittal of Improvement Plans for this project, then the above mitigation measure may be replaced with standard mitigation fees and conservation protocol to address this resource impact as set forth in the PCCP implementation document. If PCCP enrollment is chosen as mitigation for one or more biological resource area impacts, then the Program must apply to all biological resource mitigation for the project.</p> <p><b>BIO-3: Tree Protection.</b> Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans, the applicant shall submit to the satisfaction of the Development Review Committee, evidence that the following measures have been completed:</p> <p>The following protection measures shall be shown on the Improvement Plans and implemented to protect retained trees on-site:</p> |  |

**Table S-1: Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

| Impact | Level of Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures   | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--------|---|---|--|
|        |   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A Tree Protection Zone (TPZ) shall be established around any tree or group of trees to be retained. The TPZ shall be defined as 1.5 times the radius of the dripline or 5 feet from the edge of any grading, whichever is greater, unless otherwise adjusted on a case-by-case basis after consultation with a certified arborist.</li> <li>2. All TPZs shall be marked with post and wire or equivalent fencing, which shall remain in place for the duration of construction activities in the area. "Keep out" signs shall be posted on TPZ fencing facing out in all directions.</li> <li>3. Construction-related activities, including grading, trenching, construction, demolition, or other work shall be prohibited within the TPZ. No heavy equipment or machinery shall be operated within the TPZ. No construction materials, equipment, machinery, or other supplies shall be stored within a TPZ. No wires or signs shall be attached to any tree. In the event that the contractor identifies a need to conduct activities within a TPZ, such activities must be approved and monitored by a certified arborist.</li> <li>4. Selected trees shall be pruned, as necessary, to provide clearance during construction and/or to remove any defective limbs or other parts that may pose a failure risk. All pruning shall be completed by a certified arborist or tree worker and shall adhere to the Tree Pruning Guidelines of the International Society of Arboriculture.</li> <li>5. Each week during construction, a certified arborist shall monitor the health and condition of the protected trees and, if necessary, recommend additional mitigations and appropriate actions. This shall include the monitoring of trees adjacent to project facilities in order to determine if construction activities (including the removal of nearby trees) would affect protected trees in the future.</li> </ol> |  |

**Table S-1: Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

| Impact  | Level of Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures  | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|--|--|
|   |   | <p>6. Provide supplemental irrigation and other care, such as mulch and fertilizer.</p> <p>In the event the Placer County Conservation Program is adopted prior to submittal of Improvement Plans for this project, then the above mitigation measure may be replaced with standard mitigation fees and conservation protocol to address this resource impact as set forth in the PCCP implementation document. If PCCP enrollment is chosen as mitigation for one or more biological resource area impacts, then the Program must apply to all biological resource mitigation for the project.</p>  |  |
| <p><b>Significance Criteria 4.3-4:</b> The proposed project could have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community, including oak woodlands, identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish &amp; Game, U.S. Fish &amp; Wildlife Service, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers or National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries?</p> | <p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>   | <p><b>BIO-4: Wetland Permits.</b> Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans, the applicant shall provide, to the satisfaction of the Development Review Committee (DRC), evidence that the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), and the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) has been notified by certified letter regarding the existence of wetlands on the property. Any permits required shall be obtained and copies submitted to DRC prior to any equipment staging, clearing, grading, or excavation work.</p> <p>In the event the Placer County Conservation Program is adopted prior to submittal of Improvement Plans for this project, then the above mitigation measures (BIO-1a through 1f) may be replaced with standard mitigation fees and conservation protocol to address this resource impact as set forth in the PCCP implementation document. If PCCP enrollment is chosen as mitigation for one or more biological resource area impacts, then the Program must apply to all biological resource mitigation for the project.</p> <p><b>BIO-5: Wetland Compensation.</b> Prior to approval of Improvement Plans, the applicant shall submit to the</p> | <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>    |

**Table S-1: Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

| Impact | Level of Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures   | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--------|---|---|--|
|        |   | <p>satisfaction of the Development Review Committee, evidence that the following measures have been completed:</p> <p>Provide written evidence that compensatory mitigation has been established through the purchase of mitigation credits at a County-qualified wetland mitigation bank. The purchase of credits shall be equal to the amount necessary to replace wetland habitat acreage and resource values including compensation for temporal loss in accordance with approved permits. The total amount of habitat to be replaced will be determined in accordance with the total amount of impacted acreage as determined by the regulatory agencies. If written evidence is provided that regulatory permits or compensatory mitigation are not required, then this mitigation measure shall not apply.</p> <p>In the event the Placer County Conservation Program is adopted prior to submittal of Improvement Plans for this project, then the above mitigation measure may be replaced with standard mitigation fees and conservation protocol to address this resource impact as set forth in the PCCP implementation document. If PCCP enrollment is chosen as mitigation for one or more biological resource area impacts, then the Program must apply to all biological resource mitigation for the project.</p> <p><b>BIO-6: Construction Fencing.</b> Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans, the applicant shall submit to the satisfaction of the Development Review Committee, evidence that the following measures have been completed:</p> <p>The Improvement Plans shall include a note stating: High visibility and silt fencing shall be erected at the edge of construction/maintenance footprint if work is anticipated to occur within 50 feet of potentially jurisdictional features and riparian areas which are fence installation and during any initial grading or vegetation clearing activities within 50 feet of potentially jurisdictional features and riparian areas which</p> |  |

**Table S-1: Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

| Impact | Level of Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures  | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--------|---|--|--|
|        |   | <p>are proposed for avoidance. A biological monitor shall be present during the fence installation and during any initial grading or vegetation clearing activities within 50 feet of potentially jurisdictional features and riparian areas which are proposed for avoidance.</p> <p>In the event the Placer County Conservation Program is adopted prior to submittal of Improvement Plans for this project, then the above mitigation measure may be replaced with standard mitigation fees and conservation protocol to address this resource impact as set forth in the PCCP implementation document. If PCCP enrollment is chosen as mitigation for one or more biological resource area impacts, then the Program must apply to all biological resource mitigation for the project.</p> <p><b>BIO-7: Construction Staging.</b> Prior to approval of Improvement Plans, the applicant shall submit to the satisfaction of the Development Review Committee, evidence that the following measures have been completed:</p> <p>The Improvement Plans shall include a note stating that all equipment shall be stored, fueled and maintained in a vehicle staging area 300 feet or the maximum distance possible from any wetland feature and no closer than 200 feet unless a bermed (no ground disturbance) and lined refueling area is constructed and hazardous-material absorbent pads are available in the event of a spill.</p> <p>In the event the Placer County Conservation Program is adopted prior to submittal of Improvement Plans for this project, then the above mitigation measure may be replaced with standard mitigation fees and conservation protocol to address this resource impact as set forth in the PCCP implementation document. If PCCP enrollment is chosen as mitigation for one or more biological resource area impacts,</p> |  |

**Table S-1: Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

| Impact   | Level of Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures  | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|--|--|
| <p><b>Significance Criteria 4.3-5:</b> The proposed project could have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.</p> | Potentially Significant Impact          | then the Program must apply to all biological resource mitigation for the project.<br><br>Implement Mitigation Measures BIO-4 through BIO-7. | Less Than Significant Impact           |
| <p><b>Significance Criteria 4.3-6:</b> The proposed project would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors or impede the use of native wildlife nesting or breeding sites.</p>                           | Potentially Significant Impact          | Implement of Mitigation Measures BIO-1a through BIO-1e.  | Less Than Significant Impact           |
| <p><b>Significance Criteria 4.3-7:</b> The proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources, including oak woodland resources.</p>  | Potentially Significant Impact          | Implement Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-7.   | Less Than Significant Impact           |
| <p><b>Significance Criteria 4.3-8:</b> The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an</p>   | Less Than Significant Impact            | No mitigation measures are required.   | Less Than Significant Impact           |

**Table S-1: Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

| Impact  | Level of Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures   | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|--|
| <p>adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.</p>                         |   |   |  |
| <p><b>Chapter 4.4 – GEOLOGY AND SOILS</b></p>   |   |   |  |
| <p><b>Significance Criteria</b> 4.4-1: Implementation of the project could expose people or structures to unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures.</p> | <p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>   | <p><b>GEO-1a: Engineering Improvement Plans.</b> The applicant shall prepare and submit Improvement Plans, specifications and cost estimates (per the requirements of Section II of the Land Development Manual [LDM] that are in effect at the time of submittal) to the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD) for review and approval. The plans shall show all physical improvements as required by the conditions for the project as well as pertinent topographical features both on and off site. All existing and proposed utilities and easements, on-site and adjacent to the project, which may be affected by planned construction, shall be shown on the plans. All landscaping and irrigation facilities within the public right-of-way (or public easements), or landscaping within sight distance areas at intersections, shall be included in the Improvement Plans. The applicant shall pay plan check and inspection fees with the 1<sup>st</sup> Improvement Plan submittal. (NOTE: Prior to plan approval, all applicable recording and reproduction cost shall be paid). The cost of the above-noted landscape and irrigation facilities shall be included in the estimates used to determine these fees. It is the applicant's responsibility to obtain all required agency signatures on the plans and to secure department approvals. If the Design/Site Review process and/or Development Review Committee (DRC) review is required as a condition of approval for the project, said review process shall be completed prior to submittal of Improvement Plans. Record drawings shall be prepared and signed by a California Registered Civil Engineer at the applicant's expense and shall</p> | <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>    |

**Table S-1: Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

| Impact | Level of Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures   | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--------|---|---|--|
|        |   | <p>be submitted to the ESD in both hard copy and electronic versions in a format to be approved by the ESD prior to acceptance by the County of site improvements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conceptual landscape plans submitted prior to project approval may require modification during the Improvement Plan process to resolve issues of drainage and traffic safety.</li> <li>• The applicant shall provide five (5) copies of the approved Tentative Subdivision Map(s) and two copies of the approved conditions with the plan check application. The Final Subdivision Map(s) shall not be submitted to the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD) until the Improvement Plans are submitted for the second review. Final technical review of the Final Subdivision Map(s) shall not conclude until after the Improvement Plans are approved by the ESD. Any Building Permits associated with this project shall not be issued until, at a minimum, the Improvement Plans are approved by the Engineering and Surveying Division.</li> <li>• Prior to the County’s final acceptance of the project’s improvements, submit to the Engineering and Surveying Division two copies of the Record Drawings in digital format (on compact disc or other acceptable media) in accordance with the latest version of the Placer County Digital Plan and Map Standards along with two blackline hardcopies (black print on bond paper) and two PDF copies. The digital format is to allow integration with Placer County’s Geographic Information System (GIS). The final approved blackline hardcopy Record Drawings will be the official document of record.</li> </ul> <p><b>GEO -1b Grading and Drainage Improvement Plans.</b> The Improvement Plans shall show all proposed grading, drainage improvements, vegetation and tree removal and all work shall conform to provisions of the County Grading</p> |  |

**Table S-1: Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

| Impact | Level of Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures  | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--------|---|--|--|
|        |   | <p>Ordinance (Ref. Article 15.48, Placer County Code) and Stormwater Quality Ordinance (Ref. Article 8.28, Placer County Code) that are in effect at the time of submittal. No grading, clearing, or tree disturbance shall occur until the Improvement Plans are approved and all temporary construction fencing has been installed and inspected by a member of the Development Review Committee (DRC). All cut/fill slopes shall be at a maximum of 2:1 (horizontal: vertical) unless a soils report supports a steeper slope and the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD) concurs with said recommendation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The applicant shall revegetate all disturbed areas. Revegetation, undertaken from April 1 to October 1, shall include regular watering to ensure adequate growth. A winterization plan shall be provided with project Improvement Plans. It is the applicant's responsibility to ensure proper installation and maintenance of erosion control/winterization before, during, and after project construction. Soil stockpiling or borrow areas, shall have proper erosion control measures applied for the duration of the construction as specified in the Improvement Plans. Provide for erosion control where roadside drainage is off of the pavement, to the satisfaction of the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD).</li> <li>• The applicant shall submit to the ESD a letter of credit or cash deposit in the amount of 110 percent of an approved engineer's estimate for winterization and permanent erosion control work prior to Improvement Plan approval to guarantee protection against erosion and improper grading practices. One year after the County's acceptance of improvements as complete, if there are no erosion or runoff issues to be corrected,</li> </ul> |  |

**Table S-1: Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

| Impact | Level of Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures   | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--------|---|---|--|
|        |   | <p>unused portions of said deposit shall be refunded to the project applicant or authorized agent.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If, at any time during construction, a field review by County personnel indicates a significant deviation from the proposed grading shown on the Improvement Plans, specifically with regard to slope heights, slope ratios, erosion control, winterization, tree disturbance, and/or pad elevations and configurations, the plans shall be reviewed by the DRC/ESD for a determination of substantial conformance to the project approvals prior to any further work proceeding. Failure of the DRC/ESD to make a determination of substantial conformance may serve as grounds for the revocation/modification of the project approval by the appropriate hearing body.</li> </ul> <p><b>GEO-1c: Geotechnical Recommendations.</b> The Improvement Plan submittal shall include a final geotechnical engineering report produced by a California Registered Civil Engineer or Geotechnical Engineer for Engineering and Surveying Division Review and approval. The report shall address and make recommendations on the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Road, pavement, and parking area design;</li> <li>b. Structural foundations, including retaining wall design (if applicable);</li> <li>c. Grading practices;</li> <li>d. Erosion/winterization;</li> <li>e. Special problems discovered on-site, (i.e., groundwater, expansive/unstable soils, etc.)</li> <li>f. Slope stability</li> </ol> <p>Once approved by the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD), two copies of the final report shall be provided to the</p> |  |

**Table S-1: Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

| Impact  | Level of Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures   | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|--|
| <p><b>Significance Criteria 4.4-2:</b> Implementation of the project could result in significant disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcrowding of the soil</p>     | Potentially Significant Impact          | <p>ESD and one copy to the Building Services Division for its use. It is the responsibility of the developer to provide for engineering inspection and certification that earthwork has been performed in conformity with recommendations contained in the report.</p> <p>Implement Mitigation Measures GEO-1a through GEO-1c, and GEO-2.</p> <p><b>GEO-2: Staging Areas.</b> The applicant shall submit Improvement Plans that identify the stockpiling and/or vehicle staging areas with locations as far as practical from existing dwellings and protected resources in the area.</p>   | Less Than Significant Impact           |
| <p><b>Significance Criteria 4.4-3:</b> Implementation of the project would not result in substantial change in topography or ground surface relief features</p>             | Potentially Significant Impact          | Less Than Significant with Implementation of Mitigation Measures GEO-1a through GEO1c.  | Less Than Significant Impact           |
| <p><b>Significance Criteria 4.4-4:</b> Implementation of the project could result in any significant increases in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off-site</p> | Potentially Significant Impact          | <p>Implement Mitigation Measures HYD-1, HYD-2, and GEO-3.</p> <p><b>GEO-3: Construction BMPs.</b> 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 Division (ESD)).</p> <p>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</p> | Less Than Significant Impact           |

**Table S-1: Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

| Impact   | Level of Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures   | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|---|--|
| <p><b>Significance Criteria 4.4-5:</b> Implementation of the project could result in changes in deposition or erosion or changes in siltation which may modify the channel of a river, stream, or lake</p> | <p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>   | <p>entrapment of sediment, debris and oils/greases or other identified pollutants, as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD). BMPs shall be designed in accordance with the West Placer Storm Water Quality Design Manual for Sizing of Permanent Post-Construction Best Management Practices for Stormwater Quality Protection. No water quality facility construction shall be permitted within any identified wetlands area, floodplain, or right-of-way, except as authorized by project approvals.</p> <p>All permanent BMPs shall be maintained as required to ensure 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 and certification of completed maintenance reported annually to the County DPWF Stormwater Coordinator, 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.</p> <p>Implement of Mitigation Measures HYD-2 and HYD-3.</p> | <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>    |

**Table S-1: Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

| Impact  | Level of Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures   | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|--|
| <p><b>Significance Criteria 4.4-6:</b> Implementation of the project could result in exposure of people or property to geologic and geomorphological (i.e. avalanches) hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards</p>   | Potentially Significant Impact          | Implement Mitigation Measures GEO-1a, GEO-1b, and GEO-1c.   | Less Than Significant Impact           |
| <p><b>Significance Criteria 4.4-7:</b> Implementation of the project could Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse</p> | Potentially Significant Impact          | Implement Mitigation Measures GEO-1a, GEO-1b, and GEO-1c.   | Less Than Significant Impact           |
| <p><b>Significance Criteria 4.4-8:</b> Implementation of the project could be located on expansive soil, as defined in Chapter 18 of the California Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property.</p>  | Potentially Significant Impact          | Implement Mitigation Measures GEO-1a and GEO-1b, and GEO-1c | Less Than Significant Impact           |
| <b>Chapter 4.5 – GREENHOUSE GASES</b>   |   |   |  |
| <p><b>Significance Criteria 4.5-1:</b> Implementation of the project would not generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment, based on any</p>  | Less Than Significant Impact            | No mitigation measures are required.                        | Less Than Significant Impact           |

**Table S-1: Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

| Impact  | Level of Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures                  | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| applicable threshold of significance.   |   |                                      |  |
| <b>Significance Criteria 4.5-2:</b><br>Implementation of the project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.  | Less Than Significant Impact            | No mitigation measures are required. | Less Than Significant Impact           |
| <b>Chapter 4.6 – HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</b>  |   |                                      |  |
| <b>Significance Criteria 4.6-1:</b><br>Implementation of the proposed project would not violate any federal, state, or county potable water quality standards.  | Less Than Significant Impact            | No mitigation measures are required. | Less Than Significant Impact           |
| <b>Significance Criteria 4.6-2:</b><br>Implementation of the proposed project would not Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a new deficit in aquifer volume or a lessening of local groundwater supplies (i.e., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted. | Less Than Significant Impact            | No mitigation measures are required. | Less Than Significant Impact           |

**Table S-1: Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

| Impact  | Level of Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures  | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|--|--|
| <p><b>Impact 5.8-3:</b> The proposed project could degrade surface water quality or contribute runoff water which could include substantial additional sources of polluted water.</p> | <p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>   | <p><b>HYD-1: Water Quality BMPs.</b> Prior to approval of Improvement Plans, the project applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Development Review Committee, that the project implements applicable permanent and operational source control measures. Source control measures shall be designed for pollutant generating activities or sources consistent with recommendations from the California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA) Stormwater BMP Handbook for New Development and Redevelopment, or equivalent manual, and shall be shown on the Improvement Plans. The project is located within the permit area covered by Placer County’s Small Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit (State Water Resources Control Board National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), pursuant to the NPDES Phase II program. Project-related stormwater discharges are subject to all applicable requirements of said permit.</p> <p>The project is also required to implement Low Impact Development (LID) standards designed to reduce runoff, treat stormwater, and provide baseline hydromodification management as outlined in the West Placer Storm Water Quality Design Manual.</p> <p><b>HYD-2: Stormwater Quality Control Plan.</b> Prior to approval of Improvement Plans, the project applicant shall provide to the satisfaction of the Development Review Committee, a final Storm Water Quality Plan (SWQP) shall be submitted, either within the final Drainage Report or as a separate document that identifies how this project will meet the Phase II MS4 permit obligations. Site design measures, source control measures, and Low Impact Development (LID) standards, as necessary, shall be incorporated into the design and shown on the Improvement Plans. In addition, per the Phase II MS4 permit, projects creating and/or replacing one acre or more of impervious surface (excepting</p> | <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>    |

**Table S-1: Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

| Impact | Level of Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures   | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--------|---|---|--|
|        |   | <p>projects that do not increase impervious surface area over the pre-project condition) are also required to demonstrate hydromodification management of stormwater such that post-project runoff is maintained to equal or below pre-project flow rates for the 2 year, 24-hour storm event, generally by way of infiltration, rooftop and impervious area disconnection, bioretention, and other LID measures that result in post-project flows that mimic pre-project conditions.</p> <p><b>HYD-3: Diversion Around Trash Storage Areas.</b> Prior to approval of Improvement Plans, the project applicant shall provide to the satisfaction of the Development Review Committee, Improvement Plans that show 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.</p> <p><b>HYD-4: Waste Discharger Identification.</b> Prior to construction commencing, the project applicant shall provide to the satisfaction of the Development Review Committee, evidence to the Engineering and Surveying Division of a Waste Discharged Identification (WDID) number generated from the State Regional Water Quality Control Board’s Stormwater Multiple Application &amp; Reports Tracking System (SMARTS). This serves as the Regional Water Quality Control Board approval or permit under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) construction stormwater quality permit.</p> |  |

**Table S-1: Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

| Impact   | Level of Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures  | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|--|--|
| <p><b>Significance Criteria 4.6-4:</b> Implementation of the proposed project would not otherwise substantially degrade ground water quality.</p>  | <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>     | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>  | <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>    |
| <p><b>Significance Criteria 4.6-5:</b> Implementation of the proposed project could Substantially alter the drainage pattern or the site or area or increase the rate or amount of surface runoff.</p> | <p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>   | <p><b>HYD-5: Final Drainage Study.</b> Prior to approval of Improvement Plans, the project applicant shall provide to the satisfaction of the Development Review Committee the preliminary Drainage Report provided during environmental review submitted in final format. The final Drainage Report may require more detail than that provided in the preliminary report, and will be reviewed in concert with the Improvement Plans to confirm conformity between the two. 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 proposed improvements, all appropriate calculations, watershed maps, changes in flows and patterns, and 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 during construction, as well as long-term post-construction water quality measures. The final Drainage Report shall be prepared 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 improvement plan submittal.</p> <p><b>HYD-6: Drainage Improvement and Flood Control Fees.</b> 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.) have been paid. The current estimated development fee is \$1,854 per acre, payable to the Engineering and</p> | <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>    |

**Table S-1: Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

| Impact  | Level of Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures   | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|--|
| <p><b>Significance Criteria 4.6-6:</b> Implementation of the proposed project would not 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.</p>                              | Less Than Significant Impact            | <p>Surveying Division 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.</p> <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p> | Less Than Significant Impact           |
| <p><b>Significance Criteria 4.6-7:</b> Implementation of the proposed project would not 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, or place within a 100-year flood hazard area improvements which would impede or redirect flood flows.</p> | Less Than Significant Impact            | No mitigation measures are required.  | Less Than Significant Impact           |

**Table S-1: Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

| Impact  | Level of Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures                  | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <p><b>Significance Criteria 4.6-8:</b> Implementation of the proposed project would not place 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.</p>  | No Impact                               | No mitigation measures are required. | No Impact                              |
| <b>Chapter 4.7 – LAND USE AND PLANNING</b>  |   |                                      |  |
| <p><b>Significance Criteria 4.7-1:</b> Implementation of the proposed project would not physically divide an established community.</p>   | Less Than Significant Impact            | No mitigation measures are required. | Less Than Significant Impact           |
| <p><b>Significance Criteria 4.7-2:</b> Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with General Plan or Community Plan land use designations or zoning, or Plan policies adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.</p>   | Less Than Significant Impact            | No mitigation measures are required. | Less Than Significant Impact           |
| <p><b>Significance Criteria 4.7-3:</b> Implementation of the proposed project would not 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.</p> | Less Than Significant Impact            | No mitigation measures are required. | Less Than Significant Impact           |

**Table S-1: Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

| Impact  | Level of Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures                  | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <p><b>Significance Criteria 4.7-4:</b> Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the development of incompatible uses and/or the creation of land use conflicts.</p>   | Less Than Significant Impact            | No mitigation measures are required. | Less Than Significant Impact           |
| <p><b>Significance Criteria 4.7-5:</b> Implementation of the proposed project would not affect agricultural and timber resources or operations (i.e., impacts to soils or farmlands and timber harvest plans, or impacts from incompatible land uses.</p> | Less Than Significant Impact            | No mitigation measures are required. | Less Than Significant Impact           |
| <p><b>Significance Criteria 4.7-6:</b> Implementation of the proposed project would not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low income or minority community.</p>   | Less Than Significant Impact            | No mitigation measures are required. | Less Than Significant Impact           |
| <p><b>Significance Criteria 4.7-7:</b> Implementation of the proposed project would not result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area.</p>   | Less Than Significant Impact            | No mitigation measures are required. | Less Than Significant Impact           |
| <p><b>Significance Criteria 4.7-8:</b> Implementation of the proposed project would not cause economic or social changes that would result</p>  | Less Than Significant Impact            | No mitigation measures are required. | Less Than Significant Impact           |

**Table S-1: Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

| Impact  | Level of Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures                  | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| in significant adverse physical changes to the environment such as urban decay or deterioration.  |   |                                      |  |
| <b>Chapter 4.8 – NOISE</b>  |   |                                      |  |
| <b>Significance Criteria 4.8-1:</b> Implementation of the proposed project would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.                        | Less Than Significant Impact            | No mitigation measures are required. | Less Than Significant Impact           |
| <b>Significance Criteria 4.8-2:</b> Implementation of the proposed project would not expose persons to, or generate, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. | Less Than Significant Impact            | No mitigation measures are required. | Less Than Significant Impact           |
| <b>Significance Criteria 4.8-3:</b> Implementation of the proposed project would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.                                    | Less Than Significant Impact            | No mitigation measures are required. | Less Than Significant Impact           |
| <b>Significance Criteria 4.8-4:</b> The proposed project would not be located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of   | Less Than Significant Impact            | No mitigation measures are required. | Less Than Significant Impact           |

**Table S-1: Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

| Impact   | Level of Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures                  | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <p>a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.</p>  |   |                                      |  |
| <p><b>Significance Criteria 4.8-5:</b> The proposed project would not be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.</p>                       | Less Than Significant Impact            | No mitigation measures are required. | Less Than Significant Impact           |
| <p><b>Significance Criteria 4.8-6:</b> Implementation of the proposed project would not expose people to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.</p>  | Less Than Significant Impact            | No mitigation measures are required. | Less Than Significant Impact           |
| <p><b>Chapter 4.9 – PUBLIC SERVICES</b></p>  |   |                                      |  |
| <p><b>Significance Criteria 4.9-1:</b> The proposed project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with Fire Protection, Sherriff Protection, Schools, Maintenance of Public Facilities, or Other Governmental Services</p> | Less Than Significant Impact            | No mitigation measures are required. | Less Than Significant Impact           |

**Table S-1: Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

| Impact  | Level of Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures                  | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Chapter 4.10 – TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION</b>   |   |                                      |  |
| <p><b>Significance Criteria 4.10-1:</b> Implementation of the project would not cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street 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).</p> | Less Than Significant Impact            | No mitigation measures are required. | Less Than Significant Impact           |
| <p><b>Significance Criteria 4.10-2:</b> Implementation of the project would not exceed, 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.</p>  | Less Than Significant Impact            | No mitigation measures are required. | Less Than Significant Impact           |
| <p><b>Significance Criteria 4.10-3:</b> Implementation of the project would not increase impacts to vehicle safety due to roadway design features (i.e., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).</p>  | Less Than Significant Impact            | No mitigation measures are required. | Less Than Significant Impact           |
| <p><b>Significance Criteria 4.10-4:</b> Implementation of the project would not result in inadequate</p>  | Less Than Significant Impact            | No mitigation measures are required. | Less Than Significant Impact           |

**Table S-1: Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

| Impact   | Level of Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures                  | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| emergency access or access to nearby uses  |   |                                      |  |
| <b>Significance Criteria 4.10-5:</b> Implementation of the project would not result in insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site.  | Less Than Significant Impact            | No mitigation measures are required. | Less Than Significant Impact           |
| <b>Significance Criteria 4.10-6:</b> Implementation of the project would not result in hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists.  | Less Than Significant Impact            | No mitigation measures are required. | Less Than Significant Impact           |
| <b>Significance Criteria 4.10-7:</b> Implementation of the project would not result in 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. | Less Than Significant Impact            | No mitigation measures are required. | Less Than Significant Impact           |
| <b>Significance Criteria 4.10-8:</b> Implementation of the project would 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.  | Less Than Significant Impact            | No mitigation measures are required. | Less Than Significant Impact           |

**Table S-1: Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

| Impact   | Level of Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures  | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|--|--|
| <b>Chapter 4.11 – ENERGY CONSERVATION</b>  |   |  |  |
| <b>Significance Criteria 4.11-1:</b> Project implementation would not result in the inefficient, wasteful or unnecessary consumption of energy during project construction or operation. | Less Than Significant Impact            | No mitigation measures are required.   | Less Than Significant Impact           |
| <b>SUMMARY OF MITIGATION MEASURES IDENTIFIED IN THE INITIAL STUDY</b>  |   |  |  |
| <b>II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES</b>  |   |  |  |
| <b>Impact II-2:</b> Implementation of the project could conflict with General Plan or other policies regarding land use buffers for agricultural operations.                             | Potentially Significant Impact          | <b>MM II-1:</b> The facility managers shall notify all future tenants of Placer County’s Right-to-Farm Ordinance (Placer County Code Section 5.24.040) by informing them that the policies and regulations are in place to maintain, encourage, and support farm operations and that there may be agricultural activities occurring in the future in the area of the proposed project. This information shall be included in the lease or rental agreements for the development. | Less Than Significant Impact           |
| <b>Impact II-3:</b> Implementation of the project could conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, a Williamson Act contract or a Right-to-Farm Policy.                         | Potentially Significant Impact          | Implementation of MM II-1.   | Less Than Significant Impact           |

**Table S-1: Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

| Impact  | Level of Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures  | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|--|--|
| <b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>  |   |  |  |
| <p><b>Impact V-2:</b> Implementation of the proposed project could substantially cause adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5.</p> | <p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>   | <p><b>MM V.1:</b> The Improvement Plans shall include a statement that if any archaeological artifacts, exotic rock (non-native), or unusual amounts of shell or bone are uncovered during any on-site construction activities, all work shall be stopped immediately within a 100-foot radius of the find and a qualified archaeologist retained to evaluate the deposit. The Placer County Planning Services Division and Department of Museums shall also be contacted for review of the archaeological find(s).</p> <p>If the discovery consists of human remains, the Placer County Coroner and Native American Heritage Commission must also be contacted. Work in the area may only proceed after authorization is granted by the Placer County Planning Services Division. Following a review of the new find and consultation with appropriate experts, if necessary, the authority to proceed may be accompanied by the addition of development requirements that provide protection of the site and/or additional mitigation measures necessary to address the unique or sensitive nature of the site.</p> <p><b>MM V.2:</b> Prior to the start of ground disturbance, all construction personnel involved with earth-moving activities should be informed that artifacts protected by law could be discovered during excavating. The training should include the appearance of common artifacts and proper notification procedures should artifacts be discovered. This worker training should be prepared and presented by a qualified archaeological professional.</p> | <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>    |
| <p><b>Impact V-4:</b> Implementation of the proposed project could restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area.</p>   | <p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>   | <p><b>MM V.3:</b> Prior to the start of ground disturbance, develop a standard operating procedure, points of contact, timeline and schedule for the project so all possible damages can be</p>  | <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>    |

**Table S-1: Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

| Impact   | Level of Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures   | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|---|--|
|  |   | <p>avoided or alternatives and cumulative impacts properly accessed.</p> <p>If potential archaeological resources cultural resources, articulated, or disarticulated human remains are discovered by Native American Representatives or Monitors from interested Native American Tribes, qualified cultural resources specialists or other project personnel during construction activities, work will cease in the immediate vicinity of the find (based on the apparent distribution of cultural resources), whether or not a Native American Monitor from an interested Native American Tribe is present. A qualified cultural resources specialist and Native American Representatives and Monitors from culturally affiliated Native American Tribes will assess the significance of the find and make recommendations for further evaluation and treatment as necessary. These recommendations will be documented in the project record. For any recommendations made by interested Native American Tribes which are not implemented, a justification for why the recommendation was not followed will be provided in the project record.</p> <p>If adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, unique archeology, or other cultural resources occurs, then consultation with UAIC regarding mitigation contained in the Public Resources Code sections 21084.3(a) and (b) and CEQA Guidelines section 15370 should occur, in order to coordinate for compensation for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments.</p> |  |
| <b>XIII PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>  |   |   |  |
| <b>Impact XIII-1:</b> Implementation of the proposed project could directly or indirectly destroy a unique | Potentially Significant Impact          | MM XIII: Prior to improvement plan submittal, the applicant shall provide written evidence to the Planning Services Division that a qualified paleontologist has been retained by the applicant to observe grading activities and salvage fossils   | Less Than Significant Impact           |

**Table S-1: Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures**

| Impact  | Level of Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures  | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|--|--|
| paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.  |   | as necessary. The paleontologist shall establish procedures for paleontological resource surveillance and shall establish, in cooperation with the project developer, procedures for temporarily halting or redirecting work to permit sampling, identification, and evaluation of fossils. If major paleontological resources are discovered, which require temporary halting or redirecting of grading, the paleontologist shall report such findings to the project developer, and to the Placer County Department of Museums and Planning Services Division. |  |
| <b>XVI RECREATION</b>   |   |  |  |
| <b>Impact XVI-1:</b> Implementation of the proposed project could 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. | Potentially Significant Impact          | The project applicant shall provide onsite active and passive recreational land that meets the requirement set forth in the Placer County General Plan. If onsite provision of sufficient active and passive parkland cannot be provided, the project applicant shall pay in-lieu fees consistent with the Placer County Park Dedication Fee Program (PDF Program) when a building permit is applied for. This fee will be used for the acquisition, improvement, and/or expansion of parks and recreational facilities within the community.                    | Less Than Significant Impact           |
| <b>XVII TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>   |   |  |  |
| <b>Impact XVIII:</b> Implementation of the proposed project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource as defined in Public Resources Code, Section 21074   | Potentially Significant Impact          | Implement MM v.1, MM V.2, MM V.3   | Less Than Significant Impact           |