

2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This Executive Summary is provided in accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15123. It presents an overview of the analysis of the SAP—Placer County’s proposed update of the SIA Plan. As stated in Section 15123(a), an EIR shall contain a brief summary of the proposed action and its consequences. Section 15123(b) of the guidelines states, “The summary shall identify: 1) [e]ach significant effect with proposed mitigation measures and alternatives that would reduce or avoid that effect; 2) [a]reas of controversy known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public; and 3) [i]ssues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate the significant effects.” Accordingly, this summary includes a brief synopsis of the SAP, which includes the PRSP, and plan alternatives; environmental impacts and mitigation; areas of known controversy; and issues to be resolved during environmental review.

2.2 SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

Placer County is proposing to update the 1997 Sunset Industrial Area (SIA) Plan. The proposed plan update, now called the *Sunset Area Plan* (SAP), identifies a higher density mix of labor- and employment-intensive uses with an emphasis on innovation and creativity. Nested within the SAP, the proposed *Placer Ranch Specific Plan* (PRSP) includes a mixed-use town center, an employment center, a university site, open space, schools, parks, and a diverse housing mix. Both of these plans together, along with other supporting infrastructure, are referred to as the “project.” The project is described in detail in Chapter 3, “Project Description.” A brief summary of the project is provided below.

2.2.1 Background and Location

The SAP area, which includes the PRSP area, encompasses 8,497 acres in unincorporated south Placer County. It is located between the cities of Rocklin to the east; Roseville to the south; Lincoln to the north; and unincorporated Placer County, primarily farmland, to the west. The SAP area is west of SR 65, which connects to I-80 in the south and SR 99 to the north.

The PRSP area encompasses 2,213 acres in the southern portion of the SAP area. The southern boundary of the PRSP area is contiguous with the Roseville city limits, and the northern boundary is defined, in part, by the alignment of Sunset Boulevard west of Fiddymont Road.

The current SIA Plan was adopted by the Placer County Board of Supervisors in 1997. At that time, the County envisioned the area as a job center that would provide regional benefit and create primary wage-earner jobs for residents of local cities and unincorporated areas. That vision has not yet been realized, with almost 90 percent of the area remaining undeveloped.

2.2.2 Sunset Area Plan

The SAP is a policy document intended to guide growth in the SAP area over a 20-year planning horizon; buildout of the SAP area is expected to occur over 80 years or more. The SAP area is divided into seven thematic districts that reflect discrete development opportunities that make up the vision for the SAP area. These districts frame the broader land use patterns and motifs that serve as the vision and the basis for the

specific land use designations. Each district includes land use designations for specific land uses within each district. The SAP includes 10 proposed land use designations, including General Commercial (GC), Entertainment Mixed-Use (EMU), Business Park (BPK), Innovation Center (IC), Eco-Industrial (EI), Light Industrial (LI), Public Facility (PF), Preserve/Mitigation Reserve (P/MR), Urban Reserve (UR), and Placer Ranch Specific Plan (PRSP). The Land Use Diagram (see Exhibit 3-5 in Chapter 3, “Project Description”) serves as the official policy on the allocation and distribution of different land uses within the SAP area. It is intended to carry out the overall vision for the plan area; therefore, the designations are reflective of the SAP thematic districts.

The SAP includes goals, policies, and implementation measures to facilitate the vision and objectives of the SAP. The SAP policy framework includes a variety of policies related to environmental protection. These are described generally in Chapter 3, “Project Description.”

Chapter 3 provides the details of the SAP, including the specific land uses allowed in each land use designation, as well as the details regarding the level of development anticipated.

2.2.3 Placer Ranch Specific Plan

The PRSP is located within the SAP; however, the PRSP is a stand-alone planning and regulatory document that would guide and implement development activity in the 2,213-acre PRSP area over the long term. It is intended to implement the *Placer County General Plan* and the SAP by establishing the fundamental development framework; distribution of land uses; alignment of mobility systems; residential unit allocations; and all related provisions for parks, utilities, public services, and infrastructure financing within the PRSP area. The PRSP works in tandem with two companion documents: *Placer Ranch Development Standards* and *Placer Ranch Design Guidelines*. Together, these documents augment the PRSP and provide the appropriate standards and guidelines to ensure that future development projects in the PRSP area are consistently implemented to achieve the desired vision at buildout. The owner of the property associated with the PRSP area is Placer Ranch, Inc. Placer County is processing the application.

Chapter 3, “Project Description,” provides the details of the PRSP, including the specific land uses allowed in each land use designation, as well as the details regarding the level of development anticipated.

2.2.4 Other Supporting Infrastructure

The project includes a range of transportation and utility improvements. Six roads in the SAP area, including Fiddymont Road and Sunset Boulevard, would be widened or extended. Potable water, recycled water, wastewater, and drainage systems, and electricity, natural gas, and telecommunications service would be extended into the area.

The project also includes improvements outside the SAP area. Volumetric retention in the Pleasant Grove Creek watershed may be accommodated by expanding the City of Roseville’s approved Pleasant Grove Retention Facility, which, in addition to providing wildlife conservation, would accommodate increased stormwater generated by the project. Off-site transportation and utility improvements also would be required.

See Chapter 3, “Project Description,” for a more detailed discussion of these infrastructure improvements.

2.3 REQUIRED PERMITS AND APPROVALS

The following actions from Placer County are necessary to implement the proposed SAP/PRSP:

- ▲ certification of the SAP/PRSP EIR, and adoption of the mitigation monitoring and reporting plan (MMRP);
- ▲ approval of amendments to the *Placer County General Plan* to modify text, data, goals, policies, tables, and figures to reflect the SAP and PRSP (described in detail below);
- ▲ adoption of the SAP, redesignating land use within the Sunset Area and designating the PRSP as a specific plan;
- ▲ adoption of SAP Implementing Zoning Regulations and Corridor Design Standards & Guidelines;
- ▲ rezoning of lands within the SAP area as depicted on the zoning map, including a rezone of the PRSP area from Industrial (INP-DC and INP-DC-FH), Commercial (C2-UP-DC), and Farm (F-B-X-160-DR-SP, F-B-X-80, F-B-X-80-SP) to SPL-PRSP;
- ▲ adoption of the PRSP, Placer Ranch Development Standards, and Placer Ranch Design Guidelines;
- ▲ approval of Placer Ranch Large Lot Vesting Tentative Map for the PRSP to merge and resubdivide existing parcels totaling 2,213.3 acres into multiple parcels;
- ▲ approval of the Foothills Boulevard extension alignment, connecting, via Duluth Avenue, the existing Foothills Boulevard in the SAP area to Foothills Boulevard within the City of Roseville;
- ▲ adoption of an ordinance to approve the Development Agreement between the County of Placer and Placer Ranch, Inc.;
- ▲ update to the Placer County Countywide Capital Improvement Plan, countywide traffic impact fee program, and other County fee programs to be adopted concurrently with the PRSP and SAP; and
- ▲ amendment of the CFD 2012-1 Fire and Emergency Service future annexation area.

The following approvals and permits are required from other agencies to implement the proposed PRSP:

- ▲ approval of a NEPA document (USACE),
- ▲ Section 404 Individual Permit (USACE),
- ▲ Section 7 Consultation (USFWS and National Marine Fisheries Service),
- ▲ issuance of a Statewide General Order Permit for the use of Recycled Water (State Water Resources Control Board),
- ▲ execution of a Wholesaler-Retailer Agreement with the City of Roseville for the use of Recycled Water,
- ▲ execution of a Master Facilities Agreement with PCWA,
- ▲ Section 401 Water Quality Certification (Regional Water Quality Control Board – Central Valley Region),
- ▲ Section 402 National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Approval (Regional Water Quality Control Board – Central Valley Region),

- ▲ Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement (CDFW),
- ▲ amendment of the Wastewater Service Area boundaries (South Placer Wastewater Authority and local agency formation commission), and
- ▲ agreement with City of Roseville for outlining fair-share obligations for off-site retention at the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility.

2.4 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 mandates that all EIRs include a comparative evaluation of the proposed project with alternatives to the plan that are capable of attaining most of the plan's basic objectives but that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. CEQA requires an evaluation of a "range of reasonable" alternatives, including the "no project" alternative. The following alternatives are under consideration for the SAP:

- ▲ **Alternative 1: No-Project–1997 SIA Plan.** This alternative assumes that the project is not approved and that development occurs consistent with the 1997 SIA Plan. In the 20-year timeframe, implementing this alternative would result in less than half the amount of development that would be allowed under the project.
- ▲ **Alternative 2: Reduced Scale.** Section 4.1 of this Draft EIR, "Aesthetics," identifies significant impacts related to the proposed change to the visual character of the plan area. Part of this significance determination relates to the abrupt transition from undeveloped preserve land to developed land, and the larger scale of development allowed, compared to existing development. Implementing the Reduced Scale Alternative would reduce the overall scale of development by reducing the allowed maximum building height. Implementing this alternative also would help smooth the transition between developed areas and undeveloped preserve areas.
- ▲ **Alternative 3: Reduced Footprint, Reduced Development Potential.** As described in Section 4.4 of this Draft EIR, "Biological Resources," nearly all the undeveloped property in the project area is considered vernal pool recovery core area. Implementing the project would result in preservation of approximately 29 percent, or 2,140 of the 7,424 acres, of the core area. This alternative is designed to address the significant project impact by increasing the amount of core area preserved to 3,607 acres, which would be approximately 49 percent (1,467 more acres of core area preserved than under the project). Implementing this alternative would reduce the area subject to development compared to the project and would reduce the overall development potential of the project, which also would address other significant impacts associated with the project, including those associated with traffic, vehicle miles traveled (VMT), greenhouse gas emissions, air quality, and noise. The Sac State–Placer Center would not change under this alternative.
- ▲ **Alternative 4: Reduced Footprint, Similar Development Potential.** This alternative would have approximately the same development footprint as Alternative 3, and it would achieve a similar reduction in the project-related impact on core vernal pool habitat. However, rather than reducing development potential, implementing this alternative would maintain similar development potential. Maintaining a development potential similar to that of the project in an area that has almost 1,500 fewer developable acres would require an increase in net density. This would result in more compact development with a shift from lower-density residential to higher-density residential. Nonresidential structures would be slightly taller, and some might include parking structures. The Sac State–Placer Center would not change under this alternative.
- ▲ **Alternative 5: Reduced VMT.** Section 4.14, "Transportation and Circulation," of this Draft EIR identifies significant project impacts related to VMT. One of the reasons for the high level of VMT associated with the project is that the SAP Entertainment Mixed-Use (EMU) designation allows region-serving uses, potentially including indoor/outdoor commercial recreation, regional-serving retail, and/or entertainment

venue, which could result in large numbers of people traveling long distances to the SAP area from other areas in the region and beyond. Traffic modeling for the 20-year scenario revealed that by removing the nonresidential development from the EMU designation, VMT decreased by 25 percent. This alternative aims to achieve the reduction in VMT by eliminating the non-residential uses from the EMU. Overall, the Reduced VMT alternative results in a 20-percent reduction in nonresidential floor area in the net SAP area (in the 20-year development scenario). The PRSP would not change substantially under this alternative.

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 states that an EIR should identify the “environmentally superior” alternative. It also states that if the environmentally superior alternative is the “no project” alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. Consistent with the State CEQA Guidelines (CCR Section 15126.6 [e][2]), because the environmentally superior alternative was identified as the No Project Alternative, another environmentally superior alternative shall be identified.

As discussed in Section 6, “Alternatives,” all the other alternatives result in an overall level of impact that is less than the proposed project, although none of the other alternatives avoid or substantially reduce a significant impact of the project. Among the remaining alternatives, Alternative 3: Reduced Footprint, Reduced Development Potential is considered environmentally superior because it results in the greatest reduction of impacts, and it appears to meet most of the project objectives.

2.5 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

The notice of preparation (NOP) was released on November 3, 2016. It was submitted to the California State Clearinghouse and distributed to interested and affected federal, state, and local agencies; interested parties; and organizations. The NOP was circulated for 39 days, through December 12, 2016. Two public scoping meetings were held by the County to inform interested parties about the proposed project and to provide agencies and the public with an opportunity to provide comments on the scope and content of the EIR. Appendix A of this Draft EIR contains the NOP and all comments received during the scoping period.

Based on the comments received during the NOP comment periods, the major areas of controversy associated with the plan are:

- ▲ odor-related impacts and other land use compatibility issues associated with the landfill (including potential effects to operation of the landfill, encroachment of development in the landfill buffer area, increased odor impacts on existing residents);
- ▲ potential impacts on the local and regional transportation network;
- ▲ impacts on public services, including services provided by surrounding jurisdictions;
- ▲ impacts on recreation and parks, including recreation and parks facilities provided by surrounding jurisdictions;
- ▲ impacts related to utilities distribution and treatment systems capacity;
- ▲ water supply and water limitations;
- ▲ impacts related to stormwater drainage facilities and other stormwater-related impacts, including flooding impacts on existing county residents;
- ▲ the impact of eminent domain from the extension of Foothills Boulevard;

- ▲ VMT and provision of alternative transportation modes;
- ▲ greenhouse gas emissions and contribution to impacts related to global climate change;
- ▲ energy conservation and power system/distribution;
- ▲ impacts on biological and natural resources;
- ▲ conversion of farmland;
- ▲ issues related to population/employment growth and jobs-housing balance;
- ▲ affordable housing and other housing issues;
- ▲ concerns from existing neighborhoods regarding the proposed development;
- ▲ conflicts with other planned facilities, including roadways;
- ▲ aesthetic and visual impacts;
- ▲ project phasing and timeline; and
- ▲ noise impacts.

2.6 ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

Section 15123 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires the summary section of a Draft EIR to identify issues to be resolved in the EIR, including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate the significant project effects. The major issues to be resolved by the County regarding the project are whether:

- ▲ recommended mitigation measures should be adopted or modified;
- ▲ additional mitigation measures need to be applied to the proposed project; and
- ▲ the proposed project should or should not be approved or an alternative approved.

2.7 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES

Under State CEQA Guidelines Section 15382, a significant effect on the environment is defined as “a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance.” The technical sections in Chapter 4 of this draft EIR describe in detail the significant environmental impacts, including cumulative impacts, that would result from implementing the SAP. Section 5.3 provides a discussion of growth-inducing impacts. Table 2-1 presents a summary of environmental impacts, their level of significance without mitigation, the mitigation measures, and the level of significance following the implementation of mitigation measures. Many of the impacts are identified as significant and unavoidable not because sufficient and feasible mitigation is unavailable but because they would occur outside the jurisdiction of Placer County (and therefore outside the area in which the County has the ability to impose mitigation). The significant and unavoidable impacts are identified below and summarized in Chapter 5, “Other CEQA-Mandated Sections.”

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures			Significance after Mitigation
		NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	
4.1 Aesthetics					
<p>Impact 4.1-1: Substantial degradation of the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings during construction</p> <p>Construction activities associated with the project would cause a slight reduction in visual quality and would not substantially change visual character. Construction activities would be temporary and limited to localized sites within the project area. Visual impacts from construction would therefore be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.			LTS
<p>Impact 4.1-2: Substantial degradation of the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings after buildout</p> <p>Implementing the project would maintain or improve visual quality in several parts of the project area. However, in areas where there would be a contrast between rural areas and new development, implementing the project would substantially degrade visual quality. In locations where the visual character is rural or agricultural and the project calls for development rather than preservation of existing conditions, development of the project area would substantially change the visual character of portions of the sites. This impact would be potentially significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.			LTS
<p>Impact 4.1-3: New source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area during construction</p> <p>Sources of glare during construction of the proposed project would be temporary, distributed across the project area, and transient, such that glare would not be substantial. Nighttime lighting for construction activities could result in substantial adverse effects on nighttime views. This impact would be potentially significant.</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.1-3a: Shield and angle nighttime construction lighting downwards (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>Before issuance of grading or building permits for the net SAP and PRSP areas, a note shall be identified on the grading or other improvement plans requiring construction managers or contractors to include shielding on all nighttime lighting used for construction activities and angle all such lighting downwards.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.1-3b: Shield and angle nighttime construction lighting downwards (Pleasant Grove Retention Facility and Off-Site Transportation and Utility Improvements)</p> <p>The County shall coordinate with the City of Roseville with regard to mitigation for nighttime lighting impacts during construction of the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility and off-site transportation and utility improvements, which are located in the City of Roseville, including shielding for all nighttime lighting used for construction activities and to angle all such lighting downwards.</p>			SU
<p>Impact 4.1-4: New source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area after buildout</p>	PS	No mitigation is available.			SU

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures			Significance after Mitigation
		NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	
Nighttime lighting from buildout of the project area would create substantial light pollution. Glare from reflective surfaces of development could also be substantial, depending on building locations. This impact would be potentially significant.					
Cumulative Impact 4.1-5: Cumulative degradation of visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings	SU			No mitigation is available.	SU
Cumulative Impact 4.1-6: Contribution to substantial glare that would adversely affect daytime views in the area	LTS			No mitigation is required.	LTS
Cumulative Impact 4.1-7: Contribution to substantial light that would adversely affect nighttime views in the area	SU			No mitigation is available.	SU
4.2 Agricultural Resources					
Impact 4.2-1: Conversion of Farmland to a nonagricultural use Implementation of the project would require conversion of Farmland (Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance, or Unique Farmland) to nonagricultural use. This impact would be significant.	S			Mitigation Measure 4.2-1a: Preserve Farmland (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area) Farmland, as defined under the Placer County CEQA Checklist, shall be preserved in Placer County at a minimum ratio of 1:1, or in accordance with the PCCP at such time it is adopted, for each acre of Farmland converted to nonagricultural use. This is to be accomplished through the approval and implementation of a series of Farmland preservation management plans that address management of specific properties to be preserved for mitigation of converted Farmland. According to the requirements specified below, Farmland preservation management plans for individual preserve sites will accompany each proposed development project, or group of projects, in the net SAP and PRSP areas. No additional mitigation to address the loss of Farmland is required, as long as a substantial portion (as determined by the planning director in consultation with the County agricultural commissioner) of the mitigation lands acquired is undeveloped. Such lands must also have an NRCS soils classification or DOC categorization of the same or greater value than Farmland converted to nonagricultural uses. Mitigation lands will be protected by agricultural conservation easements containing restrictive encumbrances in a form deemed acceptable to and approved by the County. Farmland preserved for the purpose of habitat mitigation may be counted toward the Farmland mitigation measure if the preserved land has the same or better NRCS or DOC classification as the Farmland being converted to nonagricultural use.	SU

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
			<p>Mitigation Measure 4.2-1b: Preserve Farmland (Pleasant Grove Retention Facility)</p> <p>The County shall coordinate with the City of Roseville in an effort to preserve Farmland in Placer County at a ratio of 1.35:1 for each acre of Farmland converted to nonagricultural use. This could be accomplished through the approval and implementation of a series of Farmland preservation management plans that address management of specific properties to be preserved for mitigation of converted Farmland. No additional mitigation to address the loss of Farmland would be required beyond the 1.35:1 requirement noted above as long as a substantial portion, as determined by the City’s planning director, in consultation with the County agricultural commissioner, of the mitigation lands acquired is undeveloped and has an NRCS soils classification or DOC categorization of the same or greater value than Farmland converted to nonagricultural uses on the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility property. Mitigation lands would be protected by agricultural conservation easements containing restrictive encumbrances in a form deemed acceptable to and approved by the City. Farmland preserved for the purpose of habitat mitigation may be counted toward the Farmland mitigation measure if the preserved land has the same or better NRCS or DOC classification as the Farmland being converted to nonagricultural use.</p>	
<p>Impact 4.2-2: Conflict with existing Williamson Act contracts</p> <p>The SAP area contains 716 acres under Williamson Act contract, currently preserved as the Orchard Creek Conservation Bank. This area would not be developed under the SAP. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.</p>		LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>Impact 4.2-3: Indirect conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use, or conflict with land use buffers for agricultural operations</p> <p>Implementation of the project would result in new urban land uses that may impair adjacent agricultural activities. The <i>Placer County General Plan</i> requires a buffer between agricultural and nonagricultural uses. The SAP also includes a proposed agricultural buffer policy. In addition, agricultural land adjacent to the PRSP area is currently planned for development. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.</p>		LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>Cumulative Impact 4.2-4: Cumulative conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use</p>		SU	No mitigation is available.	SU

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
4.3 Air Quality				
<p>Impact 4.3-1: Consistency with applicable air quality plans</p> <p>PCAPCD and other air districts in the SVAB developed air quality plans to enable the region to achieve attainment of the federal 8-hour ozone standard and the California 1-hour and 8-hour ozone standards. These air quality plans are based on an inventory of existing emission sources as well as projections about the future level of land use development in the SVAB. Because the levels of growth associated with the project were accounted for in these projections of emissions-generating activity, the project would be consistent with applicable air quality plans. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS	
<p>Impact 4.3-2: Construction emissions of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors</p> <p>Construction-related activities would result in project-generated emissions of ROG, NO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} from site preparation, off-road equipment, material and equipment delivery trips, worker commute trips, building construction, and other miscellaneous activities. Construction activities would result in mass emissions of ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀ that exceed PCAPCD's thresholds of 82 lb/day. Therefore, construction-generated emissions of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors could contribute to the existing nonattainment status of the SVAB with respect to the NAAQS and the CAAQS for ozone and the CAAQS for PM₁₀. Because PM_{2.5} is a subset of PM₁₀, it is anticipated that construction-generated emissions of PM_{2.5} could contribute to the nonattainment status of the SVAB with respect to the NAAQS for PM_{2.5}. This impact would be significant.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.3-2a: Implement PCAPCD's recommended construction mitigation measures (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>Project proponents shall require their construction contractors to implement all of PCAPCD's recommended construction mitigation measures in place at the time of grading / improvement plan submittal. At the time of writing this EIR, PCAPCD's recommended construction mitigation measures include measures to address exhaust emissions and dust control (PCAPCD 2017a). This measure would assist the project in achieving compliance with SAP Policies NR-5.4 and NR-5.5.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Prior construction activity, the contractor shall submit a Construction Emission/Dust Control Plan to Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) when the project area to be disturbed is greater than one acre. The Dust Control Plan shall be submitted to the APCD a minimum of 21 days before construction activity is scheduled to commence. The Dust Control Plan can be submitted online via the fill-in form: http://www.placerair.org/dustcontrolrequirements/dustcontrolform. ▲ The contractor shall submit to the PCAPCD a comprehensive equipment inventory (e.g., make, model, year, emission rating) of all the heavy-duty off-road equipment (50 horsepower or greater) that will be used in aggregate of 40 or more hours for the construction project. If any new equipment is added after submission of the inventory, the contractor shall contact the PCAPCD before the new equipment being utilized. At least three business days before the use of subject heavy-duty off-road equipment, the project representative shall provide the PCAPCD with the anticipated construction timeline including start date, name, and phone number of the property owner, project manager, and on-site foreman. ▲ With submittal of the equipment inventory, the contractor shall provide a written calculation for approval to PCAPCD demonstrating that the heavy-duty (> 50 horsepower) off-road 	SU	

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures			Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable		
						<p>vehicles to be used in the construction project (i.e., owned, leased, and subcontractor vehicles), will achieve a project-wide fleet-average of 20 percent of NO_x and 45 percent of diesel PM reduction as compared to the CARB statewide fleet average emissions. Acceptable options for reducing emissions may include the use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as they become available. The following link shall be used to calculate compliance with this condition and shall be submitted to the APCD as described above: http://www.airquality.org/businesses/ceqa-land-use-planning/mitigation (click on the current "Construction Mitigation Tool" spreadsheet under Step 1. If, due to increasingly stringent emissions standards and decreasing CARB statewide fleet average emissions, construction contractors cannot demonstrate the aforementioned emissions reductions, the following would apply.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <p>➤ Incorporate all PCAPCD-recommended emission control measures available at the time of grading or improvement plan submittal, and comply with the State Off-Road Regulation by using diesel construction equipment meeting CARB's Tier 3 standard, or the highest tier available, for on-road and off-road heavy-duty diesel engines. Proof shall be submitted along with the written calculation of the emissions reduction achieved, incorporated additional measures, and engine model-year to be used for all equipment. Proof shall also include submittal of the CARB compliance certificate of the construction fleet to be used.</p> <p>Dust Control Measures</p> <p>Include the following standard notes on all Grading or Improvement Plans submitted for construction within the net SAP area or PRSP area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <p>▲ The contractor shall suspend all grading operations when fugitive dust exceeds PCAPCD Rule 228 Fugitive Dust limitations. Fugitive dust is not to exceed 40 percent opacity, nor go beyond the property boundary at any time. Lime or other drying agents utilized to dry out wet grading areas shall not exceed PCAPCD Rule 228 limitations.</p> <p>▲ The contractor shall be responsible for keeping adjacent public thoroughfares clean of silt, dirt, mud, and debris, and shall "wet broom" the streets (or use another method to control dust as approved by the individual jurisdiction) if silt, dirt, mud or debris is carried over to adjacent public thoroughfares. (PCAPCD Rule 228)</p> <p>▲ During construction activity, traffic speeds on all unpaved surfaces shall be limited to 15 miles per hour or less. (PCAPCD Rule 228)</p> <p>▲ The contractor shall apply methods such as surface stabilization, the establishment of a vegetative cover, paving, (or use another method to control dust as approved by Placer</p>

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures		Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable	
				<p>County) to minimize wind-driven dust.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ The contractor shall apply water or use another method to control dust impacts offsite. Construction vehicles leaving the site shall be cleaned to prevent dust, silt, mud, and dirt from being released or tracked off-site. (PCAPCD Rule 228) ▲ The contractor shall suspend all grading operations when wind speeds (including instantaneous gusts) are excessive, and dust is impacting adjacent properties. (PCAPCD Rule 228) <p><u>Exhaust Control Measures</u></p> <p>Include the following standard notes on Grading or Improvement Plans submitted for construction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ The contractor shall ensure all construction equipment is maintained properly according to manufacturer’s specifications. ▲ The contractor shall fuel all off-road and portable diesel-powered equipment with CARB-certified motor vehicle diesel fuel (non-taxed version suitable for off-road use). The contractor shall not discharge into the atmosphere volatile organic compounds (VOCs) caused by the use or manufacture of Cutback or Emulsified asphalts for paving, road construction or road maintenance unless such manufacture or use complies with the provisions of Rule 217. ▲ The contractor shall utilize existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or clean fuel (e.g., gasoline, biodiesel, natural gas) generators rather than temporary diesel power generators and use electrified equipment when feasible. ▲ During construction activity, no open burning of removed vegetation shall be allowed unless permitted by the District. All removed vegetative material shall be either chipped on site or taken to an appropriate recycling site, or if a site is not available, a licensed disposal site. (District Regulation 3) ▲ The contractor shall minimize idling time to a maximum of 5 minutes for all diesel-powered equipment. (Placer County Code Chapter 10, Article 10.14; SAP Policy NR-7.14). ▲ Idling of construction-related equipment and construction-related vehicles is not permitted within 1,000 feet of any sensitive receptor (i.e., house, hospital, or school). ▲ Staging and queuing areas shall not be located within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors. ▲ Construction equipment exhaust emissions shall not exceed PCAPCD Rule 202 Visible Emissions limitations. Operators of vehicles and equipment found to exceed opacity limits are to be immediately notified by the PCAPCD to cease operations, and the equipment must be repaired within 72 hours. (PCAPCD Rule 202) 	

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures			Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable		
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Operators of vehicles and equipment found to exceed opacity limits will be notified by the PCAPCD, and the equipment must be repaired within 72 hours. (PCAPCD Rule 228) ▲ Any device or process that discharges 2 pounds per day or more of air contaminants into the atmosphere, as defined by Health and Safety Code Section 39013, may require a PCAPCD permit. ▲ Developers/contractors should contact the PCAPCD before construction and obtain any necessary permits before the issuance of a Building Permit. (PCAPCD Rule 501) ▲ The contractor shall submit to the PCAPCD a comprehensive equipment inventory (e.g., make, model, year, emission rating) of all the heavy-duty off-road equipment (50 horsepower or greater) that will be used in aggregate of 40 or more hours for the construction project. If any new equipment is added after submission of the inventory, the contractor shall contact the PCAPCD before the new equipment being utilized. At least three business days before the use of subject heavy-duty off-road equipment, the project representative shall provide the PCAPCD with the anticipated construction timeline including start date, name, and phone number of the property owner, project manager, and on-site foreman. ▼ With submittal of the Dust Control Plan to the PCAPCD, the contractor shall provide a written calculation for approval to PCAPCD demonstrating that the heavy-duty (> 50 horsepower) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project (i.e., owned, leased, and subcontractor vehicles), will achieve a project-wide fleet-average of 20 percent of NO_x and 45 percent of diesel PM reduction as compared to the CARB statewide fleet average emissions. Acceptable options for reducing emissions may include the use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as they become available. If, because of increasingly stringent emissions standards and decreasing CARB statewide fleet average emissions, construction contractors cannot demonstrate the aforementioned emissions reductions, the following would apply. <p>Mitigation Measure 4.3-2b: Implement PCAPCD's recommended construction mitigation measures (Other Supporting Infrastructure)</p> <p>To ensure construction contractors for activities occurring outside of Placer County incorporate all available and feasible construction mitigation measures to reduce fugitive dust and exhaust emissions, Placer County shall coordinate with the City of Roseville to include specific requirements for dust suppression and exhaust emission reductions, as outlined above in Mitigation Measure 4.3-2a, as notes on Grading or Improvement Plans submitted for construction.</p>			

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable	
<p>Impact 4.3-3: Long-term operational emissions of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors</p> <p>Operation of the project after full buildout would generate emissions of ROG and NO_x, which are precursors to ozone, and PM₁₀ that exceed the applicable mass emission thresholds recommended by PCAPCD. Thus, long-term operational emissions of ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀ could conflict with the air quality planning efforts and contribute substantially to the nonattainment status of SVAB with respect to the NAAQS and CAAQS for ozone and the CAAQS for PM₁₀. Because PM_{2.5} is a subset of PM₁₀, it is anticipated that operational emissions of PM_{2.5} could contribute to the nonattainment status of the SVAB with respect to the NAAQS for PM_{2.5}. This impact would be significant.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.3-3a: Reduce area-source emissions associated with land use development (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>The County will require project proponents of development proposed under the project to incorporate the following measures to reduce area-source emissions to the extent feasible.</p> <p>Transportation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ All truck loading/unloading facilities shall be equipped with one 110/208-volt power outlet for every two dock doors or truck parking spaces. For the purpose of this mitigation measure, a truck loading/unloading facility is defined as any truck distribution yard, truck loading dock, or truck loading or unloading area where more than one truck with three or more axles will be present for more than 10 minutes per week, on average. A minimum 2-foot-by-3-foot sign shall be clearly visible at each loading dock that indicates, "Diesel engine idling limited to a maximum of 5 minutes." The sign shall include instructions for diesel trucks idling for more than 5 minutes to connect to the 110/208-volt power to run any auxiliary equipment. This measure is recommended in PCAPCD's <i>CEQA Handbook</i> (PCAPCD 2017a) and is also consistent with measure VT-1 in the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) guide (CAPCOA 2010:300-303). <p>Building Energy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Single family residential units constructed within the net SAP area and the PRSP area shall be designed to achieve a 30 percent reduction in energy use compared to a standard 2016 Title 24 code-compliant unit. Reductions in energy use shall be achieved by following the energy efficiency performance standards set forth in Tier 2 of the 2016 California Green Building Standards Code, Section A4.203.1.2.2. These reductions shall be achieved by employing energy efficient design features and/or solar photovoltaics. Compliance shall be demonstrated using CEC-approved residential energy modeling software. ▲ Multi-family residential buildings of three stories or fewer constructed within the net SAP area and the PRSP area shall be designed to achieve a 15 percent reduction in energy use compared to a standard 2016 Title 24 code-compliant building. Reductions in energy use shall be achieved by following the energy efficiency performance standards set forth in Tier 1 of the 2016 California Green Building Standards Code, Action A4.203.1.2.1. These reductions shall be achieved by employing energy efficient design features and/or solar photovoltaics. Compliance shall be demonstrated using CEC-approved residential modeling software. ▲ Commercial buildings (including multi-family residential buildings four stories or higher) shall be designed to achieve a 10 percent or greater reduction in energy use compared to a standard 2016 Title 24 code-compliant building. Reductions in energy use shall be achieved 	<p>SU</p>

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures		Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable	
				<p>through energy efficiency measures consistent with Tier 1 of the 2016 California Green Building Standards Code, Section A5.203.1.2.1. Alternatively, this could be met by installing on-site renewable energy systems that achieve equivalent reductions in building energy use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ All project buildings shall be designed to include Cool Roofs in accordance with the requirements set forth in Tier 2 of the 2016 California Green Building Energy Code, Sections A4.106.5 and A5.106.11.2. ▲ All project buildings shall comply with requirements for water efficiency and conservation as described in the 2016 California Green Building Standards Code, Divisions 4.3 and 5.3. ▲ Multiple electrical receptacles shall be included on the exterior of all non-residential buildings and accessible for purposes of charging or powering electric landscaping equipment and providing an alternative to using fossil fuel-powered generators. The electrical receptacles shall have an electric potential of 100 volts. There should be a minimum of one electrical receptacle on each side of the building and one receptacle every 100 linear feet around the perimeter of the building. This measure is consistent with SAP Policy NR-6.6, which encourages installation of electric outlets to promote the use of electric landscape maintenance equipment. ▲ Energy Star®-certified appliances and fixtures shall be installed in all buildings developed under the project are if an Energy Star®-certified model of the application is available. Types of Energy Star®-certified appliances include boilers, ceiling fans, central and room air conditioners, clothes washers, compact fluorescent light bulbs, computer monitors, copiers, consumer electronics, dehumidifiers, dishwashers, external power adapters, furnaces, geothermal heat pumps, programmable thermostats, refrigerators and freezers, residential light fixtures, room air cleaners, transformers, televisions, vending machines, ventilating fans, and windows (EPA 2018c). If EPA's Energy Star® program is discontinued and not replaced with a comparable certification program before appliances and fixtures are selected, then similar measures which exceed the 2016 California Green Building Standards Code may be used. ▲ On-demand (tankless, instantaneous, or recirculating) hot water heaters shall be installed in all residential units and commercial areas that are not served by a central water boiler in the building. This measure is consistent with SAP Policy NR-6.7 that aims to improve building energy efficiency. <p>Mitigation Measure 4.3-3b: Reduce mobile-source emissions (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area) Before Design Review approval, the project proponent shall include the following features (or features determined by the County to be equally or more effective at reducing mobile-source emissions) in finished buildings. These features shall be conditions of building permits:</p>	

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures		Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ For each single-family residential unit, install a listed raceway, associated overcurrent protective device and the balance of a dedicated 208/240-volt branch circuit at 40 amperes (amp) minimum. The raceway shall not be less than trade size 1 (nominal 1-inch inside diameter). The raceway shall originate at the main service or unit subpanel and shall terminate into a listed cabinet, box, or other enclosure near the proposed location of an EV charger. Raceways are required to be continuous at enclosed, inaccessible, or concealed areas and spaces. The service panel and/or subpanel shall provide capacity for a 40-amp minimum dedicated branch circuit. All electrical circuit components and Electric Vehicle Service Equipment (EVSE), including a receptacle or box with a blank cover, related to this section shall be installed in accordance with the California Electrical Code. ▲ Multi-family residential buildings shall design at least 10 percent of parking spaces to include EVSE or a minimum of two spaces to be installed with EVSE for buildings with 2-10 parking spaces. EVSE includes EV charging equipment for each required space connected to a 208/240-volt, 40-amp panel with conduit, wiring, receptacle, and overprotection devices. ▲ Non-residential buildings shall design at least 10 percent of parking spaces to include EVSE, or a minimum of two spaces to be installed with EVSE for buildings with 2-10 parking spaces. EVSE includes EV charging equipment for each required space connected to a 208/240-volt, 40-amp panel with conduit, wiring, receptacle, and overprotection devices. ▲ Non-residential land uses with 20 or more on-site parking spaces shall dedicate preferential parking spaces to vehicles with more than one occupant and ZEVs (including battery electric vehicles and hydrogen fuel cell vehicles). The number of dedicated spaces should be no less than two spaces or 5 percent of the total parking spaces on the individual project site, whichever is greater. These dedicated spaces shall be in preferential locations such as near the main entrances to the buildings served by the parking lot and/or under the shade of structures or trees. These spaces shall be clearly marked with signs and pavement markings. This measure shall not be implemented in a way that prevents compliance with requirements in the California Vehicle Code regarding parking spaces for disabled persons or disabled veterans. ▲ Bicycle parking areas shall be provided near entrances to all nonresidential land uses, including retail, light industrial, office, hotel, entertainment, educational, and mixed-use buildings. This measure is consistent with SAP Policy NR-7.2 and TM-2.5 that encourage installation if bicycle-related facilities. <p>Mitigation Measure 4.3-3c: Purchase ROG and NO_x offsets through PCAPCD's Off-Site Mitigation Fee Program (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>After implementing on-site mitigation (identified in Mitigation Measures 4.3-3a and 4.3-3b,</p>		

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures			Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable		
			<p>above), the net SAP area and PRSP area would still exceed the PCAPCD significance thresholds of 55 lb/day for ROG and NO_x. During the summer ozone season, ROG and NO_x emissions are estimated to exceed PCAPCD thresholds by 1,003 lb/day and 2,687 lb/day, respectively (equivalent to 339.48 tons per year of combined ROG and NO_x emissions) for the net SAP area and by 536 lb/day and 683 lb/day, respectively (equivalent to 112.15 tons per year of combined ROG and NO_x emissions) for the PRSP area. To mitigate the net SAP area and PRSP area long-term operational criteria pollutant emissions, the County will require project proponents of development proposed under the project to participate in one of the following off-site mitigation programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Establish mitigation off-site within the west Placer County by participating in an off-site mitigation program, coordinated by PCAPCD. Examples include, but are not limited to: participation in a biomass program that provides emissions benefits; retrofitting, repowering, or replacing heavy-duty engines from mobile sources (e.g., buses, construction equipment, on road haulers); or other programs to reduce emissions. ▲ Participate in the District's Off-site Mitigation Fee Program by paying the equivalent amount of money, which is equal to the net SAP area's and PRSP area's contribution of pollutants (ROG and NO_x) that exceeds the 55 lb/day threshold for a one-year period. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▼ For the net SAP area, the total ROG and NO_x emission offset requirement is 339.5 tons. The estimated mitigation fee is \$6,378,829 (equivalent to \$0.86 per square foot for non-residential and \$295 per residential unit), based upon PCAPCD's adopted cost-effectiveness of \$18,790 per ton and current California Consumer Price Index rate. ▼ For the PRSP, the total combined ROG and NO_x emission offset requirement is 112.15 tons for a one-year period. The estimated mitigation fee is \$2,107,261, equivalent to \$295 per residential unit (based on a total of 7,146 units (PRSP: 5,636; University: 1,510)). Detailed calculations for the Off-Site Mitigation Fee Program can be found in Appendix K. ▲ Any combination of the above measures, as determined feasible by PCAPCD. <p>Mitigation Measure 4.3-3d: Reduce PM₁₀ emissions (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>The County will require project proponents of development proposed under the project to incorporate the following measures to reduce PM₁₀ emissions to the extent feasible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Wood-burning fireplaces and pellet appliances shall be prohibited in all residences. Only natural gas or propane-fired fireplace appliances would be permitted. These appliances shall be clearly delineated on the floor plans submitted in conjunction with the Building Permit 			

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable	
			<p>application. This measure is consistent with SAP Policy NR-5.10 that aims to reduce particulate matter emissions from wood-burning appliances within Placer County. Where natural gas is available, gas outlets shall be provided in residential backyards for use with outdoor cooking appliances such as gas barbecues.</p> <p>▲ Project proponents shall participate in an off-site mitigation project by paying the equivalent cost, equal to the net SAP area's and PRSP area's contribution of PM₁₀ emissions that exceeds the 82-lb/day threshold for a period of one year, coordinated through Placer County and in consultation with the PCAPCD. Emission reductions achieved through the off-site mitigation program must be real and quantifiable, as determined by the County, PCAPCD, or a consultant selected by the County. Examples of an offset program include but are not limited to: participation in a biomass program that provides emission benefits; retrofitting, repowering, or replacing heavy-duty engines from mobile sources (e.g., replacing residential woodstoves, buses, construction equipment, on-road haul trucks); or other programs to reduce PM₁₀ emissions.</p> <p>For the net SAP area, the total PM₁₀ emission offset requirement is 199.7 tons. At the time of preparation of this EIR, the estimated mitigation fee for the net SAP area is \$1,209,053.45 (equivalent to \$0.16 per square foot for nonresidential uses and \$77.51 per residential unit), based upon the current cost differential of \$40 per bone dry ton of biomass waste removal.</p> <p>For the PRSP, the total PM₁₀ emission offset requirement is 91.2 tons. At the time of preparation of this EIR, the estimated mitigation fee for the PRSP is \$553,852.76, equivalent to \$77.51 per dwelling unit (based on a total of 7,146 units (PRSP: 5,636; University: 1,510)), and upon the current cost differential of \$40 per bone dry ton of biomass waste removal. Detailed calculations for the Off-Site Mitigation Fee Program can be found in Appendix K.</p> <p>The actual amount to be paid shall be determined, based on the selected program and applicable cost effectiveness rate at the time of map recordation. This measure shall be satisfied prior to the recordation of each small lot map, or approval of the first building permit when a small lot map is not required.</p>	
<p>Impact 4.3-4: Mobile-source concentrations of carbon monoxide</p> <p>Though buildout of the project area would result in additional vehicle trips on the surrounding roadway network, these land uses would not result in increases in traffic congestion such that NAAQS and CAAQS for CO concentrations would be exceeded. Therefore, the project would not result in exposure of sensitive receptors to unhealthy levels of CO. This impact would be less than significant.</p>		LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
<p>Impact 4.3-5: Exposure of sensitive receptors to TACs</p> <p>Construction of new land uses under the project, the off-site transportation and utility improvements, and the development of new stationary sources of TACs subject to the permitting requirements of PCAPCD, would not result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to an incremental increase in cancer risk greater than 10 in 1 million or a hazard index greater than 1.0. However, the net SAP area could include the development of new residential land uses or other sensitive receptors within 500 feet of a freeway or high-volume roadway, which is the setback distance recommended by CARB. Further, the development of land uses under the project with truck loading near residences, schools, and child daycares could result in the exposure of these sensitive receptors to a level of cancer risk greater than 10 in 1 million. This impact would be significant.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.3-5a: Incorporation of design features at truck loading areas to reduce health-risk exposure at sensitive receptors (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>Before Design Review approval, project proponents shall design developments so that truck loading/unloading facilities and sensitive receptors are not located within 1,000 feet of each other, if feasible considering site design parameters. For the purpose of this mitigation measure, a truck loading/unloading facility is defined as any truck distribution yard, truck loading dock, or truck loading or unloading area where more than one truck with three or more axles will be present for more than 10 minutes per week, on average; and sensitive receptors include residential land uses, campus dormitories and student housing, residential care facilities, hospitals, schools, parks, playgrounds, or daycare facilities. A truck loading/unloading facility and a sensitive receptor can be located within 1,000 feet of each other only if a project proponent prepares a qualified, site-specific HRA showing that the associated level of cancer risk at the sensitive receptors would not exceed 10 in 1 million. The HRA shall be conducted in accordance with guidance from PCAPCD and shall be approved by PCAPCD. If the HRA determines that a nearby sensitive receptor would be exposed to an incremental increase in cancer risk greater than 10 in 1 million then design measures shall be incorporated to reduce the level of risk exposure to less than 10 in 1 million. Design measures may include but are not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Implement Mitigation Measure 4.3-3a, which requires all truck loading/unloading facilities to be equipped with one 110/208-volt power outlet for every two-truck loading/unloading facility. A minimum 2-foot-by-3-foot sign shall be clearly visible at each loading dock that indicates, "Diesel engine idling limited to a maximum of 5 minutes." The sign shall include instructions for diesel trucks idling for more than 5 minutes to connect to the 110/208-volt power to run any auxiliary equipment. This measure is recommended in PCAPCD's <i>CEQA Handbook</i> (PCAPCD 2017a) and is also consistent with measure VT-1 in the CAPCOA guide (CAPCOA 2010:300-303). ▲ The use of electric-powered "yard trucks" or fork lifts to move truck trailers around a truck yard or truck loading/unloading facility. ▲ The use of buildings or walls to shield commercial activity from nearby residences or other sensitive land uses. ▲ The use of EPA-rated Tier 4 Final engines in diesel-fueled construction equipment when construction activities are adjacent to existing sensitive receptors. ▲ Plant and maintain a vegetative buffer between the truck loading/unloading facility and nearby sensitive residences, schools, and daycare facilities. As part of detailed site design, a 	<p>SU</p>	

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
			<p>landscape architect licensed by the California Landscape Architects Technical Committee shall identify all locations where trees should be located, accounting for areas where shade is desired such as along pedestrian and bicycle routes, the locations of solar photovoltaic panels, and other infrastructure.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.3-5b: Setback requirements for residential units near freeways (Net SAP Area)</p> <p>Before approval of tentative subdivision maps, project proponents shall demonstrate that residential developments are located at least 500 feet from any freeway or urban road with traffic volumes that exceed 100,000 vehicles per day, as recommended by CARB, if feasible, considering site design parameters. New residences can be located within 500 feet of a new or existing freeway or urban road with traffic volumes that exceed 100,000 vehicles per day only if a project proponent prepares a qualified, site-specific HRA, approved by Placer County, showing that the associated level of cancer risk at the new residences would not exceed 10 in 1 million. The HRA shall be conducted in accordance with guidance from PCAPCD and approved by PCAPCD. If the HRA determines that a nearby sensitive receptor would be exposed to an incremental increase in cancer risk greater than 10 in 1 million then design measures shall be incorporated to reduce the level of risk exposure to less than 10 in 1 million. Design mitigation measures may include, but are not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ install high-efficiency indoor air filters to filter particulates and other chemical matter from entering residences; ▲ plant and maintain vegetative barriers between new residences and SR 65; ▲ orient residential buildings away from SR 65; and ▲ design windows in residences to reduce PM exposure (e.g., windows nearest to the freeway do not open). 	
<p>Impact 4.3-6: Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people</p> <p>The project would generate waste that would be received, processed, and disposed of at WRSL, thereby contributing to sources of landfill odor over time. Aside from this, the project would not create objectionable odors, as described further herein, but it would establish residential and other land uses that would bring people closer to an existing odor source. With regard to creation of odors, implementing the land uses proposed in the SAP, including the PRSP, would involve construction of new facilities over the period of the planning horizon and beyond. Some new facilities, such as</p>		S	No feasible mitigation available to Placer County.	SU

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
<p>industrial uses, restaurants, breweries, and coffee roasters, may generate odors in commercial and industrial areas following buildout. Construction activities and the odors they generate would be temporary and intermittent. New odor sources would be subject to PCAPCD's Rule 205, which regulates nuisances from odors. Because of the broad geography and long time frame to which the SAP applies, particularly in the net SAP area, it is not possible to predict the odor impacts of specific, future projects that may be proposed. However, because sufficient regulations and policies are in place, and because future proposals will be subject to project-specific environmental review, analysis, and mitigation, there is no evidence to suggest that implementation of the SAP or PRSP would create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.</p> <p>The proposed project includes an amendment to County General Plan Policy 4.G.11, which reduces the 1-mile (5,280-foot) buffer for residential uses around the WRS� to 2,000 feet and if approved with a specific plan the buffer could be further reduced to 1,000 feet. Therefore, this General Plan amendment could result in development of residential uses within 1 mile of the WRS� in currently undeveloped areas. Based on review of existing data regarding nuisance complaints from residents beyond 1 mile, and on modeling and analysis of post-project landfill odor, it is expected new residents and users within the project area would be exposed to objectionable odors, would complain about such odors from WRS� operations, and that the overall number of complaints lodged about nuisance odors would increase. WPWMA is in the process of developing a Waste Action Plan to address regional growth, regulatory changes, and other operational objectives, including odor control. However, because odor impacts are subjective and there are no quantifiable thresholds of significance, and specific odor-control measures (and their effectiveness) to be implemented by WPWMA are unknown at this time, odor impacts resulting from implementation of the project would be significant and unavoidable.</p>				
Cumulative Impact 4.3-7: Construction emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors	SU	No mitigation is available.	SU	
Cumulative Impact 4.3-8: Long-term operational emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors	SU	No mitigation is available.	SU	
Cumulative Impact 4.3-9: Mobile-source CO concentrations	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS	

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
Cumulative Impact 4.3-10: Exposure of sensitive receptors to TACs	SU	No mitigation is available.	SU	
Cumulative Impact 4.3-11: Exposure of sensitive receptors to odors	SU	No mitigation is available.	SU	
4.4 Biological Resources				
<p>Impact 4.4-1: Loss and degradation of state or federally protected waters</p> <p>Implementation of the project would result in the removal or fill of jurisdictional waters of the United States, including wetlands subject to USACE jurisdiction under the federal Clean Water Act and waters of the state. This impact would be significant.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.4-1a: Compensate for loss of aquatic resources (Net SAP and PRSP)</p> <p>Consistent with proposed SAP Policy NR-1.2, Stream System Protection, the County shall require the protection and enhancement of the Stream System and other areas capable of meeting the PCCP Reserve Acquisition and avoidance criteria (e.g. Stream System, avoided areas 200 acres or greater, habitat and wetlands adjacent or connected to the Stream System or existing/future Reserves, Valley Oak Woodlands one acre or greater). Consistent with proposed SAP Program NR-4, PCCP and CARP Program Consistency, the County shall require project applicants to delineate all aquatic resources, implement all feasible avoidance and minimization measures described in the PCCP and CARP, calculate the extent of impacts, and provide compensatory mitigation according to the procedures described in the adopted PCCP and CARP, through payment of applicable mitigation fees to the In-Lieu Fee Program or purchase of mitigation credits at an agency-approved mitigation bank. If adopted, the PCCP may allow for consideration of land dedication in-lieu of PCCP fees, subject to approval by the future Placer Conservation Authority (PCA) and concurrence by the state and federal agencies. The fees collected through the In-Lieu Fee Program shall be used to fund land acquisition, mitigation projects that protect, enhance, and restore aquatic resources, and long-term management and monitoring within the PCCP Reserve Acquisition Areas.</p> <p>If the PCCP, including the Western Placer CARP and associated USACE programmatic permits are not adopted, or are not available as a permitting and mitigation strategy for future projects, compensation for loss of aquatic resources shall be implemented as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As a condition of project approval, the County shall require project proponents to conduct a delineation of waters of the United States according to methods established in the USACE wetlands delineation manual (Environmental Laboratory 1987) and Arid West Supplement (Environmental Laboratory 2008) and to delineate any aquatic resources that may not meet the definition of waters of the United States, but would qualify as waters of the state. The delineation shall map and quantify the acreage of all aquatic resources on the project site and associated off-site improvement areas and shall be submitted to USACE for jurisdictional determination. This requirement applies to project sites for which a current delineation and subsequent verification and concurrence by USACE have not been completed. 	SU	

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures		Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ A permit from the USACE will be required for any activity resulting in fill of wetlands and other waters of the United States. Project proponents shall be required to obtain this permit before project initiation. A wetland mitigation plan that satisfies USACE requirements will be needed as part of the permit application. Project proponents that obtain a Section 404 permit will also be required to obtain water quality certification from the Central Valley RWQCB pursuant to Section 401 of the CWA. ▲ The project proponent for each future project requiring fill of aquatic resources shall replace or restore on a “no-net-loss” basis the function of all wetlands and other waters that would be removed as a result of implementing the respective project. Wetland habitat will be restored or replaced at an acreage and location and by methods agreeable to USACE and the Central Valley RWQCB, depending on agency jurisdiction, and as determined during the Section 401 and Section 404 permitting processes. ▲ The project proponent shall submit a compensatory mitigation and monitoring plan (MMP) to USACE and the Central Valley RWQCB, for review and approval before USACE making a permit decision for the proposed action. The MMP shall be consistent with the Final 2015 Regional Compensatory Mitigation and Monitoring Guidelines for South Pacific Division USACE, or most current guidelines, and shall identify the amount and type of proposed compensatory mitigation to ensure “no net loss” of aquatic resource functions and services that would be removed, lost, and/or substantially degraded as a result of implementing the project. The MMP will describe compensation ratios for acres filled, mitigation sites and work plan, maintenance plan and long-term management plan, a monitoring protocol, annual performance standards and final success criteria for created or restored habitats, corrective measures to be applied if performance standards are not met, legal protection for the preservation and mitigation areas (e.g., conservation easement, declaration of restrictions), and funding mechanism information (e.g., endowment). ▲ Mitigation methods may consist of establishment by a qualified biologist of aquatic resources in upland habitats where they did not exist previously, reestablishment (restoration) of natural historic functions to a former aquatic resource, enhancement of an existing aquatic resource to heighten, intensify, or improve aquatic resource functions, or a combination thereof. The compensatory mitigation may be accomplished through purchase of credits from a USACE-approved mitigation bank, payment into a USACE-approved in-lieu fee fund, or through permittee-responsible on-site or off-site establishment, reestablishment, or enhancement, depending on availability of mitigation credits. To the extent practicable, mitigation shall be carried out within the affected watershed. ▲ Permittee-responsible mitigation habitat shall be monitored by a qualified biologist for a 		

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
			<p>minimum of 5 years from completion of mitigation, or human intervention (including recontouring and grading), or until the success criteria identified in the approved MMP have been met, whichever is longer.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.4-1b. Coordinate with City of Roseville regarding mitigation for loss of aquatic resources resulting from off-site improvements outside the County's jurisdictional boundaries (Other Supporting Infrastructure)</p> <p>The County shall coordinate with the City of Roseville regarding mitigation for loss of aquatic resources resulting from construction of the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility and other off-site improvements within the City's jurisdiction. As a part of its CEQA process for each improvement project, the City of Roseville, as lead agency, would identify and implement appropriate mitigation for significant impacts to aquatic resources. The City would also obtain permits pursuant to Sections 404 and 401 of the Clean Water Act for fill of waters of the United States, including wetlands. As part of the permitting process, the City would identify and implement mitigation resulting in no net loss of wetland functions and values. Placer County would play a coordinating role but would have no control over the timing and implementation of mitigation for off-site improvements that occur within the City of Roseville.</p>	
<p>Impact 4.4-2: Loss of special-status plants</p> <p>Implementing the project would result in direct removal of wetland habitat known to support dwarf downingia, a California species of special concern, and potential habitat for other special-status plant species. Other special-status plant species could be present in suitable habitat in the project area and could be lost through habitat removal or modification. This impact would be significant.</p>		S	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.4-2: Coordinate with City of Roseville regarding mitigation for impacts on special-status plant species resulting from off-site improvements outside the County's jurisdictional boundaries (Other Supporting Infrastructure)</p> <p>The County shall coordinate with the City of Roseville regarding mitigation for loss of special-status plants resulting from construction of the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility and off-site transportation and utility improvements within the City's jurisdiction. As a part of its CEQA process for each improvement project, the City of Roseville, as lead agency, would identify and implement appropriate mitigation for significant impacts on special-status plants. Placer County would play a coordinating role but would have no control over the timing and implementation of mitigation for off-site improvements that occur within the City of Roseville.</p>	SU
<p>Impact 4.4-3: Loss of federally listed vernal pool branchiopods and western spadefoot</p> <p>Implementing the project would result in loss and degradation of habitat for special-status wildlife species that rely on vernal pool type wetlands for at least a portion of their life cycle. These three species are federally listed vernal pool fairy shrimp and vernal pool tadpole shrimp, and species of special concern, western spadefoot.</p>		S	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.4-3a: Minimize take of western spadefoot (Net SAP and PRSP)</p> <p>As a condition of project approval and before ground disturbing activities, the County shall require future project proponents to retain a qualified biologist to determine if the project site contains suitable habitat for western spadefoot and if so, conduct surveys for western spadefoot in areas of potential habitat that would be eliminated by the project. The surveys shall be conducted at the appropriate time of year to detect western spadefoot, generally the breeding</p>	SU

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures			Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable		
<p>Incidental take of these special-status wildlife species would also result. This impact would be significant.</p>			<p>season, according to methods approved by CDFW. If western spadefoot is found in habitat that will be eliminated or made unsuitable for western spadefoot, then a plan to collect and relocate adult and larval western spadefoot and egg masses to suitable habitat that will be preserved in perpetuity as required by Mitigation Measure 4.4-3b below.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.4-3b: Compensate for take of federally listed vernal pool invertebrates and western spadefoot habitat loss (Net SAP and PRSP)</p> <p>Loss of vernal pool habitat and other seasonal wetland habitats that support or potentially support Federally listed vernal pool invertebrates shall be replaced or restored in such a manner that there will be no net loss of habitat (acreage and function) for vernal pool invertebrates and western spadefoot following project implementation. As described under Mitigation Measure 4.4-1a, project proponents shall complete and implement a compensatory habitat MMP describing how loss of vernal pool and other wetland habitats shall be offset, including details for creating habitat; accounting for the temporal loss of habitat, performance standards to ensure success, and remedial actions to be implemented if performance standards are not met. All measures shall meet the approval of Placer County, USACE, and USFWS.</p> <p>No project construction shall proceed in areas supporting potential habitat for Federally listed vernal pool invertebrates, or within adequate buffer areas (250 feet or lesser distance deemed sufficiently protective by a qualified biologist with approval from USFWS), until a biological opinion (BO) and incidental take authorization has been issued by USFWS and the project proponent has abided by conditions in the BO, including all conservation and minimization measures. Conservation and minimization measures shall include preparation of supporting documentation describing methods to protect existing vernal pools during and after project construction, a detailed monitoring plan, and reporting requirements.</p> <p>Western spadefoot also requires the protection of vernal pool habitat for survival; therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.4-3a and 4.4-3b would also reduce impacts to western spadefoot. Mitigation shall include preservation of in-kind wetland habitats within the Western Placer County core area at ratios satisfactory to ensure no net loss of habitat acreage, function, and value within the core area. To count toward preservation credits, vernal pool habitats within the open space areas shall be placed under a permanent conservation easement.</p> <p>Habitat to be protected includes both occupied and unoccupied suitable habitat that serves as corridors for dispersal, opportunities for metapopulation dynamics, reintroduction/introduction sites, and protection of undiscovered populations. Mitigation may include a combination of on-</p>			

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
			<p>site and off-site preservation, as well as on-site or off-site wetland restoration and creation, purchase of credits at a mitigation bank approved by USFWS and USACE, or in-lieu fee mitigation.</p> <p>The project proponents shall preserve acreage of vernal pool habitat for each wetted acre of any indirectly affected vernal pool habitat at a ratio approved by USFWS at the conclusion of the Section 7 consultation. This mitigation shall occur before the approval of any grading or improvement plans for any project or phase that would allow work within 250 feet of such habitat, and before any ground-disturbing activity within 250 feet of the habitat. The project proponents will not be required to complete this mitigation measure for direct or indirect impacts that have already been mitigated to the satisfaction of USFWS through another BO or MMP, such as a BO obtained for the Placer Parkway or for Pleasant Grove Retention Facility.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.4-3c: Coordinate with City of Roseville regarding mitigation for vernal pool fairy shrimp, vernal pool tadpole shrimp and western spadefoot impacts resulting from off-site improvements outside the County's jurisdictional boundaries (Other Supporting Infrastructure)</p> <p>The County shall coordinate with the City of Roseville regarding mitigation for impacts on vernal pool branchiopods and western spadefoot from construction of the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility and other off-site improvements within the City's jurisdiction. As a part of its CEQA process for each improvement project, the City of Roseville, as lead agency, would identify and implement appropriate mitigation for significant impacts to vernal pool branchiopods and western spadefoot. Likewise, as a condition of project approval, the City of Roseville or applicant for off-site improvements would be required to obtain permits from USACE for fill of wetlands, which would trigger consultation with USFWS for species listed under the Endangered Species Act, including vernal pool fairy shrimp and vernal pool tadpole shrimp. Through the consultation process, measures to avoid, minimize, or compensate for impacts to listed species would be required. Placer County would play a coordinating role but would have no control over the timing and implementation of mitigation for off-site improvements within the City of Roseville, nor would it have authority to enforce consultation with USFWS or permit compliance for off-site improvements that occur outside its own jurisdiction.</p>	
Impact 4.4-4: Loss of valley elderberry longhorn beetle		PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.4-4a: Avoid or compensate for valley elderberry longhorn beetle habitat (Net SAP and PRSP)</p> <p>▲ Valley elderberry longhorn beetle is proposed as a covered species under the PCCP. If the PCCP has been adopted before implementation of the net SAP and PRSP, potential impacts to this species shall be mitigated through implementation of the PCCP conservation strategy.</p>	SU
Implementing the project could result in loss of elderberry shrubs, the host plant for the federally endangered valley elderberry longhorn beetle, and could result in take of this species. This impact is potentially significant.				

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures			Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable		
			<p>The PCCP conservation strategy includes survey and impact minimization/avoidance requirements for covered species, other conditions on covered activities to achieve conservation goals and objectives for covered species and natural communities, establishment of a habitat reserve system, and long-term conservation and management of habitats in the reserve system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ If the PCCP has not been adopted before implementation of the net SAP and PRSP, project proponents under the PRSP and Net SAP shall be required to implement the following measures to mitigate potential impacts on valley elderberry longhorn beetle: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ As a condition of approval, a qualified biologist shall determine whether future project sites contain valley elderberry longhorn beetle habitat (i.e., elderberry shrubs). If so, a preconstruction survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist in all riverine/riparian habitat within 165 feet of project disturbance areas before any construction activity. The surveys shall be conducted according to the protocol outlined in <i>USFWS Framework for Assessing Impacts to the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle</i> (USFWS 2017c) (Framework). ▶ If elderberry shrubs are not present, no further mitigation is necessary. ▶ If elderberry shrubs are located 165 feet or more from project activities, direct or indirect impacts are not expected. Shrubs shall be protected during construction by establishing and maintaining a high visibility fence at least 165 feet from the drip line of each elderberry shrub. ▶ If elderberry shrubs can be retained within the project footprint, project activities may occur up to 20 feet from the dripline of elderberry shrubs if precautions are implemented to minimize the potential for indirect impacts. An avoidance area shall be established at least 20 feet from the drip line of an elderberry shrub for any activities that may damage the elderberry shrub (e.g., trenching, paving, etc.). The project proponent will implement avoidance and minimization measures specified in the <i>USFWS Framework for Assessing Impacts to the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle</i> (USFWS 2017c). ▶ As much as feasible, all activities that could occur within 165 feet of an elderberry shrub, shall be conducted outside of the flight season of the valley elderberry longhorn beetle (March - July). ▶ Herbicides shall not be used within the drip line of the shrub. Insecticides shall not be used within 100 feet of an elderberry shrub. All chemicals shall be applied using a backpack sprayer or similar direct application method. ▶ Mechanical weed removal within the drip-line of the shrub shall be limited to the season 			

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures		Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable	
				<p>when adults are not active (August - February) and shall avoid damaging the elderberry.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ If any elderberry shrubs cannot be avoided according to the USFWS 2017 Framework, the project proponent shall compensate for the loss of valley elderberry longhorn beetle habitat through participation in the PCCP, if it has been adopted and is available for project participation. ➤ If trimming elderberry shrubs is proposed, trimming shall be conducted between November and February and shall not result in the removal of elderberry branches that are ≥1 inch in diameter. If trimming results in removing branches that are ≥1 inch in diameter, the project proponent shall mitigate for the loss of the valley elderberry beetle habitat through participation in the PCCP, if adopted, or according to the USFWS 2017 Framework if the PCCP has not been adopted. ➤ The project proponent shall comply with ESA and consult with USFWS and will compensate for the unavoidable loss of elderberry shrubs according to USFWS 2017 Framework. The Framework uses presence or absence of exit holes, and whether the affected elderberry shrubs are in riparian habitat to determine the number of elderberry seedlings or cuttings and associated riparian vegetation that would need to be planted as compensatory mitigation for affected valley elderberry longhorn beetle habitat. Compensatory mitigation may include purchasing credits at a USFWS-approved conservation bank, providing on-site mitigation, or establishing and protecting habitat for valley elderberry longhorn beetle as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ For elderberry shrubs in riparian habitat: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – For each shrub that is trimmed, the project proponent shall purchase two credits at a USFWS-approved bank. – For each shrub that is removed, the entire shrub may be transplanted to a USFWS-approved location in addition to the purchase of two credits. ▪ For elderberry shrubs in non-riparian habitat: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The project proponent shall purchase one credit at a USFWS-approved bank for each shrub that will be trimmed if exit holes have been found in any shrub on or within 165 feet of the project area. – If no exit holes are present and the shrub is not in riparian habitat, no further action is required. – If the shrub will be completely removed by the activity, the entire shrub shall be transplanted to a USFWS-approved location in addition to a purchase of one credit. 	

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable	
		<p>Mitigation Measure 4.4-4b: Coordinate with City of Roseville regarding mitigation for impacts on valley elderberry longhorn beetle resulting from off-site improvements outside the County's jurisdictional boundaries (Other Supporting Infrastructure)</p> <p>The County shall coordinate with the City of Roseville regarding mitigation for impacts on valley elderberry longhorn beetle from construction of the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility and other off-site improvements within the City's jurisdiction. As a part of its CEQA process for each improvement project, the City of Roseville, as lead agency, would identify and implement appropriate mitigation for significant impacts on valley elderberry longhorn beetle. Likewise, as a condition of project approval, the City of Roseville or applicant for off-site improvements would be required to obtain take authorization from USFWS for species listed under the Endangered Species Act, including valley elderberry longhorn beetle. Through the consultation process, measures to avoid, minimize, or compensate for impacts to valley elderberry longhorn beetle would be required. Placer County would play a coordinating role but would have no control over the timing and implementation of mitigation for off-site improvements within the City of Roseville, nor would it have authority to enforce consultation with USFWS or permit compliance for off-site improvements that occur outside its own jurisdiction.</p>	
<p>Impact 4.4-5: Disturbance or loss of special-status reptile, bird, mammal, and fish species</p> <p>Development projects and land uses implemented under the project would result in direct removal or disturbance of habitat known to support burrowing owl, loggerhead shrike, white-tailed kite, and northern harrier. Other special-status species could be present in suitable habitat in the project area and could be disturbed or lost through habitat removal or modification, including western pond turtle, Swainson's hawk, tricolored blackbird, song sparrow, grasshopper sparrow, pallid bat, Townsend's big-eared bat, and American badger. Future development and construction activities such as ground disturbance and vegetation removal, as well as overall conversion of habitat to urban and commercial uses, could result in the disturbance or loss of individuals and reduced breeding productivity of these species. Special-status reptile, bird, and mammal species are protected under ESA, CESA, California Fish and Game Code, CEQA, or other regulations. The loss of special-status wildlife species and their habitats would be a potentially significant impact.</p> <p>No special-status fish species are known or expected to occur in the project area. However, Orchard Creek and Pleasant Grove Creek are hydrologically connected to</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.4-5a: Minimize and avoid disturbances to western pond turtle, burrowing owl, Swainson's hawk, and tricolored blackbird; compensate for loss of occupied habitats (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Western pond turtle, burrowing owl, Swainson's hawk, and tricolored blackbird are proposed as covered species under the PCCP. If the PCCP has been adopted before implementation of the SAP and PRSP, potential impacts to these covered species shall be mitigated through implementation of the PCCP conservation strategy. The PCCP conservation strategy includes survey and impact minimization/avoidance requirements for covered species, other conditions on covered activities to achieve conservation goals and objectives for covered species and natural communities, establishment of a habitat reserve system, and long-term conservation and management of habitats in the reserve system. ▲ If the PCCP has not been adopted before implementation of the SAP and PRSP, the following measures shall be implemented for potential impacts to western pond turtle, burrowing owl, Swainson's hawk, and tricolored blackbird. <p>Western Pond Turtle</p> <p>Before ground disturbing activities, project proponents shall retain a qualified biologist to determine whether the potential project site contains suitable habitat for western pond turtle.</p>	SU

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
<p>streams occupied by Central Valley steelhead and Chinook salmon, and designated as critical habitat for Central Valley steelhead, outside the project area. Therefore, construction and operation of land uses proposed under the project that may affect in-stream water quality and habitat could potentially result in indirect effects on steelhead and Chinook salmon habitat downstream of the project area. However, future projects and land uses would be required to comply with CVRWQCB, Placer County, and proposed SAP regulations and permit conditions, and would implement LID measures and stormwater BMPs to protect downstream water quality and fish habitat. Therefore, potential indirect effects of project implementation on special-status fish habitat outside the project area would be less than significant.</p>		<p>For projects or ground-disturbing activities (including any required off-site improvements) with potential to disturb suitable aquatic or adjacent upland habitat for western pond turtle, the following measures shall be implemented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Within 24 hours before beginning construction activities within 200 feet of suitable aquatic habitat for western pond turtle, a qualified biologist shall survey areas of anticipated disturbance for the presence of western pond turtle. The construction area shall be re-inspected whenever a lapse in construction activity of two weeks or more has occurred. If pond turtles are found during the survey or observed within the construction area at any other time, they shall be relocated by a qualified biologist to the nearest area with suitable aquatic habitat outside of the area of disturbance and CDFW will be notified. <p><u>Burrowing Owl</u></p> <p>Before ground disturbing activities, project proponents shall retain a qualified biologist to determine whether the project site could affect suitable habitat for burrowing owl. For projects or ground-disturbing activities with potential to disturb suitable habitat for burrowing owl, the following measures shall be implemented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ The project proponent shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct focused breeding and nonbreeding season surveys for burrowing owls in areas of suitable habitat on and within 1,500 feet of the project site and any required off-site improvements. Surveys shall be conducted before the start of construction activities and in accordance with Appendix D of CDFW's <i>Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation</i> (CDFG 2012) or the most recent CDFW protocols. ▲ If no occupied burrows are found, a letter report documenting the survey methods and results shall be submitted to CDFW and no further mitigation will be required. ▲ If an active burrow is found during the nonbreeding season (September 1 through January 31), the project proponent shall consult with CDFW regarding protection buffers to be established around the occupied burrow and maintained throughout construction. If occupied burrows are present that cannot be avoided or adequately protected with a no-disturbance buffer, a burrowing owl exclusion plan shall be developed, as described in Appendix E of CDFW's 2012 Staff Report. Burrowing owls shall not be excluded from occupied burrows until the project's burrowing owl exclusion plan is approved by CDFW. The exclusion plan shall include a plan for creation, maintenance, and monitoring of artificial burrows in suitable habitat proximate to the burrows to be destroyed, that provide substitute burrows for displaced owls. ▲ If an active burrow is found during the breeding season (February 1 through August 31), 		

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures		Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable	
			<p>occupied burrows shall not be disturbed and will be provided with a 150- to 1,500-foot protective buffer unless a qualified biologist verifies through noninvasive means that either: (1) the birds have not begun egg laying, or (2) juveniles from the occupied burrows are foraging independently and are capable of independent survival. The size of the buffer shall depend on the time of year and level disturbance as outlined in the CDFW Staff Report (CDFG 2012) or the most recent CDFW protocols. The size of the buffer may be reduced if a broad-scale, long-term, monitoring program acceptable to CDFW is implemented to ensure burrowing owls are not detrimentally affected. Once the fledglings are capable of independent survival, the owls can be evicted and the burrow can be destroyed per the terms of a CDFW-approved burrowing owl exclusion plan developed in accordance with Appendix E of CDFW's 2012 Staff Report or the most recent CDFW protocols.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ If active burrowing owl nests are found on the site and are destroyed by project implementation, the project proponent shall mitigate the loss of occupied habitat in accordance with guidance provided in the CDFW 2012 Staff Report or the most recent CDFW protocols, which states that permanent impacts to nesting, occupied and satellite burrows, and burrowing owl habitat shall be mitigated such that habitat acreage, number of burrows, and burrowing owls impacted are replaced through permanent conservation of comparable or better habitat with similar vegetation communities and burrowing mammals (e.g., ground squirrels) present to provide for nesting, foraging, wintering, and dispersal. The project proponent shall retain a qualified biologist to develop a burrowing owl mitigation and management plan that incorporates the following goals and standards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ► Mitigation lands shall be selected based on comparison of the habitat lost to the compensatory habitat, including type and structure of habitat, disturbance levels, potential for conflicts with humans, pets, and other wildlife, density of burrowing owls, and relative importance of the habitat to the species range wide. ► If feasible, mitigation lands shall be provided adjacent or proximate to the site so that displaced owls can relocate with reduced risk of take. Feasibility of providing mitigation adjacent or proximate to the project site depends on availability of sufficient suitable habitat to support displaced owls that may be preserved in perpetuity. ► If suitable habitat is not available for conservation adjacent or proximate to the project site, mitigation lands shall be focused on consolidating and enlarging conservation areas outside of urban and planned growth areas and within foraging distance of other conservation lands. Mitigation may be accomplished through purchase of mitigation credits at a CDFW-approved mitigation bank, if available. If mitigation credits are not available from an approved bank and mitigation lands are not available adjacent to other 		

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures		Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable	
			<p>conservation lands, alternative mitigation sites and acreage shall be determined in consultation with CDFW.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If mitigation is not available through an approved mitigation bank and will be completed through permittee-responsible conservation lands, the mitigation plan shall include mitigation objectives, site selection factors, site management roles and responsibilities, vegetation management goals, financial assurances and funding mechanisms, performance standards and success criteria, monitoring and reporting protocols, and adaptive management measures. Success shall be based on the number of adult burrowing owls and pairs using the site and if the numbers are maintained over time. Measures of success, as suggested in the 2012 Staff Report, shall include site tenacity, number of adult owls present and reproducing, colonization by burrowing owls from elsewhere, changes in distribution, and trends in stressors. <p>Swainson's Hawk</p> <p>Project proponents shall retain a qualified biologist to determine whether the potential project site contains suitable habitat for Swainson's hawk. For projects or ground-disturbing activities (including any required off-site improvements) with potential to affect Swainson's hawk and other raptor nests, or remove Swainson's hawk foraging habitat, the project proponent shall consult with CDFW with respect to the following measures proposed to mitigate for habitat removal and potential nest disturbance. As part of the consultation, the project proponent may seek take authorization under Section 2081 of the Fish and Game Code. The following measures will be implemented and are intended to avoid, minimize, and fully mitigate impacts to Swainson's hawk, as well as other raptors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For construction activities that would occur within 0.25 mile of a known or likely Swainson's hawk nest site (identified based on previous years' use by Swainson's hawk), the project proponent shall attempt to initiate construction activities before nest initiation phase (i.e., before March 1). Depending on the timing, regularity, and intensity of construction activity, construction in the area before nest initiation may discourage a Swainson's hawk pair from using that site and eliminate the need to implement further nest-protection measures, such as buffers and limited construction operating periods around active nests. Other measures to deter establishment of nests (e.g., reflective striping or decoys) may be used before the breeding season in areas planned for active construction. However, if breeding raptors establish an active nest site, as evidenced by nest building, egg laying, incubation, or other nesting behavior, near the construction area, they shall not be harassed or deterred from continuing with their normal breeding activities. 		

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures		Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ For project activities, including tree removal, that begin between March 1 and September 15, qualified biologists shall conduct preconstruction surveys for Swainson’s hawk and other nesting raptors and to identify active nests on and within 0.5 mile of the project site. The surveys shall be conducted before the beginning of any construction activities between March 1 and September 15, following the Recommended Timing and Methodology for Swainson’s Hawk Nesting Surveys in California’s Central Valley (Swainson’s Hawk Technical Advisory Committee 2000). ▲ Impacts to nesting Swainson’s hawks and other raptors shall be avoided by establishing appropriate buffers around active nest sites identified during preconstruction raptor surveys. Project activity shall not commence within the buffer areas until a qualified biologist has determined, in coordination with CDFW, that the young have fledged, the nest is no longer active, or reducing the buffer would not likely result in nest abandonment. CDFW guidelines recommend implementation of 0.25-mile-wide buffer for Swainson’s hawk and 500-feet for other raptors, but the size of the buffer may be adjusted if a qualified biologist and the project proponent, in consultation with CDFW, determine that such an adjustment would not be likely to adversely affect the nest. Monitoring of the nest by a qualified biologist during and after construction activities shall be required if the activity has potential to adversely affect the nest. ▲ Trees shall not be removed during the breeding season for nesting raptors unless a survey by a qualified biologist verifies that there is not an active nest in the tree. ▲ To mitigate for permanent losses of Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat, the project proponent will provide foraging habitat compensation at a 1:1 ratio (i.e., one acre of compensatory habitat for each acre developed). This compensation may be achieved through one or more approaches, including providing replacement habitat through fee title or conservation easement, or purchase of credits in a CDFW-approved Swainson’s hawk conservation bank. <p>Tricolored Blackbird</p> <p>Project proponents shall retain a qualified biologist to determine whether suitable habitat for tricolored blackbird is present on or within 500 feet of the project site. For projects or ground-disturbing activities that could affect tricolored blackbird nesting habitat, the following measures shall be implemented to avoid or minimize loss of active tricolored blackbird nests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ To minimize the potential for loss of tricolored blackbird nesting colonies and other nesting birds, vegetation removal activities shall commence during the nonbreeding season (September 1-January 31) to the extent feasible. If all suitable nesting habitat is removed during the nonbreeding season, no further mitigation would be required. 		

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures			Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable		
			<p>▲ Before removal of any vegetation within potential nesting habitat between February 1 and August 31, a qualified biologist shall conduct preconstruction surveys for nesting tricolored blackbirds (colonies). The surveys shall be conducted no more than 14 days before construction commences. If no active nests or tricolored blackbird colonies are found during focused surveys, no further action under this measure will be required. If active nests are located during the preconstruction surveys, the biologist shall notify CDFW. If necessary, modifications to the project design to avoid removal of occupied habitat while still achieving project objectives shall be evaluated, and implemented to the extent feasible. If avoidance is not feasible or conflicts with project objectives, construction shall be prohibited within a minimum of 100 feet of the nest to avoid disturbance until the nest colony is no longer active. These recommended buffer areas may be reduced or expanded through consultation with CDFW. Monitoring of all occupied nests shall be conducted by a qualified biologist during construction activities to adjust the 100-foot buffer if agitated behavior by the nesting bird is observed.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.4-5b: Protect northern harrier, white-tailed kite, and other nesting raptor nests (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>For projects or ground-disturbing activities (including any required off-site improvements) with potential to affect northern harrier, white-tailed kite, or other raptor nests (i.e., activities proposed to occur in or within 500 feet of suitable habitat), the project proponent shall implement the following preconstruction survey and nest avoidance measures.</p> <p>▲ For project activities, including tree and other vegetation removal, that begin between February 1 and September 15, qualified biologists shall conduct preconstruction surveys for white-tailed kite and northern harrier and to identify active nests on and within 500 feet of the project site. The surveys shall be conducted before the beginning of any construction activities between February 1 and September 15.</p> <p>▲ Impacts to nesting raptors shall be avoided by establishing appropriate buffers around active nest sites identified during preconstruction raptor surveys. Project activity shall not commence within the buffer areas until a qualified biologist has determined, in coordination with CDFW, that the young have fledged, the nest is no longer active, or reducing the buffer would not likely result in nest abandonment. CDFW guidelines recommend implementation of a 500-foot-wide buffer for these raptor species, but the size of the buffer may be adjusted if a qualified biologist and the project proponent, in consultation with CDFW, determine that such an adjustment would not be likely to adversely affect the nest. Monitoring of the nest by a qualified biologist during and after construction activities shall be required if the activity has potential to adversely affect the nest.</p>			

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures			Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable		
			<p>▲ Trees shall not be removed during the breeding season for nesting raptors unless a survey by a qualified biologist verifies that there is not an active nest in the tree. Similarly, because northern harrier is a ground nester, ground disturbances within suitable nesting habitat for northern harrier shall not commence unless a survey verifies that an active nest is not present.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.4-5c: Protect loggerhead shrike, song sparrow, and grasshopper sparrow nests (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>Before any ground-disturbing project activities begin, a qualified biologist will identify potential habitat for nesting loggerhead shrike, song sparrow, grasshopper sparrow, and other special-status bird species in areas that could be affected during the breeding season (February 1–August 31) by construction. To the extent feasible, construction-related vegetation removal shall occur outside the nesting season. If vegetation removal or other disturbance related to construction is required during the nesting season, focused surveys for active nests of special-status birds will be conducted before and within 14 days of initiating construction. A qualified biologist will conduct preconstruction surveys to identify active nests that could be affected. The appropriate area to be surveyed and timing of the survey may vary depending on the activity and species that could be affected. If no active nests are found during focused surveys, no further action under this measure will be required. If an active loggerhead shrike, song sparrow, grasshopper sparrow, or other special-status bird nest is located during the preconstruction surveys, the biologist will notify CDFW. If necessary, modifications to the project design to avoid removal of occupied habitat while still achieving project objectives will be evaluated and implemented to the extent feasible. If avoidance is not feasible, construction will be prohibited within a minimum of 100 feet of the nest to avoid disturbance until the nest is no longer active. These recommended buffer areas may be reduced or expanded through consultation with CDFW. Monitoring of all occupied nests shall be conducted by a qualified biologist during construction activities to adjust the 100-foot buffer if agitated behavior by the nesting bird is observed.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.4-5d: Minimize disturbance and loss of bat roost sites (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>Bat surveys shall be conducted by a qualified wildlife biologist within 14 days before any tree removal or clearing during each construction season. Locations of vegetation and tree removal or excavation will be examined for potential bat roosts. Specific survey methodologies will be determined in coordination with CDFW, and may include visual surveys of bats (e.g., observation of bats during foraging period), inspection for suitable habitat, bat sign (e.g., guano), or use of ultrasonic detectors (e.g., Sonobat, Anabat). Removal of any significant roost sites located will be</p>			

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures			Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable		
			<p>avoided to the extent feasible. If it is determined that an active roost site cannot be avoided and will be affected, bats will be excluded from the roost site before the site is removed. The biologist shall first notify and consult with CDFW on appropriate bat exclusion methods and roost removal procedures. Exclusion methods may include use of one-way doors at roost entrances (bats may leave, but not reenter), or sealing roost entrances when the site can be confirmed to contain no bats. Once it is confirmed that all bats have left the roost, crews will be allowed to continue work in the area.</p> <p>Exclusion efforts may be restricted during periods of sensitive activity (e.g., during winter hibernation or while females in maternity colonies are nursing young [generally, during late spring and summer]). If a hibernation or maternity roosting site is discovered, the project developer will consult with CDFW to establish appropriate exclusionary buffers until all young are determined to be volant (i.e., able to fly) by a qualified biologist. Once it is determined that all young are volant, passive exclusion devices shall be installed and all bats will be allowed to leave voluntarily. Once it is determined by a qualified biologist that all bats have left the roost, crews will be allowed to work within the buffer zone.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.4-5e: Protect active American badger den sites (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>Before construction activities within suitable habitat for American badger, a qualified biologist shall conduct surveys to identify any American badger burrows/dens. These surveys shall be conducted not more than 15 days before the start of construction. If occupied burrows are not found, further mitigation will be not required. If occupied burrows are found, CDFW shall be notified and impacts to active badger dens shall be avoided by establishing exclusion zones around all active badger dens, within which construction-related activities shall be prohibited until denning activities are complete or the den is abandoned. A qualified biologist shall monitor each den once per week to track the status of the den and to determine when a den area has been cleared for construction.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.4-5f: Coordinate with City of Roseville regarding mitigation for impacts on special-status reptile, bird, and mammal species resulting from off-site improvements outside the County's jurisdictional boundaries (Other Supporting Infrastructure)</p> <p>The County shall coordinate with the City of Roseville regarding mitigation for loss of special-status animals resulting from construction of the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility and other off-site improvements within the City's jurisdiction. As a part of its CEQA process for each improvement project, the City of Roseville, as lead agency, would identify and implement</p>			

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
			appropriate mitigation for significant impacts to special-status reptile, bird, and mammal species. Placer County would play a coordinating role but would have no jurisdiction or control over the timing and implementation of mitigation for off-site improvements that occur outside its own jurisdiction.	
<p>Impact 4.4-6: Loss or degradation of riparian habitat</p> <p>Implementing the project could result in loss or degradation of riparian habitat considered sensitive in the Placer County General Plan and protected under Section 1602 of the Fish and Game Code. Loss and degradation of riparian habitat would be significant impact.</p>		S	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.4-6a: Avoid, minimize, or compensate for loss of riparian habitat (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ The County shall require future project proponents, including for off-site improvements, to retain a qualified botanist to identify, map, and quantify riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities on the project site before final project design is completed. ▲ If impacts on riparian habitat cannot be avoided as part of future project construction, the project proponent shall compensate for loss of riparian habitat through participation in the PCCP if it has been adopted and is available for mitigation for project impacts. Per the PCCP, mitigation shall be through off-site restoration at an area ratio of at least 1.5:1 and shall be funded through fees paid in addition to land conversion fees. On-site restoration by the project proponent may serve in lieu of some or all of the Special Habitat fees if it meets all the applicable requirements described in the PCCP conservation measures and implementation plan. ▲ If the PCCP is not adopted, the project proponent shall consult with the County and CDFW to determine appropriate mitigation for removal of riparian habitat resulting from project implementation. Mitigation measures may include restoration of affected habitat on site and in kind, restoration of another section of stream within the project area, habitat restoration off site, or payment of a mitigation fee to a CDFW-approved mitigation bank. The compensation habitat shall be similar in composition and structure to the habitat/natural community to be removed and shall be at ratios adequate to offset the loss of habitat functions in the affected project area so that there is no-net-loss of riparian habitat functions, consistent with Placer County General Plan policy and CDFW regulations. ▲ If required, the project proponents shall obtain a Section 1602 streambed alteration agreement from CDFW and comply with all conditions of the agreement. <p>Mitigation Measure 4.4-6b: Coordinate with City of Roseville regarding mitigation for impacts on riparian habitat resulting from off-site improvements outside the County's jurisdictional boundaries (Other Supporting Infrastructure)</p> <p>The County shall coordinate with the City of Roseville regarding mitigation for loss of riparian habitat resulting from construction of the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility within the City's jurisdiction. As a part of its CEQA process for the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility project, the</p>	SU

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
			City of Roseville, as lead agency, would identify and implement appropriate mitigation for significant impacts to riparian habitat. Placer County would play a coordinating role but would have no control over the timing and implementation of mitigation for off-site improvements that occur outside its jurisdiction.	
<p>Impact 4.4-7: Conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources</p> <p>Implementing the project would result in development in areas containing trees protected under the County Tree Ordinance and sensitive biological resources that are afforded protections under Placer County General Plan goals, policies, and implementation programs, including special-status plants and animals, wetland and riparian habitats, vernal pool complexes, streams and stream zones, and large, unfragmented areas of natural habitat. Plan implementation would therefore result in removal and/or degradation of these resources and could conflict with these local ordinances and policies. This would be a potentially significant impact.</p>		PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.4-7a: Avoid or compensate for loss of protected trees (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ The County shall require future project proponents, including proponents for off-site improvements, to avoid tree removal or death if feasible and appropriate, through incorporation of these features into project design and planning. ▲ All trees retained on-site shall be protected from construction-related impacts by placing exclusion fencing one foot outside the drip line of retained trees, or one foot outside the outer edge of the riparian woodland habitat, and maintaining said fencing through the duration of construction. ▲ If any trees protected under County ordinance cannot feasibly be avoided, they shall be mitigated through the payment of PCCP land conversion fees and incorporation of its avoidance and minimization measures into the project. If the PCCP is not approved prior to project development, trees subject to loss shall be replaced at a 1:1 ratio (1 new inch dbh of tree for each inch dbh lost), unless alternative mitigation is approved by the County pursuant to Placer County Code Article 12.16. Replacement trees will be a minimum of 15-gallon size plantings and will be the same or similar native species as the tree removed. Replacement trees may be planted on-site to areas that would not be developed or to nearby offsite open space areas. Alternatively, if approved by the County, trees to be removed may be transplanted to other open space areas in proximity to the SAP area. Payment of an in-lieu fee to the Placer County tree preservation fund may also be allowed to compensate for tree loss. ▲ The project proponent required to replace lost trees shall provide appropriate irrigation and maintenance to replacement trees and will enter a maintenance agreement with the County. The project proponent shall post a deposit for the replacement cost of replanted trees to the County and the deposit shall be retained until the County arborist certifies that conditions of the tree permit have been satisfied. ▲ Any replacement tree that is dead after three years shall be replaced in kind with equal-sized, healthy replacements and these trees shall be maintained until established. 	SU

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
		<p>Mitigation Measure 4.4-7b: Coordinate with City of Roseville regarding mitigation for loss of trees protected under City ordinance resulting from off-site improvements outside the County's jurisdictional boundaries (Other Supporting Infrastructure)</p> <p>The County shall coordinate with the City of Roseville regarding mitigation for loss of trees resulting from construction of the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility and other off-site improvements within the City's jurisdiction. As a part of its CEQA process for each improvement project, the City of Roseville as lead agency, would identify and implement appropriate mitigation for significant loss of trees and would comply with City ordinances. Placer County would play a coordinating role but would have no control over the timing and implementation of mitigation for off-site improvements that occur outside its jurisdiction.</p>		
<p>Impact 4.4-8: Interfere substantially with wildlife movement</p> <p>Implementing the project would interfere with the movement of native resident wildlife species by developing large areas of natural habitat and eliminating connectivity across large portions of the SAP area. This impact would be significant.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.4-8a: Provide wildlife crossing for Placer Parkway (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>The County shall coordinate with PCTPA during the design of Placer Parkway to incorporate safe wildlife-crossing features, as feasible. Design features that promote wildlife crossing could include (but may not be limited to) sizing bridges/culverts sufficiently to allow wildlife movement between the Net SAP and PRSP open space areas and locating them to maximize the connection between open space areas. The County shall work with a qualified biologist to determine the appropriate size and location of these wildlife crossing points.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.4-8b: Provide interconnected natural areas (Net SAP Area)</p> <p>The County shall require the maintenance of open space and natural areas in the Net SAP area that are interconnected and of sufficient size to protect biodiversity, accommodate wildlife movement, and sustain ecosystems. The County will work with proponents of future projects in the Net SAP area to identify and design an appropriate wildlife movement corridor, consistent with the PCCP conservation strategy (if adopted), between the open space preserve area in the PRSP area and the Reserve/Mitigation Preserve lands in the northern portion of the SAP. The location of movement corridors should be coordinated with the wildlife crossings in Placer Parkway (See Mitigation Measure 4.4-8a).</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.4-8c: Provide wildlife crossing structures (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>The County shall require road crossings over the stream system open space areas to be designed to provide safe wildlife movement using wildlife overpasses, underpasses, bridges, or culverts that are adequately sized to allow safe crossing even during high water. Design of crossings shall be based on movement requirements for the range of common and sensitive native wildlife species in the region. Where feasible and appropriate, fencing may be used to direct animals toward wildlife crossing structures and away from roadways.</p>	SU	

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures			Significance after Mitigation
		NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	
<p>Impact 4.4-9: Interfere substantially with native nursery sites</p> <p>Project implementation would result in loss of human-made structures and trees that may support maternity bat roosts. If these structures are used by bats as maternity colony roosts, implementation of the project could result in mortality of large numbers of bats and inability to reproduce young. This impact would be potentially significant.</p>	PS	<p>Implement Mitigation Measure 4.4-5d: Minimize Disturbance and Loss of Bat Roost Sites.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.4-9: Coordinate with City of Roseville regarding mitigation for loss of maternity bat colonies resulting from off-site improvements outside the County's jurisdictional boundaries (Other Supporting Infrastructure)</p> <p>The County shall coordinate with the City of Roseville regarding mitigation for loss of maternity bat colonies resulting from construction of the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility and off-site transportation and utility improvements within the City's jurisdiction. As a part of its CEQA process for each improvement project, the City of Roseville would identify and implement appropriate mitigation for significant impacts to maternity bat colonies. Placer County would play a coordinating role but would have no control over the timing and implementation of mitigation for off-site improvements that occur within the City of Roseville.</p>			SU
<p>Impact 4.4-10: Conflict with an approved conservation plan</p> <p>Project implementation could result in conflicts with the goals of the proposed PCCP, should the Plan be implemented before project commencement. In general, the Specific Plan has been designed to provide consistency with the conservation strategy of the proposed PCCP. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.			LTS
<p>Cumulative Impact 4.4-11: Contribution to loss and degradation of state or federally protected waters</p>	SU	No mitigation is available.			SU
<p>Cumulative Impact 4.4-12: Contribution to loss of federally listed vernal pool branchiopods and western spadefoot</p>	SU	No mitigation is available.			SU
<p>Cumulative Impact 4.4-13: Contribution to loss of special-status plants</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.			LTS
<p>Cumulative Impact 4.4-14: Contribution to loss of special-status reptile, bird, mammal, and fish species; and valley elderberry longhorn beetle</p>	SU	No mitigation is available.			SU
<p>Cumulative Impact 4.4-15: Contribution to the loss or degradation of riparian habitat</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.			LTS
<p>Cumulative Impact 4.4-16: Contribution to conflicts with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.			LTS
<p>Cumulative Impact 4.4-17: Contribution to interference with wildlife movement</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.			LTS

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
Cumulative Impact 4.4-18: Contribution to loss of wildlife nursery sites	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS	
Cumulative Impact 4.4-19: Contribution to conflicts with an adopted conservation plan	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS	
4.5 Archaeological, Historical, and Tribal Cultural Resources				
<p>Impact 4.5-1: Change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource</p> <p>UAIC and the Shingle Springs Rancheria responded to letters sent by the County offering consultation under AB 52. Although no specific known TCRs have been identified through consultation, UAIC has identified two areas that may be sensitive for TCRs. Specifically, UAIC has identified an area of sensitivity where localized topography mimics conditions on a nearby but unrelated project site at which UAIC has identified significant TCRs. Therefore, this impact would be potentially significant.</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.5-1a: Identified resource avoidance (PRSP Area)</p> <p>Based on UAIC’s identification of a 0.96-acre area where on-site topography mimics conditions on a nearby unrelated project site (where the tribe has identified significant TCRs), as well as identification of a potentially indicative surface artifact at this location, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented:</p> <p>Prior to recordation of the final large lot subdivision map for the area including the 0.96-acre area, one of the following two actions shall be taken:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Subsurface soil testing shall be conducted with UAIC tribal monitors present within the 0.96-acre sensitive area identified by the Tribe to determine that TCRs are absent and therefore that no restrictions or map changes are necessary, or 2. The 0.96-acre sensitive area shall be either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ designated as Open Space on the land use plan; or ▲ restricted on the map and deed to preclude construction of any structures, roadway or utility infrastructure, agricultural cultivation, or other earth-disturbing activities. <p>If this identified resource will be avoided (and no subsurface testing will be conducted), project construction plans shall demarcate the area through “Environmentally Sensitive Area” notation. The demarcations shall be reviewed and approved by UAIC before finalization to ensure they correctly identify the location of the TCRs.</p> <p>Before each phase of construction, including staging of equipment, silt fence installation, and clearing and grubbing, the construction contractor shall install protective fencing at the perimeter of the Environmentally Sensitive Area as shown on the plans and as verified by UAIC. Installation of the fencing shall be monitored by a UAIC monitor. The fencing shall be maintained and repaired as needed and to the satisfaction of the County’s Development Review Committee and UAIC for the duration of the construction activity.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.5-1b: Inadvertent discoveries (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>If potential Native American prehistoric, historic, archaeological, or cultural resources, including</p>	LTS	

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures			Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable		
			<p>midden soil, artifacts, chipped stone, exotic rock (nonnative), or unusual amounts of baked clay, shell, or bone, are uncovered during any on-site construction activities, all work must immediately stop in the area. Work shall cease within 100 feet of the find regardless of whether the construction is being actively monitored by a cultural resources specialist, professional archaeologist, or representative from UAIC. Following discovery, a professional archaeologist shall be retained to evaluate the significance of the deposit, and the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, the Department of Museums, and Native American representatives from UAIC shall make recommendations for further evaluation and treatment, as appropriate.</p> <p>If Native American prehistoric, historic, archaeological, or cultural deposits or isolates found to be ineligible for inclusion in the CRHR are identified within the SAP area, UAIC shall be notified. Culturally appropriate treatment and disposition shall be determined following coordination with UAIC. Culturally appropriate treatment may involve processing materials in a lab for reburial, minimizing handling of cultural objects, leaving objects in place within the landscape, and returning objects to a location within the project area where they will not be subject to future impacts. UAIC does not consider curation of TCRs to be appropriate or respectful and request that materials not be permanently curated, unless requested by the tribe.</p> <p>If articulated or disarticulated human remains are discovered during construction activities, the County coroner and NAHC shall be contacted immediately. Upon determination by the County coroner that the find is Native American in origin, the NAHC will assign the Most Likely Descendant (MLD), who will work with the project proponent to define appropriate treatment and disposition of the burials.</p> <p>Following a review of the find and consultation with the Native American tribe and appropriate experts, if necessary, the authority to proceed may be accompanied by the addition of development requirements or special conditions that provide for protection of the site and/or additional measures necessary to address the unique or sensitive nature of the site. Work in the area of the cultural resource discovery may proceed only after authorization is granted by the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency following coordination with tribal representatives and cultural resource experts, as appropriate.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.5-1c: Tribal monitoring (PRSP Area)</p> <p>An area within the PRSP area has been identified by UAIC as having the potential for significant cultural finds based on the presence of multiple surface isolates. Before commencement of earth-disturbing activities in the PRSP area, a tribal site monitor from UAIC shall be contacted.</p>			

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures			Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable		
			<p>The monitor shall identify a site boundary and demarcate an “Environmentally Sensitive Area.” In this area, the project proponent and/or its construction contractor(s) shall accommodate Native American monitors or their representatives on the construction site during ground-disturbing activities, including vegetation clearing, grubbing, and stripping or other earth-moving/disturbing activities, such as grading or excavation. Native American monitors or their representatives will have the authority to request that work be temporarily stopped, diverted, or slowed if sites or objects of significance are identified within 100 feet of the direct impact area. Only a Native American monitor or representative shall recommend appropriate treatment and final disposition of TCRs.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.5-1d: Tribal cultural resource awareness training (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>Before initiation of construction in the areas defined by UAIC as potentially sensitive, all construction crew members, consultants, and other personnel involved in project implementation shall receive project-specific TCR awareness training. The training shall be conducted in coordination with qualified cultural resource specialists and representatives from UAIC. The training will emphasize the requirement for confidentiality and culturally appropriate, respectful treatment of any find of significance to UAIC.</p> <p>As a component of the training, a brochure will be distributed to all personnel associated with project implementation. At a minimum, the brochure shall discuss the following topics in clear and straightforward language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ field indicators of potential archaeological or cultural resources (e.g., what to look for; for example: archaeological artifacts, exotic or nonnative rock, unusually large amounts of shell or bone, significant soil color variation); ▲ regulations governing archaeological resources and TCRs; ▲ consequences of disregarding or violating laws protecting archaeological or TCRs; and ▲ steps to take if a worker encounters a possible resource. <p>The training shall include project-specific guidance for on-site personnel, including agreed upon protocols for resource avoidance, when to stop work, and whom to contact if potential archaeological or TCRs are identified.</p> <p>The training shall also address directing work to stop and contacting the County coroner and the NAHC immediately if potential human remains are identified. NAHC will assign an MLD if the remains are determined by the coroner to be Native American in origin.</p>			

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures			Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable		
			<p>Mitigation Measure 4.5-1e: Site visit after ground disturbance (Net SAP Area)</p> <p>The project proponent shall notify the CEQA lead agency a minimum of 7 days before initiation of ground disturbance to allow the agency time to notify culturally affiliated tribes. Tribal representatives from culturally affiliated tribes shall be allowed access to the project site within the first 5 days of ground-breaking activity to inspect soil piles, trenches, or other disturbed areas.</p> <p>If potential Native American prehistoric, historic, archaeological, or cultural resources, including midden soil, artifacts, chipped stone, exotic rock (nonnative), or unusual amounts of baked clay, shell, or bone, are identified during this initial inspection following ground disturbance, the following actions shall be taken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Work shall be suspended within 100 feet of the find, and the project proponent shall immediately notify the CEQA lead agency representative. The project proponent shall coordinate any subsequent investigation of the site with a qualified archaeologist approved by the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency and a tribal representative from the culturally affiliated tribe(s). The archaeologist shall coordinate with the culturally affiliated tribe(s) to allow for proper management recommendations if potential impacts on the resources are found by the CEQA lead agency representative to be significant. ▲ A site meeting of construction personnel shall be held to afford the tribal representative the opportunity to provide TCR awareness information. ▲ A written report detailing the site assessment, coordination activities, and management recommendations shall be provided to the CEQA lead agency representative by the qualified archaeologist. Possible management recommendations for historical or unique archaeological resources or TCRs could include resource avoidance, preservation in place, reburial on-site, or other measures deemed acceptable by the project proponent, the County, and the tribal representative from the culturally affiliated tribe(s). ▲ The contractor shall implement any measures deemed by the CEQA lead agency representative staff to be necessary and feasible to avoid or minimize significant effects on the TCR, including the use of a Native American monitor whenever work is occurring within 100 feet of the find. <p>Mitigation Measure 4.5-1f: Lead agency notification (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>A minimum of 7 days before beginning earthwork or other soil-disturbing activities, the project proponent shall notify the CEQA lead agency representative of the proposed earthwork start date to provide the CEQA lead agency representative adequate time to contact UAIC regarding TCR concerns.</p>			

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable	
			<p>Mitigation Measure 4.5-1g: Woodcreek Water Treatment Plant (Other Off-Site Transportation and Utility Improvements)</p> <p>Although identified as a possible off-site improvement, it is highly unlikely that any improvements related to the SAP project, including the PRSP, will ever occur at this recycled water facility. This facility is located in the City of Roseville and is outside County jurisdiction. In the unlikely event that the County’s project requires work at this location, the County will coordinate with City of Roseville regarding consultation with UAIC.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.5-1h: Pleasant Grove Retention Facility (Pleasant Grove Retention Facility)</p> <p>This is a proposed regional retention facility that will be constructed on City of Roseville–owned land and may be operated in accordance with a joint operations agreement developed by the participating jurisdictions. The City has already prepared a programmatic CEQA document for the project and will be the CEQA lead agency for the project-level (construction) CEQA analysis. City staff also will prepare the engineering improvement plans. When the project-level CEQA analysis occurs, the City of Roseville will be the lead agency responsible for AB 52 consultation. During consultation for the off-site improvements, the City agreed to allow UAIC to participate, on a voluntary basis, in any subsequent pedestrian surveys that may be conducted in support of the cultural resource and tribal cultural resource sections of its future CEQA document.</p>	
<p>Impact 4.5-2: Change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource</p> <p>Four archaeological sites and two multicomponent sites are known within the Net SAP area (outside the PRSP area), but the significance of these sites in the SAP has not yet been evaluated. Regarding the PRSP, based on pedestrian surveys and evaluation of identified archaeological sites, no archaeological resources eligible for listing in the NRHP or CRHR are known within the PRSP area. Implementation of the SAP, including PRSP, would result in development on properties that could contain known archaeological resources. The ground disturbance from construction activities associated with the SAP and PRSP could disturb, disrupt, or destroy unknown archaeological resources, which could cause a substantial change in the significance of a previously undiscovered unique archaeological resource as defined in the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. SAP Policies CR-1.1, 1.5, 1.6, and 1.7 require the identification, evaluation, and protection of archaeological resources; however, the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility and a portion of the Off-Site Transportation and Utility Improvements would not be subject to these policies. This impact would be potentially significant.</p>		PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.5-2: Require archaeological resource survey for areas outside the SAP (Pleasant Grove Retention Facility and Off-Site Transportation and Utility Improvements)</p> <p>The County shall coordinate with the City of Roseville for the preparation of a cultural resource evaluation report for the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility and off-site transportation and utility improvements, before grading, excavation, or other earthmoving activities begin. The evaluation should include preparing archaeological and historical survey reports. Any identified archaeological and historical sites (including structures 45 years of age or older) and materials should be evaluated and recorded on standard DPR 523-series forms in accordance with NRHP/CRHR criteria. The evaluation report should be completed by a qualified archaeologist, architectural historian, or historical architect who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications for Archaeology and Historic Preservation, as appropriate, and submitted to the City of Roseville. Project contractors and construction managers should follow the recommendations identified in the report.</p>	SU

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures			Significance after Mitigation
		NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	
<p>Impact 4.5-3: Accidental discovery of human remains</p> <p>Although unlikely based on research, construction and excavation activities associated with implementation of the SAP could unearth previously undiscovered or unrecorded human remains if they are present. Compliance with California Health and Safety Code Sections 7050.5 and 7052, PRC Section 5097, and SAP Policy CR-1.7 would minimize project-related effects on human remains. However, without project-specific mitigation, this impact could be potentially significant.</p>	PS	Implement Mitigation Measure 4.5-1b.			LTS
<p>Impact 4.5-4: Change in the significance of a historic resource</p> <p>The survey and evaluation of the PRSP area concluded that it does not contain any historic resources. Construction activities in the net SAP area could occur on properties that contain unrecorded historic sites or result in adverse physical effects on previously identified historic resources. Damage to or destruction of a building or structure that is a designated historic resource, is eligible for listing as a historic resource, or has not yet been evaluated could result in the change in its historical significance. SAP Policies CR-1.1, 1.5, 1.6, and 1.7 require the identification, evaluation, and protection of historic resources; however, the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility would not be subject to these policies. This impact would be potentially significant.</p>	PS	Implement Mitigation Measure 4.5-2.			SU
Cumulative Impact 4.5-5: Cumulative impacts on tribal cultural resources	LTS	No mitigation is required.			LTS
Cumulative Impact 4.5-6: Cumulative impacts on archaeological resources	LTS	No mitigation is required.			LTS
Cumulative Impact 4.5-7: Cumulative impacts on human remains	LTS	No mitigation is required.			LTS
Cumulative Impact 4.5-8: Cumulative impacts on historic resources	SU	No mitigation is available.			SU
4.6 Geology and Soils					
<p>Impact 4.6-1: Result in substantial soil erosion</p> <p>Construction associated with the project would involve clearing and grading in areas where new structures or other facilities would be built and trenching for placement of utility connections. This would temporarily expose soils previously protected by vegetation to the effects of wind and water erosion. Proponents of individual development projects within the SAP area would comply with the state CBC and</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.6-1a: Submit improvement plans (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>The project proponent shall prepare and submit improvement plans, specifications, and cost estimates (in accordance with the requirements of Section II of the Land Development Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal) to 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</p>			SU

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures		Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable	
<p>federal NPDES program and would implement BMPs for stream protection in accordance with Placer County General Plan Policy NR-3.5 and fugitive dust control measures identified by the Placer County Air Pollution Control District. Compliance with the Placer County Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance and Placer County Land Development Manual would be required for all projects within the SAP area. Similar City of Roseville protections would be required for other supporting infrastructure improvements outside the SAP area. However, given the size of the project area and the extent of ground-disturbing activities that could occur as a result of the project, substantial on- or off-site soil erosion could occur. This impact would be potentially significant.</p>			<p>site and adjacent to the project, that 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 project proponent shall pay plan check and inspection fees and Placer County Fire Department improvement plan review and inspection fees with the first improvement plan submittal. (NOTE: Before plan approval, all applicable recording and reproduction costs 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 project proponent'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, the review process shall be completed before improvement plans are submitted. Record drawings shall be prepared and signed by a California Registered Civil Engineer at the project proponent's expense and shall be submitted to the ESD in both hard copy and electronic versions in a format to be approved by the ESD before site improvements are accepted by the County.</p> <p>Conceptual landscape plans submitted before project approval may require modification during the improvement plan process to resolve issues of drainage and traffic safety.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.6-1b: Implement improvement plans (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>The improvement plans shall show all proposed grading, drainage improvements, and vegetation and tree removal, and all work shall conform to provisions of the County Grading Ordinance (Ref. Article 15.48, Placer County Code) and Stormwater Quality Ordinance (Ref. Article 8.28, Placer County Code) that are in effect at the time of submittal. No grading, clearing, or tree disturbance shall occur until the improvement plans are approved and all temporary construction fencing has been installed and inspected by a member of the 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 ESD concurs with this recommendation.</p> <p>The project proponent shall revegetate all disturbed areas. Revegetation, undertaken from April 1 through October 1, shall include regular watering to ensure adequate growth. A winterization plan shall be provided with project improvement plans. It is the project proponent's responsibility to ensure proper installation and maintenance of erosion control/winterization before, during, and after project construction. Stockpiled soil and borrow areas shall have proper erosion control measures applied for the duration of the construction as specified in the improvement plans. Erosion control shall be provided where roadside drainage is off the pavement, to the satisfaction of the ESD.</p>		

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures			Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable		
						<p>The project proponent 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 before 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, unused portions of the deposit shall be refunded to the project proponent or authorized agent.</p> <p>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 before any further work is performed. 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.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.6-1c: Implement best management practices (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>The improvement plans shall show that water quality treatment facilities/BMPs shall be designed according to the guidance of the California Stormwater Quality Association stormwater BMP handbooks for construction, for new development/redevelopment, and for industrial and commercial (or other similar source as approved by the ESD). Construction (temporary) BMPs for the project include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ straw mulch, ▲ velocity dissipation devices, ▲ silt fencing, ▲ fiber rolls, ▲ storm drain inlet protection, ▲ wind erosion control, and ▲ stabilized construction entrances. <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, or similar features for entrapment of sediment, debris, and oils/greases or other identified pollutants as approved by the ESD. BMPs shall be designed in accordance with the <i>West Placer Storm Water Quality Design Manual</i> 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 project proponent shall provide for the establishment of vegetation, where specified, by means of</p>

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures			Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable		
			<p>proper irrigation. Proof of ongoing 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 Department of Public Works and Facilities Stormwater Coordinator unless, and until, a County Service Area is created and said facilities are accepted by the County for maintenance. Contractual evidence of monthly parking lot sweeping and vacuuming and a catch basin cleaning program shall be provided to the ESD upon request. Failure to do so will be grounds for discretionary permit revocation. Before improvement plan or final subdivision map 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>Mitigation Measure 4.6-1d: Submit improvement plans (Other Supporting Infrastructure) The County shall work with the project proponent to coordinate with the City of Roseville to make sure improvement plans are submitted that meet all City requirements for accurate identification of features, such as topographical features; location of existing utilities and easements; proposed landscaping and irrigation facilities within public right of way; proposed grading and drainage improvements; and vegetation and tree removal (as well as any other items the City of Roseville requires for improvement plans).</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.6-1e: Implement improvement plans (Other Supporting Infrastructure) The County shall work with the project proponent to coordinate with the City of Roseville to make sure proposed grading, drainage improvements, and vegetation and tree removal are consistent with City requirements, including requirements for slopes and construction-related erosion control and stormwater quality protection as well as other specific City of Roseville requirements and conditions of approval.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.6-1f: Implement best management practices (Other Supporting Infrastructure) The County shall work with the project proponent to coordinate with the City of Roseville to make sure that water quality treatment facilities/BMPs are designed according to the guidance of the California Stormwater Quality Association stormwater BMP handbooks for construction, for new development/redevelopment, and for industrial and commercial. Construction (temporary) BMPs include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ straw mulch, ▲ velocity dissipation devices, ▲ silt fencing, ▲ fiber rolls, ▲ storm drain inlet protection, ▲ wind erosion control, and ▲ stabilized construction entrances. 			

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable	
<p>Impact 4.6-2: Damage or instability from construction on expansive soils</p> <p>Implementation of the project involves construction of structures and roadways in areas that are expected to contain expansive soils. Unless recommendations of site-specific geotechnical studies (e.g., design of roads, foundations, retaining walls; grading practices) are implemented, development on these soils that would occur with implementation of the project could experience cracking, deterioration of roadway pavement, and damage to building foundations because of moisture-related changes in soil volume.</p> <p>Regarding implementation of other supporting infrastructure, adherence to standard geotechnical engineering practices, building code requirements, and the City of Roseville Design and Construction Standards would minimize potential impacts from expansive soils such that no substantial risk to life or property would occur with implementation of the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility and other facilities proposed outside the SAP area.</p> <p>Unless recommendations of site-specific geotechnical studies are implemented, this impact could be potentially significant.</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.6-2a: Submit preliminary and final geotechnical engineering reports (Net SAP Area)</p> <p>Proponents of projects within the net SAP area shall submit to ESD for review and approval a preliminary geotechnical report, prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer or Geotechnical Engineer, as part of the subsequent entitlement application review.</p> <p>Improvement plan submittals for development within the net SAP area shall include a final geotechnical engineering report produced by a California Registered Civil Engineer or Geotechnical Engineer for ESD review and approval. The report shall address and make recommendations on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ road, pavement, and parking area design; ▲ structural foundations, including retaining wall design (if applicable); ▲ grading practices; ▲ erosion/winterization; ▲ special problems discovered on-site (e.g., groundwater, expansive/unstable soils); and ▲ slope stability. <p>Once approved by the ESD, two copies of the final report shall be provided to the 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>Mitigation Measure 4.6-2b: Submit final geotechnical engineering report (PRSP Area)</p> <p>The Improvement plan submittals for development within the PRSP area shall include a final geotechnical engineering report produced by a California Registered Civil Engineer or Geotechnical Engineer for ESD review and approval. The report shall address and make recommendations on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ road, pavement, and parking area design; ▲ structural foundations, including retaining wall design (if applicable); ▲ grading practices; ▲ erosion/winterization; ▲ special problems discovered on-site (e.g., groundwater, expansive/unstable soils); and ▲ slope stability. 	LTS

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable	
			<p>Once approved by the ESD, two copies of the final report shall be provided to the 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>If the soils report indicates the presence of critically expansive or other soils problems that, if not corrected, could lead to structural defects, a certification of completion of the requirements of the soils report shall be required for subdivisions, before issuance of building permits. This certification may be completed on a lot-by-lot basis or on a tract basis. This shall be so noted on the improvement plans; in the development notebook; in the conditions, covenants, and restrictions; and on the informational sheet filed with the final subdivision map(s).</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.6-2c: Implement geotechnical recommendations (PRSP Area)</p> <p>Before approval of grading plans within the PRSP area, the project proponent shall submit, for review and approval by the County, site-specific soils engineering reports that include recommendations, based on the specific soil conditions, for design of foundations, roadway subgrades, grading and construction techniques, fill material and compaction, and other necessary recommendations in compliance with the CBC. Recommendations from the <i>Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering Report: Placer Ranch</i> (Wallace-Kuhl & Associates 2004) shall be incorporated into the site-specific soils engineering reports (and shall be updated as needed in accordance with CBC requirements). The following recommendation addresses expansive soils:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Maintaining higher moisture content in subgrade soils at the time of construction, chemical treatment of near-surface soils (e.g., lime treatment), and/or deepened or post-tensioned foundation systems. 	
<p>Impact 4.6-3: Loss of availability of mineral resources</p> <p>The project area is classified MRZ-4. No mineral resources of value are known to exist in this area. The project area does not contain sites designated as locally important mineral resource recovery sites on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan. Furthermore, given the surrounding developed land uses, commercial mining operations are unlikely to be feasible because compatibility impacts on adjacent land uses may not be adequately mitigated. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.</p>		LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures			Significance after Mitigation
		NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	
<p>Impact 4.6-4: Loss of a unique paleontological resource or geologic feature</p> <p>No paleontological resources or geologic features are known to exist within the project area. However, the geologic units underlying the area have a high paleontological sensitivity. Implementation of the project would involve ground-disturbing activities that could affect undiscovered paleontological resources. This impact would be potentially significant.</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.6-4a: Train construction personnel on protocol to follow if fossils are encountered (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>Prior to construction commencing and before initiating earthmoving activities in areas likely to contain important paleontological or geologic features (including Upper Riverbank Formation, Turlock Lake, or undifferentiated Quaternary Alluvium sediments), project proponents shall retain a qualified paleontologist to train all construction personnel involved with earthwork in those areas. The paleontologist will teach construction workers about the possibility of encountering fossils, the appearance and types of fossils likely to be seen during construction, and the proper stop-work and County-approved notification procedures to follow if fossils are encountered. A note to contractors regarding this requirement shall be included on the Improvement Plans.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.6-4b: Train construction personnel on protocol to follow if fossils are encountered (Other Supporting Infrastructure)</p> <p>The County shall coordinate with the City of Roseville to make sure project proponents retain a qualified paleontologist to train all construction personnel involved with earthwork in geologic units with high paleontological sensitivity. The paleontologist should teach construction workers about the possibility of encountering fossils, the appearance and types of fossils likely to be seen during construction, and the proper stop-work and notification procedures to follow if fossils are encountered.</p>			SU
<p>Impact 4.6-5: Consistency with applicable General Plan policies</p> <p>The project is consistent with the policies of the <i>Placer County General Plan</i> relating to geology and soils. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.			LTS
Cumulative Impact 4.6-6: Cumulative soil erosion	LTS	No mitigation is required.			LTS
Cumulative Impact 4.6-7: Cumulative impacts related to expansive soils	LTS	No mitigation is required.			LTS
Cumulative Impact 4.6-8: Cumulative loss of availability of mineral resources	LTS	No mitigation is required.			LTS
Cumulative Impact 4.6-9: Cumulative loss of a unique paleontological resource or geologic feature	LTS	No mitigation is required.			LTS

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
4.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions				
<p>Impact 4.7-1: Construction-generated greenhouse gas emissions</p> <p>Construction activity associated with development under the project, including building Pleasant Grove Retention Facility and the off-site transportation and utility improvements, is estimated to generate a maximum of 9,691 MTCO_{2e} per year. These levels of GHG emissions would not result in a considerable contribution to cumulative emissions related to global climate change and would not conflict with state GHG reduction targets. The contribution of the project to this cumulative impact would not be considerable. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS	
<p>Impact 4.7-2: Operational greenhouse gas emissions</p> <p>Operation of the land uses developed under the net SAP area is estimated to generate 378,518 MTCO_{2e}/year at full buildout, and operation of the land uses developed under the PRSP area is estimated to generate 201,004 MTCO_{2e}/year at full buildout. These levels of GHG emissions have the potential to result in a considerable contribution to cumulative emissions related to global climate change and conflict with state GHG reduction targets. This impact would be significant.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a: Implement all feasible on-site features to reduce operational GHG emissions (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>The County will require project proponents of development proposed under the project to incorporate the following measures to reduce operational emissions of GHGs to the extent feasible.</p> <p>Transportation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ For each single-family residential unit, install a listed raceway, associated overcurrent protective device and the balance of a dedicated 208/240-volt branch circuit at 40 amperes (amp) minimum. The raceway shall not be less than trade size 1 (nominal 1-inch inside diameter). The raceway shall originate at the main service or unit subpanel and shall terminate into a listed cabinet, box, or other enclosure near the proposed location of an EV charger. Raceways are required to be continuous at enclosed, inaccessible or concealed areas and spaces. The service panel and/or subpanel shall provide capacity for a 40-ampere minimum dedicated branch circuit. All electrical circuit components and Electric Vehicle Service Equipment (EVSE), including a receptacle or box with a blank cover, related to this section shall be installed in accordance with the California Electrical Code. ▲ Multi-family residential buildings shall design at least 10 percent of parking spaces to include EVSE, or a minimum of two spaces to be installed with EVSE for buildings with 2-10 parking spaces. EVSE includes EV charging equipment for each required space connected to a 208/240-volt, 40-amp panel with conduit, wiring, receptacle, and overprotection devices. ▲ Non-residential buildings shall design at least 10 percent of parking spaces to include EVSE, or a minimum of two spaces to be installed with EVSE for buildings with 2-10 parking spaces. EVSE includes EV charging equipment for each required space connected to a 208/240-volt, 40-amp panel with conduit, wiring, receptacle, and overprotection devices. 	SU	

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures		Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable	
			<p>▲ Non-residential land uses with 20 or more on-site parking spaces shall dedicate preferential parking spaces to vehicles with more than one occupant and ZEVs (including battery electric vehicles and hydrogen fuel cell vehicles). The number of dedicated spaces should be no less than two spaces or 5 percent of the total parking spaces on the individual project site, whichever is greater. These dedicated spaces shall be in preferential locations such as near the main entrances to the buildings served by the parking lot and/or under the shade of structure or trees. These spaces shall be clearly marked with signs and pavement markings. This measure shall not be implemented in a way that prevents compliance with requirements in the California Vehicle Code regarding parking spaces for disabled persons or disabled veterans.</p> <p>Building Energy Reduce GHG emissions associated with building energy through the following measures:</p> <p>▲ Single family residential buildings constructed within the net SAP area and the PRSP area shall be designed to achieve a 30 percent reduction in energy use versus a standard 2016 Title 24 code-compliant building. Reductions in energy shall be achieved by following the energy efficiency performance standards set forth in Tier 2 of the 2016 California Green Building Standards Code, Section A4.203.1.2.2. These reductions shall be achieved by employing energy efficient design features and/or solar photovoltaics. Compliance shall be demonstrated using CEC-approved residential energy modeling software.</p> <p>▲ Multi-family residential buildings of three stories or less constructed within the net SAP area and the PRSP area shall be designed to achieve a 15 percent reduction in energy use compared to a standard 2016 Title 24 code-compliant building. Reductions in energy shall be achieved by following the energy efficiency performance standards set forth in Tier 1 of the 2016 California Green Building Standards Code, Action A4.203.1.2.1. These reductions shall be achieved by employing energy efficient design features and/or solar photovoltaics. Compliance shall be demonstrated using CEC-approved residential modeling software.</p> <p>▲ Commercial buildings (including multi-family residential structures four stories or higher) shall be designed to achieve a 10 percent or greater reduction in energy use compared to a standard 2016 Title 24 code-compliant building. Reductions in energy shall be achieved through energy efficiency measures consistent with Tier 1 of the 2016 California Green Building Standards Code, Section A5.203.1.2.1. Alternatively, this could be met by installing on-site renewable energy systems that achieve equivalent reductions in building energy use.</p> <p>▲ All project buildings shall be designed to include Cool Roofs in accordance with the requirements set forth in Tier 2 of the 2016 California Green Building Energy Code, Sections A4.106.5 and A5.106.11.2.</p>		

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures			Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable		
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ All project buildings shall comply with requirements for water efficiency and conservation as described in the 2016 California Green Building Standards Code, Divisions 4.3 and 5.3. ▲ Multiple electrical receptacles shall be included on the exterior of all non-residential buildings and accessible for purposes of charging or powering electric landscaping equipment and providing an alternative to using fossil fuel-powered generators. The electrical receptacles shall have an electric potential of 100 volts. There should be a minimum of one electrical receptacle on each side of the building and one receptacle every 100 linear feet around the perimeter of the building. This measure is consistent with SAP Policy NR-6.6, encourages installation of electric outlets to promote the use of electric landscape maintenance equipment. ▲ Ensure that all appliances and fixtures installed in buildings developed under the project are Energy Star®-certified if an Energy Star®-certified model of the appliance is available. Types of Energy Star®-certified appliances include boilers, ceiling fans, central and room air conditioners, clothes washers, compact fluorescent light bulbs, computer monitors, copiers, consumer electronics, dehumidifiers, dishwashers, external power adapters, furnaces, geothermal heat pumps, programmable thermostats, refrigerators and freezers, residential light fixtures, room air cleaners, transformers, televisions, vending machines, ventilating fans, and windows (EPA 2018). If EPA's Energy Star® program is discontinued and not replaced with a comparable certification program before appliances and fixtures are selected, then similar measures which exceed the 2016 California Green Building Standards Code may be used. <p>Mitigation Measure 4.7-2b: Purchase carbon offsets (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>The County will require project proponents of individual developments under the project to offset operational GHG emissions remaining after implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a. This mitigation measure is consistent with guidance recommended by PCAPCD and CARB (PCAPCD 2017:54, CARB 2017:152). This measure is also consistent with the State CEQA Guidelines, which recommend several options for mitigating GHG emissions. State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(C)(3) states that measures to mitigate the significant effects of GHG emissions may include “off-site measures, including offsets that are not otherwise required....”</p> <p>Project proponents shall implement an off-site GHG emissions reduction program or to pay GHG offset fees to compensate for the project’s emissions in excess of 1,100 MTCO₂e for a single year, or as determined feasible by the County and project proponents. The off-site program shall comply with approved protocols from California Air Pollution Control Officers Association’s (CAPCOA) GHG Rx program or CARB’s Cap & Trade Offset protocols. Alternatively, the project proponent can purchase local or California-only GHG mitigation credits through the CAPCOA GHG Rx program or ARB accredited offset project registry. At the time this EIR was written, the</p>			

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures		Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable	
					<p>average rate ranges from \$8 to \$35 per metric ton of CO₂e.</p> <p>The net SAP area would generate 373,896 MTCO₂e/year after implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a. The total GHG emission offset requirement would be 372,795 MT CO₂e for a period of one year. Based on the current average rate of \$12 per metric ton of CO₂e, the estimated payment to offset GHG emissions in excess of thresholds, for a period of one year, would equal \$5,120,190 (equivalent to \$0.66 per square foot for nonresidential and \$954 per residential unit).</p> <p>PRSP would generate 195,014 MTCO₂e/year after implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a. The total GHG emission offset requirement would be 193,914 MTCO₂e, or 27.14 MTCO₂e/year for each residential unit in the PRSP area. The estimated payment to offset GHG emissions in excess of thresholds, for a period of one year, would equal \$1,706,730 (equivalent to \$955 per residential unit). Detailed calculations for the Off-Site Mitigation Fee Program can be found in Appendix K.</p> <p>This condition shall be satisfied prior to the recordation of each Final Map.</p> <p>PCAPCD and CARB also recommend that lead agencies prioritize direct investments in GHG emission reductions near the project site to provide potential local air quality and economic co-benefits. For example, mPOWER is a local program in Placer County that provides financing to property owners for the installation of energy and water efficiency retrofits and renewable energy systems. Investing in mPOWER is consistent with the County’s General Plan Policy 2.G.5, as described above in Section 4.7.3, “Regulatory Setting.”</p> <p>Other examples of local direct investments include financing installation of regional electric vehicle–charging stations, paying for electrification of public school buses, and investing in local urban forests. However, it is critical that any such investments in actions to reduce GHG emissions are real and quantifiable, as determined by the County, PCAPCD, or a consultant selected by the County.</p> <p>Where development of a local offset is not feasible, the County will allow project proponents to mitigate GHG emissions through the purchase of local or California-only carbon credits issued through the CAPCOA GHG Rx program or CARB-accredited offset project registry.</p> <p>The GHG reductions achieved through an offset or through the purchase of a carbon credit must meet the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Real—They represent reductions actually achieved (not based on maximum permit levels). ▲ Additional/surplus—They are not already planned or required by regulation or policy (i.e., not

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
		double counted). ▲ Quantifiable —They are readily accounted for through process information and other reliable data. ▲ Enforceable —They are acquired through legally binding commitments/agreements. ▲ Validated —They are verified through the accurate means by a reliable third party. ▲ Permanent —They will remain as GHG reductions in perpetuity. Establishment of offsets or purchases of carbon credits to offset operational-generated GHG emissions should be made prior to recordation of each small lot final map, or approval of the first building permit when a small lot map is not required.		
<p>Impact 4.7-3: Impacts of climate change on the project area</p> <p>The project area is not located in an area projected to experience a substantial increase in wildland fire risk or flooding because of climate changes in the future. Further, water supply to land uses developed under the project would be adequate. Anticipated changes in future climate patterns are not anticipated to have any substantial adverse effects on the project area, and development under the project would neither violate nor conflict with policies and plans that would reduce the extent and severity of potential climate change-related effects. Therefore, the impacts of climate change on the project area would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS	
<p>4.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials</p>				
<p>Impact 4.8-1: Exposure to hazardous materials during construction</p> <p>Construction of residential, commercial, industrial, educational, and public facilities under the project would involve the use, storage, and transport of hazardous materials. All such hazardous materials and activities would be typical for such uses, and would occur in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations, which would minimize but not eliminate the potential for upset or accident conditions. A Phase I ESA has not yet been completed for the net SAP area or the other supporting infrastructure areas; therefore, unknown recognized environmental conditions could be encountered during construction. The impact to the public and the environment from exposure to these unknown hazardous materials and other hazards during construction would be potentially significant.</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.8-1a: Complete a Phase I ESA (Net SAP Area)</p> <p>A Phase I ESA shall be completed by project proponents of individual projects in the net SAP area. The Phase I ESA shall be performed in general conformance with the scope and limitations of ASTM E 1527-13 “Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments” and EPA “Standards and Practices for All Appropriate Inquires,” 40 CFR Part 312. If existing hazardous materials contamination is identified in the Phase I ESA, and the Phase I ESA recommends further review, the project proponent shall retain a Registered Environmental Assessor or other qualified professional to conduct follow-up sampling to characterize the contamination and to identify any require remediation that shall be conducted. These recommendations shall be implemented, and the site shall be deemed remediated by the appropriate agency (DTSC, Placer County Department of Environmental Health Services [PCDEHS]) or Placer County shall issue a No Further Action letter before earth disturbance in the vicinity of the contamination.</p>	SU	

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures			Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable		
			<p>Mitigation Measure 4.8-1b: Adhere to American Petroleum Institute and Transportation Research Board recommendations regarding setbacks from pipelines (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>Before issuance of grading permits or improvement plans, project proponents shall demonstrate that final site design adheres to pipeline setback recommendations from API and the Transportation Research Board when permitting projects. API recommends setbacks of 50 feet from petroleum and hazardous liquid lines for new homes, businesses, and places of public assembly. It also recommends 25 feet for garden sheds, septic tanks, and water wells, as well as 10 feet for mailboxes and yard lights (API 2011).</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.8-1c: Prepare and implement a construction hazardous materials management plan (Net SAP Area and Net PRSP Area)</p> <p>Before issuance of grading permits or improvement plans, a construction hazardous materials management plan shall be prepared by the project proponent or the project proponent's construction-manager/contractor for all future development projects and shall be incorporated into the construction and contract specifications for each project. The plan shall be reviewed and approved by PCDEHS before any project construction. The management plan shall include measures to reduce potential hazards to workers, the public, and the environment associated with use of hazardous materials and exposure to potentially contaminated soil during project construction. The management plan shall include provisions for agency notification, managing impacted materials, sampling and analytical requirements and disposal procedures. Specifically, the construction hazardous materials management plan shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ describe the necessary actions to be taken if evidence of contaminated soil or groundwater is encountered during construction; ▲ describe the types of evidence that could indicate potential hazardous materials contamination, such as soil discoloration, petroleum or chemical odors, or buried building materials; ▲ include measures to protect worker safety if signs of contamination are encountered; ▲ identify sampling and analysis protocols for various substances that might be encountered; ▲ list required regulatory agency contacts if contamination is found; ▲ include recommendations on soil management in the event that aerially deposited lead is discovered in existing road right-of-way; ▲ identify legal and regulatory processes and thresholds for cleanup of contamination; 			

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures			Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable		
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ include provisions for delineation, removal, and disposal of any contaminants identified as exceeding human health risk levels; and ▲ require that the project contractor follow all procedural direction given by PCDEHS to ensure that suspect soils are isolated, protected from runoff, and disposed of in accordance with Section 31303 of the California Vehicle Code and the requirements of the licensed receiving facility. <p>Mitigation Measure 4.8-1d: Complete a Phase I ESA (Other Supporting Infrastructure)</p> <p>The County shall coordinate with the City of Roseville, which has jurisdiction over the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility and off-site transportation and utility improvement areas, to verify one or more Phase I ESAs are completed for the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility and off-site transportation and utility improvement areas). The Phase I ESA should be performed in general conformance with the scope and limitations of ASTM E 1527-13, "Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments," and EPA's "Standards and Practices for All Appropriate Inquires," 40 CFR Part 312. If existing hazardous materials contamination is identified in the Phase I ESA, and the Phase I ESA recommends further review, the project proponent should retain a Registered Environmental Assessor or other qualified professional to conduct follow-up sampling to characterize the contamination and to identify any require remediation that should be conducted. These recommendations should be implemented, and the site should be deemed remediated by the appropriate agency (DTSC, PCDEHS) or the City of Roseville should issue a No Further Action letter before earth disturbance in the vicinity of the contamination.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.8-1e: Prepare and implement a construction hazardous materials management plan (Other Supporting Infrastructure)</p> <p>The County shall coordinate with the City of Roseville, which has jurisdiction over the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility and off-site transportation and utility improvement areas, to verify, before issuance of grading permits or improvement plans, that a construction hazardous materials management plan is prepared by the project proponent or the project proponent's construction manager/contractor for all future development projects and is incorporated into the construction and contract specifications for each project. The plan should be reviewed and approved by the appropriate City department before any project construction. The management plan should include measures to reduce potential hazards to workers, the public, and the environment associated with use of hazardous materials and exposure to potentially contaminated soil during project construction. The management plan should include provisions for agency notification, describe the proper procedure for managing affected materials, identify</p>			

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable	
			sampling and analytical requirements, and describe disposal procedures. Specifically, the construction hazardous materials management plan should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ describe the necessary actions to be taken if evidence of contaminated soil or groundwater is encountered during construction; ▲ describe the types of evidence that could indicate potential hazardous materials contamination, such as soil discoloration, petroleum or chemical odors, or buried building materials; ▲ include measures to protect worker safety if signs of contamination are encountered; ▲ identify sampling and analysis protocols for various substances that might be encountered; ▲ list required regulatory agency contacts if contamination is found; ▲ include recommendations on soil management in the event that aerially deposited lead is discovered in existing road right-of-way; ▲ identify legal and regulatory processes and thresholds for cleanup of contamination; ▲ include provisions for the delineation, removal, and disposal of any contaminants identified as exceeding human health risk levels; and ▲ require that the project contractor follow all procedural direction given by PCDEHS to ensure that suspect soils are isolated, protected from runoff, and disposed of in accordance with Section 31303 of the California Vehicle Code and the requirements of the licensed receiving facility. 	
Impact 4.8-2: Exposure to hazardous materials during operation During project operation, land uses would include the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous or potentially hazardous materials. General commercial and household hazardous materials are generally handled and transported in small quantities and would be required to comply with regulations covering the use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials and wastes. Any businesses that would store hazardous materials and/or waste at its business site would be required to submit business information and hazardous materials inventory forms contained in an Hazardous Materials Management Plan and Hazardous Materials Business Plan by the State of California Office of Emergency Services. With adherence to existing regulatory requirements, impacts related to routine use or disposal of hazardous materials would be minimized. Additionally, future discretionary projects in the net SAP area would be subject to environmental review in which any potential exposure to		PS	Mitigation Measure 4.8-2: Implement measures specified in CCR Title 27 to minimize intrusion of landfill gas into structures (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area) For any structure sited within 1,000 feet of the WRSL property boundary, the following measures specified in CCR Title 27 Section 21190(g) shall be included in the construction drawings and/or blueprints (as applicable) for review and approval by the County Health and Human Services Department: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ a geomembrane or equivalent system with low permeability to landfill gas shall be installed between the concrete floor slab of the building and subgrade; ▲ a permeable layer of open graded material of clean aggregate with a minimum thickness of 12 inches shall be installed between the geomembrane and the subgrade or slab; ▲ a geotextile filter shall be used to prevent the introduction of fines into the permeable layer; ▲ perforated venting pipes shall be installed within the permeable layer, and shall be designed 	LTS

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
<p>hazardous materials sites would be addressed in accordance with existing laws and regulations adopted to protect public and environmental health. However, if development were not setback appropriately from existing petroleum transmission lines, the impact could be potentially significant.</p>		<p>to operate without clogging;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ the venting pipe shall be constructed with the ability to be connected to an induced draft exhaust system; and ▲ automatic methane gas sensors shall be installed within the permeable gas layer, and inside the building to trigger an audible alarm when methane gas concentrations are detected. <p>In addition, the developer or building operator shall agree to hire a qualified specialist to conduct periodic methane gas monitoring (pursuant to CCR Section 20920 et. seq.) inside all buildings and underground utilities and submit results to the County Health and Human Services Department.</p> <p>The County Health and Human Services Department may require additional measures specified in Title 27 Section 21190(g), depending on the specific circumstances.</p>		
<p>Impact 4.8-3: Interfere with implementation of an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation area</p> <p>Placer County Office of Emergency Services serves as the Emergency Manager for the County. Placer County LHMP (2016) provides detailed and unified guidance for mitigating hazard events and ensures a coordinated response provided in cooperation with the County Sheriff, city police, and fire departments. As part of project operation, adequate emergency access routes to and from the development area would be established and emergency response would not be impaired. However, construction activities associated with project implementation would involve truck traffic and temporary lane/shoulder closures in work zones that could result in temporary lane closures on certain roads, increased traffic, and other roadway conditions that could interfere with or slow down emergency vehicle access and services. This could create a potentially significant impact with respect to the implementation of an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation area.</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.8-3a: Prepare and enforce a Construction Traffic Management Plan (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>Before construction of any project within the SAP area, the project proponent shall submit to the County for review and approval a Construction Traffic Management Plan to minimize traffic impacts on all roadways at and near the work site affected by construction activities. The plan shall include construction and public (if applicable) access points, procedures for notification of road closures, construction materials delivery plan, a description of emergency personnel access routes during road closures. This plan shall reduce potential traffic safety hazards and ensure adequate access for emergency responders.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.8-3b: Prepare and enforce a Construction Traffic Management Plan (Other Supporting Infrastructure)</p> <p>The County shall coordinate with the City of Roseville, which has jurisdiction over the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility and off-site transportation and utility improvement areas, to verify, before construction of any project in the other supporting infrastructure areas (Pleasant Grove Retention Facility and off-site transportation and utility improvement areas), that the project proponent submits to the City for review and approval a Construction Traffic Management Plan to minimize traffic impacts on all roadways at and near the work site affected by construction activities. The plan should include construction and public (if applicable) access points, procedures for notification of road closures, construction materials delivery plan, a description of emergency personnel access routes during road closures. This plan should reduce potential traffic safety hazards and ensure adequate access for emergency responders.</p>	SU	

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures			Significance after Mitigation
		NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	
<p>Impact 4.8-4: Wildland fire risk</p> <p>The project area is composed mostly of grasslands and agricultural land which is designated as a moderate wildland fire hazard or are within local responsibility areas (CAL FIRE 2007). The implementation of the project would convert these areas to primarily urban uses, which would result in an increased number of residents, employees, and visitors to the project area, and thus the number of people exposed to moderate wildland fire hazard. Future development resulting from implementation of the project would be required to comply with existing local and state regulations for fire protection. Development would be constructed and maintained in compliance with local and state regulations for fire protection, including the use of fire-resistant building materials, fire-resistant landscaping, defensible space, adequate water supply, and emergency access. The impact related to exposure of people or structures to wildland fire hazards would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.			LTS
<p>Impact 4.8-5: Exposure of school sites to hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of a proposed school</p> <p>There are no existing or proposed schools located within the net SAP area, but there are two schools proposed within the PRSP area. The proposed elementary and middle schools are located on the west side of the area in the proposed University Creek Neighborhood. Additionally, the 300-acre Sac State-Placer Center is proposed in the PRSP area. There are no known hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of the proposed elementary and middle schools. A high-voltage line crosses the PRSP area directly through the proposed Sac State-Placer Center site; however, the according to the PRSP Land Use Plan, the property lines of proposed school sites would be greater than 150 feet from the 230-kV line. This impact is less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.			LTS
<p>Impact 4.8-6: Vector-related health hazards</p> <p>The project area has the potential to contain areas of standing water during construction and during operation of the area plans. Potential areas of standing water include stream channels, ditches, swales, canals, drainageways, retention, and detention facilities which could provide habitat for vector populations. Project implementation could potentially increase the number of people exposed to vector-borne diseases carried by mosquitoes breeding in these areas of standing water. An</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.8-6a: Vector control during construction and operation (Net SAP and PRSP Areas)</p> <p>During construction, all grading shall be performed by contractors in a manner to prevent the occurrence of standing water or other areas suitable for breeding of mosquitoes and other vectors. The Placer Mosquito and Vector Control District shall be granted access to perform vector control both during construction and operation of the SAP and PRSP. This includes ongoing access to all common areas including drainages, open space corridors, and park areas. As part of the access</p>			SU

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable	
increased risk of health hazards from vector-borne diseases would be potentially significant.		agreement with Placer Mosquito and Vector Control District, the County shall require that the district use appropriate vector control methods in biologically sensitive areas to minimize any potential adverse effects to sensitive wildlife and plant species or their habitat. Mitigation Measure 4.8-6b: Vector control during construction and operation (Other Supporting Infrastructure) The County shall coordinate with the City of Roseville, which has jurisdiction over the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility and off-site transportation and utility improvement areas, to verify during construction that all grading is performed by contractors in a manner to prevent the occurrence of standing water or other areas suitable for breeding of mosquitoes and other vectors. The Placer Mosquito and Vector Control District should be granted access to perform vector control both during construction and operation of the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility. As part of the access agreement with Placer Mosquito and Vector Control District, the City should require that the district use appropriate vector control methods in biologically sensitive areas to minimize any potential adverse effects on sensitive wildlife and plant species or their habitat.	
Cumulative Impact 4.8-7: Cumulative impacts related to increased exposure to hazards or hazardous materials	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.9 Hydrology and Water Quality			
Impact 4.9-1: Increased stormwater runoff and potential for downstream flooding Implementation of the project would increase impervious surfaces in the project area, which could subsequently increase stormwater runoff volumes and velocities, exceed capacity of existing drainageways, and create downstream flooding. The protective SAP policies and Placer County permit conditions would require any future development within the SAP area to implement LID and stormwater management measures to reduce stormwater runoff such that peak runoff flow rates are reduced to less than their predevelopment levels for the 2-year through 100-year storm events; stormwater runoff is infiltrated, evapotranspired, and/or captured and used on-site in accordance with LID designs standards to reduce site runoff for smaller storm events into municipal systems; and increases in volumetric runoff would be retained to prevent increased downstream flooding. Additionally, the SAP storm drain system would be designed to accommodate buildout stormwater conveyance, so that new development within the SAP area would not generate runoff that exceeds the capacity of the system's ability to handle. Modeling and analysis indicate that	S	Mitigation Measure 4.9-1a: Submit final drainage report (Net SAP Area and PRSP Areas) As part of the improvement plan submittal process, the preliminary drainage report provided during environmental review shall be 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 text addressing existing conditions, the effects of the proposed improvements, all appropriate calculations, changes in flows and patterns, and proposed on- and off-site improvements and drainage easements to accommodate flows from this project, as well as watershed maps. The report shall identify permanent water quality protection features and methods to be used during construction as well as long-term postconstruction 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 when the report is submitted.	SU

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable	
<p>compliance with these policies is achievable and feasible. However, either the City of Roseville or a City of Roseville / Placer County JPA would be the project proponent and CEQA lead agency for implementation of the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility. Because the County could not enforce implementation of this off-site retention project, this impact would be significant.</p>		<p>Mitigation Measure 4.9-1b: Design, construct, and maintain retention and detention facilities or pay retention mitigation fees (Net SAP Area and PRSP Areas)</p> <p>The improvement plan submittal and final drainage report shall provide details on how to achieve the following requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Stormwater run-off peak flows shall be reduced to obtain an objective post-project mitigated peak flow that is equal to the estimated preproject peak flow, less 10 percent of the difference, through the installation of detention facilities. <p>and,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Stormwater volumetric increases shall be mitigated to retain the increase for the 100-year, 8-day design storm, depth of 10.75 inches at elevation of 200- feet, unless another methodology has been agreed upon by Placer County. The project proponent shall either provide permanent on-site retention or participate in a regional stormwater retention program, if established by the County, by paying retention mitigation fees, as deemed appropriate, to mitigate the project's increases to stormwater volume. If interim retention facilities are constructed within the PRSP and net SAP areas on parcels zoned for development, the development project would also be subject to payment of the retention fee, in order to fund construction of the ultimate regional retention facility. <p>Retention and detention facilities shall be designed in accordance with the requirements of the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual and/or City of Roseville standards that are in effect at the time of submittal, and to the satisfaction of the Engineering and Surveying Division, and shall be shown in the improvement plans. No retention/detention facility construction shall be permitted within any identified wetlands area, floodplain, or right-of-way, except as authorized by project approvals.</p>	
<p>Impact 4.9-2: Groundwater depletion and recharge</p> <p>The project would be served predominantly by surface water resources. Groundwater wells within the SAP area would be used only during emergency and single dry-year situations, and their operation would meet the management objectives of the WPCGMP, including monitoring to ensure that water levels in adjacent wells are not affected. Additionally, the potential impact on groundwater recharge resulting from the increase in the extent of impervious surfaces would be minimized by the incorporation of LID measures that allow infiltration of stormwater on-site. For these reasons, implementing the project would have a less-than-significant impact with regard to groundwater depletion and recharge.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
<p>Impact 4.9-3: Construction-related water quality impacts</p> <p>Construction activities required to implement the project could degrade the quality of stormwater flows and potentially degrade downstream surface water quality. Grading, excavation, and accidental spills of construction-related hazardous substances could degrade surface water quality downstream of the project area. However, the SAP would protect water quality by establishing preserve and open space areas around streams and sensitive habitats. In addition, all future projects constructed through the project would be required to install erosion and sediment controls; implement and maintain temporary construction BMPs to control and properly manage site runoff; and waste control measures to prevent leakage or spill of hazardous materials into soils and surface waters. If properly implemented, these existing protective policies and regulations would reduce the potential for construction activities to adversely affect water quality. However, a lack of enforcement or poor implementation of water quality protections could result in water quality degradation. However, at this stage of planning, the detailed site-specific BMPs have not been developed, and the County conservatively determines this impact to be potentially significant.</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.9-3a: Place staging areas away from dwellings and resources (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>The improvement plans shall identify the stockpiling and/or vehicle staging areas with locations as far as practical from existing dwellings and protected resources in the net SAP and PRSP areas. The locations of stockpiling and/or staging areas shall be reviewed and approved by the County prior to initiating construction.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.9-3b: Place staging areas away from dwellings and resources (Other Supporting Infrastructure)</p> <p>The County shall work with the project proponent to coordinate with the City of Roseville to make sure that stockpiling and/or vehicle staging, as identified on improvement plans, is located as far as practical from existing dwellings and protected areas, and that the locations are consistent with City of Roseville standards.</p>	SU	
<p>Impact 4.9-4: Water quality impacts from urban land uses</p> <p>Contaminants generated by urban development within the project area could be carried in stormwater runoff and could reach surface waters and degrade water quality. However, future projects within the project area would be required to comply with CVRWQCB, Placer County, and proposed SAP regulations, and permit conditions and would implement LID measures and stormwater BMPs to prevent urban pollutants from being carried into surface waters. Additional protections would be required for industrial projects. If properly implemented, these existing protections would reduce the potential for urban development within the project area to create a substantial adverse impact on water quality. However, at this stage of planning, the detailed site-specific BMPs have not been developed, and the County conservatively determines this impact to be potentially significant.</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.9-4a: Provide evidence of Waste Discharge Identification number (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>Before construction begins, the project proponent shall provide evidence to the Placer County ESD of a Waste Discharge Identification number generated from SWRCB's Stormwater Multiple Application and Report Tracking System. This document will serve as the RWQCB approval or permit under the NPDES construction stormwater quality permit.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.9-4b: Design project to meet source control requirements of MS4 Permit (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>The project is located in the permit area covered by Placer County's Small Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit (SWRCB NPDES), pursuant to the NPDES Phase II program. Project-related stormwater discharges are subject to all applicable requirements of the MS4 Permit.</p> <p>The project proponent shall implement permanent and operational source control measures as applicable. Source control measures shall be designed for pollutant-generating activities or sources consistent with recommendations from the California Stormwater Quality Association's <i>Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbook: New Development and Redevelopment</i>, or</p>	SU	

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable	
			<p>an equivalent manual, and shall be shown on the improvement plans.</p> <p>The project is also shall implement LID standards designed to reduce runoff, treat stormwater, and provide baseline hydromodification management as outlined in the <i>West Placer Storm Water Quality Design Manual</i>.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.9-4c: Design project to meet impervious surface and flow requirements of MS4 Permit (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>In accordance with the NPDES Phase II MS4 Permit, the project is a Regulated Project that creates and/or replaces 5,000 square feet or more of impervious surface. The project proponent shall submit a final SWQP either within the final drainage report or as a separate document that identifies how this project would meet the Phase II MS4 permit obligations. Site design measures, source control measures, and LID standards, as necessary, shall be incorporated into the design and shown in the improvement plans.</p> <p>In addition, in accordance with the Phase II MS4 permit, projects creating and/or replacing 1 acre or more of impervious surface (excepting projects that do not increase the extent of impervious surface area over the preproject condition) are also required to demonstrate hydromodification management of stormwater such that the amount of postproject runoff is kept to equal to or below preproject 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 postproject flows that mimic preproject conditions.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.9-4d: Design off-site transportation and utility improvements to meet source control and impervious surface requirements (Off-site Transportation and Utility Improvements)</p> <p>The County shall work with the project proponent to coordinate with the City of Roseville to verify that design of off-site transportation and utility improvements meet NPDES Phase II MS4 permit requirements, as well as any additional City of Roseville standards for protecting water quality during project operation.</p>	
<p>Impact 4.9-5: Development within 100-year floodplains</p> <p>The project area contains low-lying regions that are within the 100-year flood zone of Pleasant Grove, University, Auburn Ravine, and Orchard Creeks. Placer County regulatory protections and proposed SAP policies would effectively prohibit the placement of habitable structures within the 100-year floodplain. However, at this stage of planning, the details of these protections have not been developed, and the County conservatively determines this impact to be potentially significant.</p>		PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.9-5a: Delineate 100-year floodplain on subdivision maps (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>The improvement plans and informational sheet(s) filed with the appropriate small lot final subdivision map(s) shall show the limits of the future, unmitigated, fully developed 100-year floodplain (after grading) for University Creek and its tributaries and designate the limits as a building setback line.</p>	LTS

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
			<p>Mitigation Measure 4.9-5b: Demonstrate that all building pad elevations are a minimum of 2 feet above the 100-year floodplain line (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>The improvement plans and informational sheet(s) filed with the appropriate small lot final subdivision map(s) shall show finished building pad elevations to be a minimum of 2 feet above the 100-year floodplain line (or finished floor 3 feet above the 100-year floodplain line). The final pad certification letter shall be certified by a California registered civil engineer or licensed land surveyor and submitted to the Placer County ESD. This certification shall be done before construction of the foundation or at the completion of final grading, whichever comes first. No construction is allowed until the certification has been received by ESD and approved by the floodplain manager. Benchmark elevation and location shall be shown on the improvement plans and informational sheet(s) to the satisfaction of Development Review Committee.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.9-5c: Prohibit grading within the 100-year floodplain (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>No grading activities of any kind may take place within the 100-year floodplain of the stream/drainageway unless approved and analyzed as part of this project. All work shall conform to provisions of the County Flood Damage Prevention Regulations (Section 15.52, Placer County Code). The location of the 100-year floodplain shall be shown on the Improvement Plans.</p> <p>Prior to Improvement Plan approval and if required by the County Floodplain Administrator, the project proponent shall obtain from FEMA, a Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) or Conditional Letter of Map Revision based on Fill (CLOMR-F) for fill within a Special Flood Hazard Area. A copy of the letter shall be provided to the Engineering and Surveying Division prior to approval of Improvement Plans. A Letter of Map Revision (LOMR), or a Letter of Map Revision based on Fill (LOMR-F) from FEMA shall be provided to the Engineering and Surveying Division prior to acceptance of project improvements as complete.</p>	
Cumulative Impact 4.9-6: Cumulative increases in stormwater runoff and potential for downstream flooding		LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Cumulative Impact 4.9-7: Cumulative groundwater depletion and recharge		LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Cumulative Impact 4.9-8: Cumulative construction-related water quality impacts		LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Cumulative Impact 4.9-9: Cumulative water quality impacts from urban land uses		LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Cumulative Impact 4.9-10: Cumulative development within 100-year floodplains		LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
4.10 Land Use				
<p>Impact 4.10-1: Consistency and compatibility with existing and planned development</p> <p>Implementation of the SAP, including the PRSP, would convert, over buildout of the project, an 8,500-acre expanse of largely undeveloped land to urban uses, including residential, commercial, industrial, and educational uses. The plan would also include large expanses of open space, parks, and recreation facilities. While the future urban character of the project area would be less compatible with adjacent agricultural uses to the west, General-Plan-required buffers would be maintained in that area, and proposed uses would be consistent with the land uses, visual quality, and urban character of the cities of Roseville to the south, Rocklin to the east, and Lincoln to the north. Further, the project would be consistent with land use trends in the region, including the Amoruso Ranch project, the Creekview Specific Plan, the West Roseville Specific Plan, and Lincoln Village 7 Specific Plan and, therefore, the characterization of the area as a developing community in the MTP/SCS. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS	
<p>Impact 4.10-2: Consistency and compatibility with the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill</p> <p>The proposed project includes an amendment to the County General Plan Policy 4.G.11, which would reduce the buffer around the WRSL from 1 mile (5,280 feet) to 2,000 feet for residential development, or 1,000 feet with the approval of a specific plan, master plan, or development agreement. This proposed General Plan amendment could result in land use incompatibility due to residential development occurring closer to the WRSL in areas that would otherwise remain undeveloped under the current residential buffer policy. Based on review of existing data regarding nuisance complaints from residents beyond 1 mile, it is expected that new residents and users within the project area would complain about odor from the WRSL and that the number of complaints lodged about nuisance odors would increase. Such complaints could create pressure for the Western Placer Waste Management Authority (WPWMA) to implement additional odor control and reduction measures at the WRSL and, absent measures to control odors at the source and/or at receptors, could interfere with the ability of the landfill to expand or modify needed operations. Impacts relative to consistency and compatibility of proposed land uses with the WRSL would be potentially significant.</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.10-2: Require odor control measures for specific plans (PRSP Area and Net SAP Area)</p> <p>Placer County shall require that project proponents include, as part of proposed specific plans, master plans, or development agreements, measures that would improve land use compatibility with the WRSL by reducing land use conflicts related to undesirable odor from the WRSL. Measures that can be included in specific plans, master plans, or development agreements include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Building Design <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Locate air intake on the side of the building that is most-distant from the WRSL. ➤ Require a level of air filtration that exceeds Title 24 standards. ➤ Overall site orientation ▲ Landscape Design <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Require a landscape buffer zone on all land uses adjacent to the WRSL. ➤ Install sound walls or other solid vertical structures between residences and WRSL. ▲ Deed Notification <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Require written disclosures to initial and subsequent prospective buyers, lessees, and 	SU	

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
		renters of those properties, particularly residential buyers, with information that their respective properties would potentially be subject to objectionable odors from a known nearby odor source. While this specific action would not eliminate complaints, it may reduce the frequency of complaints by those living or working closest to the landfill. The County shall verify that these measures have been incorporated into proposed specific plans, master plans, or development agreements in order to reduce to the degree feasible the potential for land use incompatibility.		
Impact 4.10-3: Physical division of an established community Implementation of the SAP, including the PRSP, would result in development in an area with little existing development, which is primarily industrial and is not considered a part of an established community. Implementation of the project would not physically divide an established community and would improve access between existing communities. There would be no impact.	NI	No mitigation is required.	NI	
Impact 4.10-4: Economic or social changes resulting in physical environmental changes The project would not result in an oversupply of any land uses within the market. Demand would support additional retail space developed as part of the proposed project. When considering other planned development, there also would be no oversupply, as retail would be phased in to the project in response to adequate market demand. Other factors, such as possible building repurposing, would also prevent blight if business closures occur. The project would have no impact with regard to adverse economic or social change.	NI	No mitigation is required.	NI	
Cumulative Impact 4.10-5: Cumulative consistency and compatibility	NI	No mitigation is required.	NI	
Cumulative Impact 4.10-6: Cumulative consistency and compatibility with the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill	NI	No mitigation is required.	NI	
Cumulative Impact 4.10-7: Contribution to physical division of an established community	NI	No mitigation is required.	NI	
Cumulative Impact 4.10-8: Cumulative economic or social changes resulting in physical environmental changes	NI	No mitigation is required.	NI	

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
4.11 Noise				
<p>Impact 4.11-1: Exposure of existing sensitive receptors to construction noise</p> <p>Buildout of the PRSP area is assumed to occur mostly within 20 years whereas full buildout of the net SAP area could take place over the next 80 years. Therefore, various levels of construction could occur throughout the net SAP area at any given time. Construction activities would include site preparation, road improvements, utility infrastructure installation, and building construction. While specific construction intensity, duration, and locations is not known at this time, reference noise levels for typical construction activities associated with land development were used to assess peak construction noise. Based on those reference levels, construction noise could reach levels of up to 90.5 dBA L_{eq} and 96.6 dBA L_{max}. In addition, some construction work, such as utility installation and roadway improvements may occur during nighttime hours, as is typical with this type of construction, to reduce traffic impacts, and, therefore, could expose existing and future sensitive receptors to noise levels that may disrupt sleep and exceed Placer County nighttime noise limits of 45 dBA L_{eq} and 65 dBA L_{max}. Thus, construction activities could result in a substantial (i.e., 5 dB) temporary and periodic increase in noise during daytime or nighttime hours at existing and future sensitive land uses. This impact would be potentially significant.</p>		PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.11-1: Implement construction-noise reduction measures for daytime or nighttime construction (Other Supporting Infrastructure)</p> <p>The County shall coordinate with the City of Roseville to ensure that construction activities that will take place in the vicinity of sensitive land uses (i.e., places where people sleep, reside, or work), comply with the appropriate noise reduction measures, such that noise levels do not exceed City of Roseville noise standards. Appropriate noise-reducing measures shall be determined at the time of grading/improvement plan submittal and may include, but not be limited to, specific measures included in SAP Program N-4. Implementation of noise-reducing measures would be the responsibility of the project construction manager or contractor.</p>	SU
<p>Impact 4.11-2: Exposure of sensitive receptors to construction and operational vibration</p> <p>Potential vibration impacts could occur when project-related construction activities are close (i.e., within 550 feet) to existing or future planned sensitive land uses. It is unknown at this time where specific pile-driving activities would be required and to what extent they would occur. Therefore, it is possible that pile-driving and other vibration-inducing construction activities could occur near sensitive land uses. Specifically, the potential exists for pile driving to occur within 100 feet of a structure, exceeding Caltrans recommended levels for structural damage (i.e., 0.2 in/sec PPV), and within 550 feet of a sensitive land use, exceeding FTA recommended levels for vibration annoyance (i.e., 72 VdB). SAP Program N-5 requires a vibration control plan for pile-driving activities near structures and identifies several vibration control measures, including setbacks, monitoring, alternative methods of installing piles, predrilling pile holes, limiting hours, etc. Implementing SAP Program N-5 would minimize construction-related vibration effects. Development occurring within the net</p>		LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable	
<p>SAP area could result in the placement of new sensitive land uses close (i.e., within 350 feet) to the existing UPRR tracks on the eastern portion of the net SAP area, exposing new sensitive receptors to levels that exceed FTA-recommended vibration levels of 65 VdB for infrequent events, such as passing trains on the UPRR tracks. However, SAP Policy N-1.8 Rail Operations Vibration Exposure would require a site-specific vibration assessment to ensure all new development in proximity to the existing rail line would not be exposed to excessive vibration levels. Impacts related to vibration would be less than significant.</p>			
<p>Impact 4.11-3: Exposure of existing sensitive receptors to new stationary noise sources The project would result in the development of various land uses (e.g., residential, lodging, entertainment, commercial, office, industrial, retail, and university). Noise sources associated with these land uses include mechanical equipment, such as HVAC units, backup emergency generators, vehicular and human activity in parking lots, loading dock and delivery activities at commercial/retail land uses, amplified sound, activities at outdoor recreational land uses, and new electric transmission lines and substations. New substations and entertainment land uses would not be located within distances that could expose existing sensitive receptors to excessive noise levels. However, exact locations, building footprints, and building orientation have not been identified; therefore, it is unknown specifically where other future stationary noise sources may be located. Considering the relatively large scale of potential development, it is possible that new stationary noise sources would result in excessive noise levels at existing sensitive receptors and exceed applicable Placer County and SAP noise standards. Proposed SAP Policy N-1.6 Exposure to Existing Sensitive Receptors provides distance setback recommendations for new stationary sources locating near sensitive land uses. SAP Program N-3 implements Policy N-1.6 by providing specific siting requirements and noise reduction features for stationary noise sources to comply with County noise standards. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>Impact 4.11-4: Exposure of new sensitive receptors to existing and new stationary noise sources Buildout of the project area would result in development of various land uses and associated stationary sources, including mechanical equipment such as HVAC units and backup generators, vehicular and human activity in parking lots, loading dock</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.11-4a: Conduct site-specific noise study (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area) To prevent future sensitive land uses from disturbance during the sensitive times of the day, project proponents of a residential land use or a structure containing residential units shall, before approval of small-lot tentative maps, provide to the County a site-specific noise study prepared by a qualified acoustical engineer addressing interior and exterior noise levels at sensitive land uses.</p>	LTS

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures			Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable		
<p>and delivery activities at commercial/retail land uses, amplified sound associated with entertainment land uses, and noise associated with transmission lines and substations. Because of the nature of mixed-use development, and the wide range of development density proposed, new sensitive land uses may be located adjacent or within distances to these noise sources that could result in exceedances of 24-hour L_{dn}/CNEL noise standards for various land uses, or noise limits established for sensitive receptors. Further, new residential land uses proposed within the PRSP area may be exposed to excessive noise from the existing RPP2. This impact would be potentially significant.</p>			<p>The noise study shall consider the types of land uses being proposed in the same building or in the vicinity as the residential units in a mixed-use structure and existing noise sources adjacent to the proposed structure. The noise study shall confirm, using approved calculation methodologies, that building design and materials are sufficient to maintain a maximum 45 dB L_{dn}/CNEL interior noise level, with windows closed, in residential units given the reasonably foreseeable noise generation sources within the building, and existing noise sources adjacent to the building. If the study shows such standards would not be met with the design as proposed, the project proponent shall implement recommendations of the study that are shown to achieve the standards.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.11-4b: Reduce exposure to new sensitive land uses from the existing Roseville Power Plant 2 (PRSP Area)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Before approval of small-lot tentative maps, the project proponent shall demonstrate that the building occupants of new residential or other sensitive land use within the PRSP area are not exposed to noise levels from the RPP2 that exceed Placer County land use compatibility standards (e.g., 60 dBA L_{dn}/CNEL for residential uses), daytime and nighttime noise limits for sensitive receptors (i.e., 45 dBA L_{eq}/65 dBA L_{max} [night], 55 dBA L_{eq} /70 dBA L_{max} [day]). ▲ If achievement of the Placer County noise standards cannot be met by providing adequate setback of at least 590 feet from the RPP2 (i.e., distance at which nighttime L_{eq} standard is met), then the County shall require a sound wall be constructed between the existing RPP2 and any new sensitive receptors. The sound wall shall be designed by an acoustical engineer and constructed and placed in a manner that achieves, at a minimum, a 5 dB reduction in sound. 			
<p>Impact 4.11-5: Exposure of new and existing sensitive receptors to project-generated transportation noise</p> <p>Development of the project area would result in new and expanded roadways to serve future development as well as long-term traffic and associated noise increases on affected roadways. Existing residential development within the City of Roseville located to the south of the net SAP and PRSP area boundary would be exposed to substantial increases in traffic noise levels that exceed maximum allowable City of Roseville residential noise standards of 60 dBA L_{dn}/CNEL. Future development would result in the construction of new sensitive land uses (e.g., houses, schools, churches, hospitals) that could be located close to existing or future planned roads that would generate traffic noise levels that exceed applicable maximum allowable noise standards for various land uses. In addition, new land use development could occur near the existing UPRR tracks, exposing these new receptors to noise levels that</p>		PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.11-5a: Reduce noise levels associated with new, expanded, or extended roads (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>Before finalizing roadway design for roadway expansion or new roadway construction, a design-level acoustical study shall be prepared to identify specific roadway design considerations, which shall be incorporated into final road design and approved by Placer County for roadways that result in a substantial increase in noise identified by Tables 4.11-12, 4.11-13, and 4.11-14. Roadway segments outside of Placer County are excluded (Fiddymont Road extension, Foothills Boulevard extension, and Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard extension). The following design features shall be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Roadway design shall provide sufficient setback between occupied structures that are defined as sensitive land uses by Placer County (or planned future sensitive land uses) and the roadway to minimize noise exposure to the extent feasible. ▲ In locations where setback is not feasible to reduce noise levels at existing or planned future 			SU

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures			Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable		
<p>exceed applicable noise standards. This impact would be potentially significant.</p>			<p>sensitive receptors, roadway design shall incorporate quiet pavement types such as rubberized concrete achieving at least a 4-dB decrease in traffic noise where feasible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Where existing sensitive receptors are located such that neither setback, nor quiet pavement, can reduce traffic noise from new or expanded roads associated with the project, the County shall coordinate with property owners of the existing residences regarding installation of sound walls along property lines to minimize traffic noise to meet exterior noise standards (city or County, as applicable) and, if necessary to meet the 45-dBA interior noise standards, upgrading windows that face the new or extended roadway. <p>Mitigation Measure 4.11-5b: Reduce noise levels associated with new, expanded, or extended roads (Other Supporting Infrastructure)</p> <p>The County shall coordinate with the City of Roseville to ensure that, for new roadways or roadway expansions that would result in substantial increases in noise (i.e., 5 dB or more), a design-level acoustical study is conducted and available design measures are incorporated to reduce noise impacts at sensitive receptors. Roadways that would result in substantial increases in noise include Fiddymment Road, Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard, and Foothills Boulevard extensions. Specific design considerations may include those specified in Mitigation Measure 4.11-5b.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.11-5c: Reduce transportation noise levels within the PRSP area (PRSP Area)</p> <p>Before approval of small-hot tentative maps, the project proponent shall conduct a design-level acoustic study for noise-sensitive land uses within the noise contours identified below in Table 4.11-15 and Exhibit 4.11-3, and 3,625 feet from the UPRR tracks. The noise study shall provide recommendations to ensure that specific site design and building placement do not exceed the exterior noise standards (identified in Table 4.11-15 for each applicable land use) and the 45 dBA L_{dn}/CNEL interior noise standard. Recommendations shall include, but shall not be limited to, the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Noise-sensitive outdoor use areas (e.g., backyards, common areas, outdoor dining, playgrounds) shall be located as far away from adjacent roadways and/or railroad tracks as possible and buildings shall be oriented to shield noise-sensitive spaces whenever possible. ▲ If noise standards cannot feasibly be met through site design measures identified above, noise barriers shall be placed between the transportation noise source and the receptor. Noise barriers shall be constructed of concrete cinderblock (or other solid material of similar density), shall be designed consistent with PRSP design guidelines, and shall completely block line-of-sight between the noise source and receptor such that traffic noise levels are reduced by up to 10 dB. 			

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures			Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable	

Table 4.11-15 Distance from Roadway Centerline to Relevant Noise Contours

(ID) Road Name	From	To	ADT	L _{dn} /CNEL @ 100 Feet	Distance to Contour (L _{dn} /CNEL)			
					75 dBA (Park, Playground, Golf Course)	70 dBA (Restaurant w/ Outdoor Seating)	65 dBA (Hotel, Motel, Child/Adult Day Care, Church)	60 dBA (Residential)
(184) Foothills Blvd	Athens Ave	Sunset Blvd	18,300	67.4	19	42	90	194
(300) Foothills Blvd	Placer Parkway	Campus Park Blvd	15,500	67.1	17	37	81	174
(303) Foothills Blvd	Campus Park Blvd	Sunset Blvd	22,200	67.0	22	48	104	223
(304) Sunset Blvd	Foothills Blvd	Industrial Ave	28,000	68.5	26	56	120	258
(305) Campus Park Dr	Foothills Blvd	East	8,800	64.6	12	26	55	119
(306) Campus Park Dr	Foothills Blvd	University Village Dr	12,800	65.3	15	33	71	154
(307) University Village Dr	Campus Park Blvd	Sunset Blvd	18,500	66.9	20	42	91	197
(308) University Village Dr	Sunset Blvd	Foothills Blvd	2,100	58.4	5	10	21	46
(309) Sunset Blvd	University Village Dr	College Park Dr	26,200	68.5	25	53	115	248
(310) Sunset Blvd	Foothills Blvd	University Village Dr	17,600	66.7	19	41	88	190
(311) Foothills Blvd	Sunset Blvd	University Village Dr	9,100	63.1	12	27	57	123
(312) Foothills Blvd	University Village Dr	College Park Dr	7,200	62.1	11	23	49	105
(314) College Park Dr	Foothills Blvd	Westbrook Blvd	15,300	66.1	17	37	80	173
(315) Woodcreek Oaks Blvd	College Park Dr	Northpark Dr	36,400	69.9	31	67	143	309
(316) College Park Dr	Sunset Blvd	Woodcreek Oaks Blvd	24,200	68.1	24	51	109	235

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures								Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable							
			(317) Campus Park Dr	Fiddymnt Rd	Foothills Blvd	21,100	67.5	21	46	100	215
			(318) Sunset Blvd	Fiddymnt Rd	College Park Dr	17,300	66.7	19	41	87	188
			(319) Fiddymnt Rd	Placer Pkwy	Campus Park Blvd	20,900	66.7	21	46	99	214
			(320) Fiddymnt Rd	Campus Park Blvd	Sunset Blvd	44,900	70.0	36	77	166	357
			(321) Fiddymnt Rd	Sunset Blvd	Settlers Ridge Dr	53,000	70.8	40	86	185	398
			(324) Campus Park Dr	Fiddymnt Rd	Maple Park Dr	21,000	67.5	21	46	99	214
			(325) Sunset Blvd	Fiddymnt Rd	Maple Park Dr	8,100	64.2	11	24	52	113
			(326) Maple Park Dr	Campus Park Blvd	Sunset Blvd	7,900	64.1	11	24	52	111
			(327) Campus Park Dr	Maple Creek Cir	C St	3,800	61.0	7	15	32	68
			(328) Sunset Blvd	Maple Creek Cir	C St	4,500	61.7	8	16	35	76
			(329) C St	Campus Park Blvd	Sunset Blvd	1,100	55.6	3	6	14	30
			(330) Campus Park Dr	C St	B St	3,800	61.0	7	15	32	68
			(331) Sunset Blvd	C St	B St	2,800	59.6	6	12	26	56
			(332) Campus Park Dr	B St	A St	1,000	55.2	3	6	13	28
			(333) Sunset	B St	A St	2,800	59.6	6	12	26	56
Notes: ADT= Average Daily Trips; L _{dn} = day-night noise level; CNEL= community equivalent noise level; dBA= A-weighted decibel Source: Modeled by Ascent Environmental 2017											
Cumulative Impact 4.11-6: Cumulative short-term construction noise		SU	No mitigation is available.								SU
Cumulative Impact 4.11-7: Cumulative vibration		LTS	No mitigation is required.								LTS
Cumulative Impact 4.11-8: Cumulative long-term operational noise (stationary and transportation)		S	Implement Mitigation Measures 4.11-5a and 4.11-5b.								SU

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
4.12 Population, Employment, and Housing				
<p>Impact 4.12-1: Population growth from new homes and businesses</p> <p>Buildout of the net SAP and PRSP areas would result in 8,094 new dwelling units for a population growth of 19,314 new residents. Additionally, buildout of the net SAP and PRSP areas would generate 55,760 new jobs in the project area. The physical effects resulting from this level of population and employment growth (e.g., traffic generation, air pollutant and GHG emissions, noise, demand for services, construction of utilities and infrastructure) would be substantial. This impact would be significant.</p>	S	No mitigation is available.	SU	
<p>Impact 4.12-2: Consistency with applicable general plan policies</p> <p>The project is consistent with the policies of the Placer County General Plan relating to population, employment, and housing. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS	
<p>Impact 4.12-3: Cumulative population growth from new homes and businesses</p>	SU	No mitigation is available.	SU	
4.13 Public Services				
<p>Impact 4.13-1: Increased demand for fire protection and emergency response services</p> <p>Development proposed in the net SAP and PRSP areas would generate approximately 6,095 and 13,219 residents, respectively, and up to 30,000 students and associated faculty and staff. In addition, up to 5,000 on-site student housing units and 200 on-site faculty/staff housing units may be provided. Demand for fire protection and emergency response services provided by Placer County Fire at Station #77 would increase, including an increase in demand for additional firefighters, staff. Table 4.13-5 describes County staffing ratios for fire protection personnel needed to serve the Net SAP and PRSP. Staffing at the existing Station 77 may not meet the required service levels, and therefore this impact is potentially significant. New development would be annexed into CFD No. 2012-1, or a new CFD (or other funding mechanism as approved by the County for new development to pay its fair share for increased fire protection and emergency services through a special tax that would be collected by the County each year. Additionally, new development would implement SAP policies and comply with Placer County General Plan policies applicable to fire protection and emergency response</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.13-1a: Create or annex into a CFD for fire protection and emergency response (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>Prior to either the recordation of Final Subdivision Maps or the approval of Improvement Plans, for each property, whichever occurs first, the developer shall create a Community Facilities District (CFD), County Service Area (CSA) Zone of Benefit, annex to an existing CSA Zone of Benefit, or combination thereof, for the purposes of funding supplemental revenue for operations, training, maintenance, and personnel costs. The chosen mechanism shall include a landowner-approved special tax of an adequate amount, or other financing mechanism acceptable to the County, to ensure that a funding mechanism for fire protection services, infrastructure, and equipment is in place to provide adequate fire safety services to the net SAP area and PRSP area during all stages of development. The staffing ratios in Table 4.13-5 shall be maintained for the net SAP and PRSP areas concurrent with demand.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.13-1b: Fire stations (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>A minimum of two fire stations shall be constructed to serve net SAP and PRSP areas. Both fire stations will be located within the SAP/PRSP area and shall be fully funded and equipped. The specific locations for the fire stations and fire station design will be identified in coordination with the Placer County Fire Department. The fire stations will be constructed as needed to serve</p>	LTS	

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
<p>To accommodate new demand associated with PRSP a new fire station is required to be developed in the PRSP area. Further, expansion of an existing fire station or construction of a new facility would involve minor land clearing, grading, installation of utilities, and building construction, generally on a modest-sized lot (up to 2.5 acres). Construction activities and duration would be typical of such facilities, and would be required to comply with applicable SAP policies and regulatory requirements to reduce adverse environmental effects. For these reasons, there is no evidence to suggest that such construction would result in unmitigable, adverse effects on the environment. However, the need for addition fire protection infrastructure and equipment in the net SAP and PRSP area is potentially significant.</p>		<p>development and maintain staffing ratios. Funding shall be provided pursuant to Mitigation Measure 4.13-1a.</p>		
<p>Impact 4.13-2: Increased demand for law enforcement services Implementation of the project would allow for the development of more than 2,400 dwelling units in the net SAP area and more than 5,600 dwelling units in the PRSP area. In addition, on-campus housing for students, faculty, and staff may be provided. The increase in the number of residences and jobs in the project area would generate demand for at least 19 additional Placer County Sheriff officers. A sheriff’s substation is currently planned as part of the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan and would serve the project area and would be designed to accommodate the additional officers generated by the project. Individual residential projects in the SAP area would pay the County Public Facilities Impact Fee toward their fair share of demand for law enforcement facilities in compliance with SAP Policies PFS-7.1 and PFS-7.2 and Placer County General Plan Policy 4.H.4. Implementation of the project would increase demand for law enforcement services; because Placer County has policies in place to fund, staff, and maintain adequate law enforcement facilities and services, no adverse effect on such levels of service would occur; however, no specific funding mechanism are in place for the project. Therefore, the impact would be potentially significant.</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.13-2: Create or annex into a CFD for law enforcement services (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area) Prior to either the recordation of Final Subdivision Maps or the approval of Improvement Plans, for each property, whichever occurs first, the developer shall create a CFD, CSA Zone of Benefit, annex to an existing CSA Zone of Benefit, or combination thereof, for the purposes of funding supplemental revenue for operations, training, maintenance, and personnel costs. The chosen mechanism shall include a landowner-approved special tax of an adequate amount, or other financing mechanism acceptable to the County, to ensure that a funding mechanism for law enforcement services, infrastructure, and equipment is in place to provide adequate law enforcement services to the net SAP area and PRSP area during all stages of development.</p>	<p>LTS</p>	
<p>Impact 4.13-3: Increased demand for public schools New dwelling units allowed in the net SAP area could generate approximately 540 elementary school students, 240 middle school students, and 240 high school students in the WPUSD. New dwelling units in the PRSP area would generate approximately 1,200 elementary school students and 430 middle school students in</p>	<p>LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LTS</p>	

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable	
<p>the RCSD and approximately 580 high school students in the RJUHSD. Housing to serve up to 200 faculty or staff members may be provided in the Sac State–Placer Center; if it is, it also could generate students in the RCSD and RJUHSD. Because new development in the project area would pay school impact development fees, existing schools have available capacity to serve new students, and the PRSP would provide new elementary and middle schools in the RCSD, the impact on school services would be less than significant.</p>			
<p>Impact 4.13-4: Increased demand for library services Implementation of the SAP would allow for development of more than 2,400 dwelling units, and the PRSP would create more than 5,600 dwelling units. In addition, on-campus housing for students, faculty, and staff may be developed. The increase in the number of residences in the project area would increase demand for library services from County libraries in Rocklin, as well as the nearest City of Roseville library. Individual residential projects in the project area would pay the County Public Facilities Impact Fee toward their fair share of demand for library facilities in compliance with SAP Policies PFS-1.2, PFS-2.1, PFS-2.2, and PFS-2.3 and Placer County General Plan Policies 4.A.2 and 4.A.5. Because Placer County has policies place to fund, staff, and maintain adequate library facilities and services, no adverse effect to library services would occur; however, no specific funding mechanism for the project are currently in place. The impact would therefore be potentially significant.</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.13-4: Create or annex into a CFD for library services (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area) Prior to either the recordation of Final Subdivision Maps or the approval of Improvement Plans, for each property, whichever occurs first, the developer shall create a CFD, CSA Zone of Benefit, annex to an existing CSA Zone of Benefit, or combination thereof, for the purposes of funding supplemental revenue for library facilities, operations, and maintenance. The chosen mechanism shall include a landowner-approved special tax of an adequate amount, or other financing mechanism acceptable to the County, to ensure that a funding mechanism for library services is in place to provide adequate library services to the net SAP area and PRSP area during all stages of development.</p>	LTS
<p>Impact 4.13-5: Increased demand for parks and recreation facilities The project area would include recreation facilities to serve future residents, including open space areas with public access, shared-use paths and multipurpose trails, and active recreation amenities. To achieve Placer County’s standard for active and passive recreation, however, future development in the project area would be required to pay in-lieu fees, dedicate additional land, or construct facilities in addition to those identified in the plans. The physical impacts of constructing these facilities in the project area associated with site preparation and excavation (e.g., construction noise, generation of fugitive dust, and increased traffic) are addressed in the resource sections of this EIR (e.g., Section 4.1, “Aesthetics”; Section 4.3, “Air Quality”; Section 4.6, “Geology and Soils”; Section 4.9, “Hydrology and Water Quality”; Section</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
<p>4.11, “Noise”; and Section 4.14, “Transportation and Circulation”). The SAP and PRSP identify recreational facilities, and development in these areas. The amount and type of parkland proposed in the PRSP area meet the County’s park provision standards. The net SAP area has sufficient space and opportunity to comply with Placer County General Plan and SAP policies for provision of sufficient active and passive parkland and would be required to do so, and development within the SAP would pay in-lieu fees, as necessary, to fund recreational facilities that would meet or exceed Placer County General Plan standards. In addition, as discussed in Section 3, “Project Description,” the PRSP includes a supplemental regional recreation facilities fee. Impacts related to increased demand for parks and recreation facilities would be less than significant.</p>				
<p>Impact 4.13-6: Impacts on existing recreation facilities</p> <p>The project would be located in an area with limited parks and recreation facilities, with nearby facilities found in the cities of Rocklin, Lincoln, and Roseville. Future residential development in the project area could increase use of parks and recreation facilities in these jurisdictions. However, as described for Impact 4.13-5, these developments would meet residential demand for parks and recreation through construction of passive and active recreation facilities in the SAP area and through payment of in-lieu fees or dedication of parkland in compliance with Placer County requirements. Because the SAP includes parks and recreation facilities and County requirements would be met in time to serve the development, no physical deterioration of existing recreation resources and facilities would occur. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS	
<p>Impact 4.13-7: Impacts on maintenance of public roads</p> <p>Implementing the project would result in new residential and commercial development and new jobs in a portion of the County that is generally undeveloped. New residents and employees in the project area would increase use of existing nearby County roads and state highways, which could increase the frequency of maintenance needed for these facilities. However, these developments would contribute to the maintenance of new public roads in the project through payment of fair-share contributions. Implementation of the PRSP would form a County Service Area Zone of Benefit to ensure that a funding mechanism for maintenance of new</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.13-8: Create or annex into a CFD for road maintenance (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>Prior to either the recordation of Final Subdivision Maps or the approval of Improvement Plans, for each property, whichever occurs first, the developer shall create a CFD, CSA Zone of Benefit, annex to an existing CSA Zone of Benefit, or combination thereof, for the purposes of funding road maintenance. The chosen mechanism shall include a landowner-approved special tax of an adequate amount, or other financing mechanism acceptable to the County, to ensure that a funding mechanism for road maintenance is in place to provide adequate maintenance of roads within the net SAP area and PRSP area during all stages of development.</p>	LTS	

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable	
public roads is in place to meet the increased use of public roads from new development in the PRSP area, the project would contribute to the maintenance of public roads. Additionally, sales tax revenues in the County help fund maintenance of County and state roads. However, because these funding mechanisms are not currently in place, the impact would be potentially significant.			
<p>Impact 4.13-8: Consistency with applicable general plan policies</p> <p><i>Placer County General Plan</i> policies that are applicable to the project include policies related to the timely provision of public services; fair-share contribution of fees from the project to fund public services and facilities; and service level standards for fire protection, law enforcement, and parks and recreation facilities. The project is consistent with the policies of the Placer County General Plan (Placer County 2013). This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>Cumulative Impact 4.13-9: Cumulative increase in demand for fire protection and emergency response services</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>Cumulative Impact 4.13-10: Cumulative increase in demand for law enforcement services</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>Cumulative Impact 4.13-11: Cumulative increase in demand for public schools</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>Cumulative Impact 4.13-12: Cumulative increase in demand for library services</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>Cumulative Impact 4.13-13: Cumulative impacts on parks and recreation facilities</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>4.14 Transportation and Circulation</p>			
<p>Impact 4.14-1: Impacts to roadway operations in Placer County</p> <p>Vehicle trips generated by the proposed project would increase traffic volumes on study roadway segments in Placer County, causing several roadway segments to worsen from an acceptable LOS C or better to an unacceptable LOS D or worse. The traffic generated by the proposed project would also increase the v/c ratio by more than 0.05 for the study roadway segment of Walerga Road, which operates at an unacceptable LOS F under existing conditions. This would be a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.14-1a: Widen Sunset Boulevard to four lanes from PRSP boundary to Placer Corporate Drive/South Loop Road (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>The Placer County Countywide CIP (Placer County 2018c) includes funding for the widening of Sunset Boulevard to four lanes from Cincinnati Avenue to SR 65. Prior to issuance of building permits, project proponents of development projects within the SAP area, including the PRSP area, shall pay the applicable countywide traffic impact fees that are in effect in this area (Sunset District) pursuant to the applicable ordinances and resolutions, which will provide funding towards this improvement. The constructing party shall be eligible for fee credits for the applicable countywide traffic impact fees, as determined by DPWF.</p>	LTS

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable	
			<p>Mitigation Measure 4.14-1b: Construct extension of Foothills Boulevard as a four-lane arterial between PRSP area and its current northern terminus in City of Roseville (PRSP Area)</p> <p>This improvement is not fully funded through a known fee program. Placer County proposes to include this improvement in an update to the Placer County Countywide CIP and countywide traffic impact fee, which will be adopted concurrently with the PRSP and SAP. With the inclusion of this improvement into the Countywide CIP, project proponents of future development projects within the SAP area, including the PRSP area, shall pay the applicable countywide traffic impact fees prior to the issuance of building permits, which will provide funding for this improvement. The constructing party shall be eligible for fee credits for the applicable countywide traffic impact fees, as determined by DPWF.</p>	
<p>Impact 4.14-2: Impacts to intersection operations in Placer County</p> <p>Vehicle trips generated by the proposed project would cause traffic operations at study intersections in Placer County to be degraded from an acceptable LOS to an unacceptable LOS. The traffic generated by the proposed project would also significantly increase delay by 4 seconds or more at intersections already operating at an unacceptable LOS E or F. This would be a significant impact.</p>		S	<p>Implement Mitigation Measures 4.14-1a (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area) and 4.14-1b (PRSP Area).</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.14-2a: Contribute fair share of feasible physical improvements (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>Project proponents of future development projects within the SAP area, including the PRSP area, shall be responsible for the project's fair share of all feasible physical improvements necessary and available to reduce the severity of the project's significant impacts to traffic operations at study intersections in Placer County, as identified in the traffic analysis above, consistent with the policies and exceptions set forth in the Transportation and Circulation Element of the Placer County General Plan. The project proponent's contribution towards such improvements may take any, or some combination, of the following forms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ For intersections within or adjacent to the boundaries of the SAP area, including the PRSP area, construction of intersection improvements which may be eligible for fee credits and/or reimbursement, coordinated by the County, from other fee-paying development projects with respect to roadways and intersections that would also serve fee-paying development projects other than the SAP and PRSP. ▲ Construction of roadway and intersection improvements outside the boundaries of the SAP area but within unincorporated Placer County, subject in some instances to future reimbursement, coordinated by the County, from other fee-paying development projects where the intersection improvements at issue would also serve fee-paying development projects other than the SAP and PRSP. ▲ Payment of applicable countywide traffic impact fees to Placer County in amounts that constitute the SAP's and PRSP's fair share contributions to the construction of intersection improvements to be built within unincorporated Placer County, consistent with the Placer 	LTS

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable	
			<p>County Countywide CIP and as determined by DPWF. This includes improvements that would be included in an update to the Placer County Countywide CIP and countywide traffic impact fee that the County will adopt concurrently with the SAP and PRSP.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.14-2b: Pay applicable City/County Baseline Road fee (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>Consistent with Mitigation Measure 4.14-2a, project proponents of future development projects within the SAP area shall pay the applicable City/County Baseline Road fee, which would provide funding for constructing improvements to Baseline Road. This includes widening Baseline Road to 4 lanes (2 eastbound and 2 westbound) through the Locust Road intersection before buildout of the SAP.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.14-2c: Adopt update to Placer County Countywide CIP and countywide traffic impact fee (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>Consistent with Mitigation Measure 4.14-2a, the County shall adopt an update to the Placer County Countywide CIP and countywide traffic impact fee concurrently with the SAP and PRSP to include installing traffic signals and capacity-enhancing improvements currently not included in any known fee program at the following intersections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Industrial Avenue / Placer Corporate Drive (net SAP area), ▲ Industrial Avenue / South Loop Road (net SAP area), ▲ Sunset Boulevard / South Loop Road/Placer Corporate Drive (net SAP and PRSP areas), ▲ Sunset Boulevard West / Fiddymont Road (net SAP and PRSP areas), ▲ Athens Avenue / Fiddymont Road (net SAP and PRSP areas), and ▲ Athens Avenue / Foothills Boulevard North (net SAP and PRSP areas). <p>Prior to issuance of building permits, project proponents of future development projects within the SAP area, including the PRSP area, shall pay the applicable countywide traffic impact fees, as determined by DPWF, which will provide funding for improvements at the above intersections.</p>	
<p>Impact 4.14-3: Impacts to signalized intersection operations in the City of Roseville</p> <p>Vehicle trips generated by the proposed project would cause signalized study intersections in the City of Roseville to be degraded from an acceptable LOS C or better to an unacceptable LOS D or worse. In addition, the traffic generated by the proposed project would cause signalized study intersections in the City of Roseville that are already operating at an unacceptable LOS D or worse to degrade one or</p>		S	<p>Implement Mitigation Measures 4.14-1a (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area), 4.14-1b (PRSP Area), and 4.14-10 (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area).</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.14-3: Pay impact fees associated with signalized intersections in City of Roseville to Placer County (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>Prior to building permit issuance, project proponents of individual development projects within the SAP area, including the PRSP area, shall pay impact fees to Placer County in amounts that</p>	SU

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures			Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable	
<p>more service level (i.e., LOS D to LOS E, LOS E to LOS F, etc.). The Douglas Boulevard / Harding Boulevard intersection, which operates at LOS F during the p.m. peak hour under existing conditions, would experience an increase in delay of 14 seconds per vehicle under existing plus PRSP conditions. Furthermore, the percentage of signalized intersections in the City of Roseville operating at LOS C or better would be reduced from 84 percent to 68 percent during the p.m. peak hour under existing plus SAP conditions. These increases in delay, degradations in LOS, and reduction in percentage of signalized intersections operating at LOS C or better would be a significant impact.</p>		<p>constitute the SAP area’s fair share contribution to the construction of transportation facilities and/or improvements at the following signalized intersections within the City of Roseville:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Baseline Road / Fiddymont Road (net SAP and PRSP areas), ▲ Blue Oaks Boulevard / Crocker Ranch Road (net SAP area), ▲ Blue Oaks Boulevard / Fiddymont Road (net SAP and PRSP areas), ▲ Blue Oaks Boulevard / New Meadow Drive (net SAP area), ▲ Blue Oaks Boulevard / Diamond Creek Boulevard (net SAP and PRSP areas), ▲ Blue Oaks Boulevard / Foothills Boulevard (net SAP and PRSP areas), ▲ Blue Oaks Blvd / Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard (net SAP and PRSP areas), ▲ Cirby Way / Sunrise Avenue (net SAP area), ▲ Cirby Way / Foothills Boulevard (net SAP area), ▲ Cirby Way / Melody Lane (net SAP area), ▲ Cirby Way / Northridge Drive (net SAP area), ▲ Cirby Way / Riverside Avenue (net SAP and PRSP areas), ▲ Cirby Way / Vernon Street (net SAP area), ▲ Douglas Boulevard / Eureka Road (net SAP area), ▲ Douglas Boulevard / Rocky Ridge Drive (net SAP area), ▲ Douglas Boulevard/ Sunrise Avenue (net SAP area), ▲ Douglas Boulevard / East Roseville Parkway (net SAP and PRSP areas), ▲ Douglas Boulevard / Harding Boulevard (PRSP area), ▲ Douglas Boulevard / Sierra College Boulevard (net SAP area), ▲ Del Webb Boulevard / Village Green Drive / Fiddymont Road (net SAP area), ▲ Hayden Parkway (North) / Fiddymont Road (net SAP area), ▲ Hayden Parkway (South) / Fiddymont Road (net SAP area), ▲ Baseline Road / Main Street / Foothills Boulevard (net SAP area), ▲ Atkinson Road / Foothills Boulevard (net SAP area), ▲ Junction Boulevard / Foothills Boulevard (net SAP and PRSP areas), ▲ Pleasant Grove Boulevard / Foothills Boulevard (net SAP and PRSP areas), ▲ Roseville Parkway / Galleria Boulevard (net SAP area), 			

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures			Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable		
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Fairway Drive / Pleasant Grove Boulevard (net SAP area), ▲ Pleasant Grove Boulevard / Fiddymont Road (net SAP and PRSP areas), ▲ Market Street / Pleasant Grove Boulevard (net SAP area), ▲ Pleasant Grove Boulevard / Roseville Parkway (net SAP area), ▲ Pleasant Grove Boulevard / Washington Boulevard (net SAP and PRSP areas), ▲ Pleasant Grove Boulevard / Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard (net SAP and PRSP areas), ▲ Roseville Parkway / Reserve Drive (net SAP area), ▲ Roseville Parkway / Taylor Road (net SAP area), ▲ Eureka Road / Roseville Parkway (net SAP area), ▲ Roseville Parkway / Washington Boulevard (net SAP area), ▲ S. Cirby Way / Old Auburn Road (net SAP area), ▲ Eureka Road / Sierra College Boulevard (net SAP and PRSP areas), ▲ Old Auburn Road / Sierra College Boulevard (net SAP and PRSP areas), ▲ Fairway Drive / Stanford Ranch Road (net SAP area), ▲ Baseline Road / Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard (net SAP and PRSP areas), ▲ Canevari Drive / Arsenault Drive / Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard (net SAP area), ▲ Pleasant Grove Boulevard / SR 65 SB Off-Ramp (net SAP area), ▲ I-80 WB Off-Ramp / Riverside Avenue (net SAP area), ▲ SR 65 NB On-Ramp / Stanford Ranch Road (net SAP area), ▲ Eureka Road / Taylor Road/I-80 Eastbound Off-Ramp (net SAP and PRSP areas), ▲ I-80 EB Off-Ramp / Orlando Avenue / Riverside Avenue (net SAP area), and ▲ Watt Avenue / Baseline Road (net SAP and PRSP areas). <p>Placer County, in working with the City of Roseville to provide funding for improvements not already subject to an existing interagency fee program, shall negotiate in good faith with the City of Roseville to enter into additional fair and reasonable arrangements with the intention of achieving, within a reasonable time period after approval of the SAP, including the PRSP, commitment for the provision of adequate fair share mitigation from the SAP/PRSP for significant impacts on City of Roseville intersections. In reaching an accommodation with the City of Roseville, the County and City, in order to better ensure an effective sub-regional approach to mitigating transportation-related impacts, may choose to include within the same</p>			

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures		Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable	
			<p>agreements or JPA (if a JPA is formed) additional public agencies with whom it must work to mitigate transportation-related impacts, such as Sacramento County, Sutter County, and Caltrans. As the County strives to achieve agreement(s) with one or more of these other agencies, the County shall insist that “fair share” fee obligations be reciprocal, in the sense that the other local agencies, in accepting fair share contributions from the SAP/PRSP developers, must agree to require new development occurring in their own jurisdictions to make fair share contributions towards mitigating the significant effects of such development on the County’s transportation network. Any such arrangement(s), with just the City of Roseville or with additional agencies, shall account for existing inter-agency fee programs in order to avoid requiring redundant mitigation or fee payments exceeding fair share mitigation levels.</p> <p>The County intends that its arrangement(s) with the City of Roseville and any other agencies shall permit the participating agencies’ flexibility in providing cross-jurisdictional credits and reimbursements consistent with the general “fair share” mitigation standard, and require an updated model run incorporating the best available information in order to obtain the most accurate, up-to-date impact assessment feasible and to generate the most accurate, up-to-date estimates of regional fair share contributions. These arrangements, moreover, should also include provisions that allow for periodic updates to the traffic modeling on which fair share payment calculations depend in order to account for (i) newly approved projects cumulatively contributing to transportation-related impacts and that therefore should contribute to the funding of necessary improvements, (ii) additional physical improvements necessitated in whole or in part by newly approved projects, (iii) changing cost calculations for the construction of needed improvements based on changes in the costs of materials, labor, and other inputs. The County will monitor traffic volumes and coordinate with the City of Roseville regarding traffic mitigation fees to fund regional improvements.</p> <p>The implementation of improvements at the impacted intersections listed above vary by location based on the type of improvement, and whether the improvement is included in a known fee program. Therefore, the project’s contribution toward such improvements may take one of the following forms:</p> <p>(a) The widening of Blue Oaks Boulevard to eight lanes from Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard to SR 65, as included in the City of Roseville CIP, would restore operations to an acceptable LOS C or better during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours at the following intersection. This improvement is considered feasible because it is identified in the City of Roseville CIP, which is funded by the City of Roseville’s Traffic Mitigation Fee (TMF).</p>		

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures			Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable		
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Blue Oaks Boulevard / Foothills Boulevard (net SAP and PRSP areas) (b) The capacity-enhancing improvements to the intersections listed below are included in the City of Roseville CIP, which is funded by the City of Roseville's TMF. These enhancements are considered feasible because they are funded through an adopted fee program. These improvements would restore operations to an acceptable LOS C or better for intersections that operate at LOS C or better under existing conditions. Similarly, these improvements would restore operations to the LOS under existing conditions or better for intersections that currently operate at an unacceptable LOS D, E, or F. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Douglas Boulevard / Sierra College Boulevard (net SAP area) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▼ Widen southbound approach to accommodate a right-turn pocket ▲ Pleasant Grove Boulevard / Foothills Boulevard (PRSP) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▼ Modify the westbound approach to convert the outside left-turn lane to a third westbound through lane, resulting in 2 left-turn lanes, 3 through lanes, and 1 right-turn lane on the westbound approach ▲ Roseville Parkway / Galleria Boulevard (net SAP area) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▼ Widen the eastbound and westbound approaches to accommodate a fourth through lane ▲ Pleasant Grove Boulevard / Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard (PRSP area) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▼ Widen the eastbound approach to accommodate a third through lane ▲ Blue Oaks Boulevard / Washington Boulevard (net SAP area) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▼ Widen the eastbound and westbound approaches to accommodate a fourth through lane ▼ Widen the northbound approach to accommodate a second right-turn lane (c) The capacity-enhancing improvements to the intersections listed below are included in the City/County Baseline Road Fee Program. These improvements are considered feasible because they are funded through an adopted fee program. These improvements would restore operations to an acceptable LOS C or better during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Baseline Road / Fiddymont Road (PRSP area) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▼ Modify the eastbound approach to accommodate a second left-turn lane ▼ Modify the westbound approach to accommodate a second left-turn lane and third through lane ▼ Modify signal to provide right-turn overlap phase for the westbound, northbound, and 			

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable	
			<p>southbound right-turn movements, and prohibit the conflicting U-turn movements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Watt Avenue / Baseline Road (net SAP area) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▼ Widen the eastbound and westbound approaches to accommodate two through lanes ▼ Widen the westbound approach to accommodate two left-turn lanes <p>(d) The capacity-enhancing improvements to the intersection listed below is included in the SPRTA fee program and the City of Roseville CIP, which is funded by the City of Roseville’s TMF. These improvements are considered feasible because they are funded through an adopted fee program. These improvements would restore operations to an acceptable LOS C or better during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Eureka Road / Sierra College Boulevard (net SAP area) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▼ Widen the northbound and southbound approaches to accommodate a third through lane ▲ Old Auburn Road / Sierra College Boulevard (net SAP area) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▼ Widen the northbound and southbound approaches to accommodate a third through lane <p>(e) Capacity-enhancing improvements to the intersections listed below are not included in any known fee program, including the City of Roseville’s TMF program. These improvements would restore operations to an acceptable LOS C or better for intersections that operate at LOS C or better under existing conditions. Similarly, these improvements would restore operations to the LOS under existing conditions or better for intersections that currently operate at an unacceptable LOS D, E, or F. The following enhancements are necessary only to mitigate the traffic impacts for buildout of the SAP and are not necessary to mitigate traffic impacts from the buildout of the PRSP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Baseline Road / Fiddymont Road <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▼ Widen the northbound approach to accommodate one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and a shared through/right-turn lane ▲ Blue Oaks Boulevard / Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▼ Widen the eastbound and westbound approaches to accommodate a fourth through lane, as identified in the City of Roseville’s CIP for widening Blue Oaks Boulevard to eight lanes ▼ Restripe the southbound approach to accommodate three left-turn lanes, one through lane, and one through/right-turn lane 	

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures			Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable		
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Modify signal to provide right-turn overlap phases for the westbound and northbound right-turn movements, and prohibit the conflicting U-turn movements ▲ Cirby Way / Riverside Avenue <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Widen the eastbound approach to accommodate a third eastbound through lane ➤ Widen the northbound approach to accommodate a third left-turn lane ➤ Widen the westbound approach to accommodate a third left-turn lane and right-turn pocket ➤ Modify signal to provide right-turn overlap phases for the northbound and southbound right-turn movements, and prohibit the conflicting U-turn movements ▲ Cirby Way / Vernon Street <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Widen the eastbound approach to accommodate a right-turn pocket ➤ Widen the southbound approach to accommodate a second right-turn lane ➤ Modify signal to provide right-turn overlap phases for the southbound right-turn movement and prohibit the conflicting U-turn movements ▲ Douglas Boulevard / Rocky Ridge Drive <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Widen the northbound and southbound approaches to accommodate a third through lane ➤ Modify signal to provide right-turn overlap phases for the northbound and southbound right-turn movements, and prohibit the conflicting U-turn movements ▲ Douglas Boulevard / Sunrise Avenue <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Widen northbound approach to accommodate a right-turn pocket ➤ Widen the southbound approach to accommodate a second right-turn lane ▲ Lead Hill Boulevard / N. Sunrise Avenue <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Modify signal to provide right-turn overlap phases for the southbound and eastbound right-turn movements, and prohibit the conflicting U-turn movements ▲ Pleasant Grove Boulevard / Fiddymont Road <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Widen the southbound approach to accommodate a third through lane ➤ Modify signal to provide right-turn overlap phases for the northbound, eastbound, and westbound right-turn movements, and prohibit the conflicting U-turn movements ▲ Pleasant Grove Boulevard / Roseville Parkway

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Widen the westbound approach to accommodate a fourth through lane ▲ Pleasant Grove Boulevard / Washington Boulevard <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Modify signal to provide right-turn overlap phases for the southbound and eastbound right-turn movements, and prohibit the conflicting U-turn movements ▲ Roseville Parkway / Taylor Road <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Widen the westbound approach to accommodate a fourth through lane ▲ Eureka Road / Roseville Parkway <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Restripe the eastbound approach to accommodate one left-turn pocket, one through lane, one through/right-turn lane, and one right-turn lane ▲ Fairway Drive / Stanford Ranch Road <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Widen the northbound approach to accommodate a third through lane ➤ Modify signal to provide right-turn overlap phases for the northbound and eastbound right-turn movements, and prohibit the conflicting U-turn movements ▲ Baseline Road / Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Restripe the northbound approach to accommodate one left-turn lane and one shared through/right-turn lane ➤ Widen the eastbound approach to accommodate one left-turn lane, one through lane, and one shared through/right-turn lane ▲ Douglas Boulevard / I-80 Westbound Off-Ramp <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Widen the eastbound approach to accommodate a right-turn pocket ➤ Widen the southbound approach to accommodate a second left-turn pocket ▲ Pleasant Grove Boulevard / SR 65 Northbound Ramps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Widen the westbound approach to accommodate a second left-turn lane ➤ Modify signal to provide right-turn overlap phases for the northbound and eastbound right-turn movements, and prohibit the conflicting U-turn movements ▲ Pleasant Grove Boulevard / SR 65 Southbound Ramps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Widen the southbound approach to accommodate a second right-turn lane ➤ Widen the eastbound approach to accommodate a right-turn lane ▲ I-80 Westbound Off-Ramp / Riverside Avenue <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Widen the northbound approach to accommodate a third through lane 	

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures			Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable		
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Widen the westbound approach to accommodate a second right-turn lane ▲ SR 65 Northbound Ramps / Stanford Ranch Road ➤ Widen the northbound approach to accommodate a third through lane and two left-turn lanes ➤ Widen the southbound approach to accommodate a right-turn lane ▲ Eureka Road / Taylor Road/I-80 Eastbound Off-Ramp ➤ Widen the eastbound approach to accommodate a third through lane ➤ Widen the southbound approach to accommodate a second right-turn lane ▲ I-80 Eastbound Off-Ramp/Orlando Avenue / Riverside Avenue ➤ Widen the northbound approach to accommodate a third through lane <p>(f) Signal timing improvements to the intersections listed below would occur through the City of Roseville's regular maintenance of its traffic signals. Therefore, these improvements would require implementation by the City of Roseville. The signal timing improvements would include modification of timings to optimize use of the signal cycle to provide more green time allocation for critical movements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Blue Oaks Boulevard / Crocker Ranch Road (net SAP area) ▲ Blue Oaks Boulevard / Fiddymont Road (net SAP area) ▲ Blue Oaks Boulevard / Diamond Creek Boulevard (net SAP area) ▲ Cirby Way / Sunrise Avenue (net SAP area) ▲ Cirby Way / Foothill Boulevard (net SAP area) ▲ Douglas Boulevard / Eureka Road (net SAP area) ▲ Douglas Boulevard / Santa Clara Drive (net SAP area) ▲ Douglas Boulevard / Sierra Gardens Drive (net SAP area) ▲ Douglas Boulevard / E. Roseville Parkway (net SAP and PRSP areas) ▲ Del Webb Boulevard / Village Green Drive / Fiddymont Avenue (net SAP area) ▲ Baseline Road / Main Street / Foothills Boulevard (net SAP area) ▲ Junction Boulevard / Foothills Boulevard (net SAP and PRSP areas) ▲ Pleasant Grove Boulevard / Foothills Boulevard (net SAP area) ▲ Pleasant Grove Boulevard / Fiddymont Road (PRSP area) 			

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Pleasant Grove Boulevard / Washington Boulevard (PRSP area) ▲ Antelope Creek Drive / Galleria Boulevard (net SAP area) ▲ Fairway Drive / Pleasant Grove Boulevard (net SAP area) ▲ Pleasant Grove Boulevard / Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard (net SAP area) ▲ Roseville Parkway / Creekside Ridge Drive (net SAP area) ▲ Roseville Parkway / N. Sunrise Avenue (net SAP area) ▲ Roseville Parkway / Reserve Drive (net SAP area) ▲ Roseville Parkway / Washington Boulevard (net SAP area) ▲ S. Cirby Way / Old Auburn Road (net SAP area) ▲ Canevari Drive/Arsenault Drive / Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard (net SAP area) 	
<p>Impact 4.14-4: Impacts to unsignalized intersection operations in the City of Roseville</p> <p>Vehicle trips generated by the buildout of the SAP would cause the unsignalized intersections at Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard / Northpark Drive, Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard / Parkside Way, Fiddymont Road / Angus Drive/Parkland Way, and Industrial Avenue / Alantown Drive in the City of Roseville to be degraded from an acceptable LOS C or better to an unacceptable LOS F and meet the MUTCD peak hour signal warrant. Similarly, vehicle trips generated by the PRSP would cause the unsignalized intersections at Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard / Northpark Drive, Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard / Parkside Way, and Fiddymont Road / Angus Drive/Parkland Way in the City of Roseville to be degraded from an acceptable LOS C or better to an unacceptable LOS F and meet the MUTCD peak hour signal warrant.</p> <p>In addition, the Junction Boulevard / Park Regency Drive, which operates at LOS F during the a.m. peak hour under existing conditions, would experience an increase in delay of more than 88 seconds per vehicle and meet the MUTCD peak hour signal warrant under existing plus SAP conditions. Similarly, the Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard / Painted Desert Drive intersection, which operates at LOS F during the a.m. peak hour under existing conditions, would experience an increase in delay of more than 200 seconds per vehicle and meet the MUTCD peak hour signal warrant under existing plus SAP buildout and existing plus PRSP conditions. These increases in delay and degradations in LOS and would be a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>Implement Mitigation Measure 4.14-1b (PRSP Area).</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.14-4: Pay impact fees associated with unsignalized intersections in City of Roseville to Placer County (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>Prior to building permit issuance, project proponents of individual development projects within the SAP area shall pay impact fees to Placer County in amounts that constitute the SAP area’s fair share contribution to the installation of traffic signals at the following unsignalized intersections within the City of Roseville.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard / Northpark Drive (SAP area) ▲ Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard / Parkside Way (SAP area) ▲ Industrial Avenue / Alantown Drive (SAP area) <p>As with Mitigation Measure 4.14-3, Placer County, in working with the City of Roseville to provide funding for improvements not already subject to an existing interagency fee program, shall negotiate in good faith with the City of Roseville to enter into additional fair and reasonable arrangements with the intention of achieving, within a reasonable time period after approval of the SAP, including the PRSP, commitment for the provision of adequate fair share mitigation from the SAP/PRSP for significant impacts on City of Roseville intersections. In reaching an accommodation with the City of Roseville, the County and City, in order to better ensure an effective sub-regional approach to mitigating transportation-related impacts, may choose to include within the same agreements or JPA (if a JPA is formed) additional public agencies with whom it must work to mitigate transportation-related impacts, such as Sacramento County, Sutter County, and Caltrans. As the County strives to achieve agreement(s) with one or more of</p>	SU

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
			<p>these other agencies, the County shall insist that “fair share” fee obligations be reciprocal, in the sense that the other local agencies, in accepting fair share contributions from the SAP/PRSP developers, must agree to require new development occurring in their own jurisdictions to make fair share contributions towards mitigating the significant effects of such development on the County’s transportation network. Any such arrangement(s), with just the City of Roseville or with additional agencies, shall account for existing inter-agency fee programs in order to avoid requiring redundant mitigation or fee payments exceeding fair share mitigation levels.</p> <p>The County intends that its arrangement(s) with the City of Roseville and any other agencies shall permit the participating agencies’ flexibility in providing cross-jurisdictional credits and reimbursements consistent with the general “fair share” mitigation standard, and require an updated model run incorporating the best available information in order to obtain the most accurate, up-to-date impact assessment feasible and to generate the most accurate, up-to-date estimates of regional fair share contributions. These arrangements, moreover, should also include provisions that allow for periodic updates to the traffic modeling on which fair share payment calculations depend in order to account for (i) newly approved projects cumulatively contributing to transportation-related impacts and that therefore should contribute to the funding of necessary improvements, (ii) additional physical improvements necessitated in whole or in part by newly approved projects, (iii) changing cost calculations for the construction of needed improvements based on changes in the costs of materials, labor, and other inputs. The County will monitor traffic volumes and coordinate with the City of Roseville regarding traffic mitigation fees to fund regional improvements.</p>	
<p>Impact 4.14-5: Impacts to intersection operations in the City of Rocklin</p> <p>Vehicle trips generated by buildout of the proposed SAP would cause study intersections in the City of Rocklin to be degraded from an acceptable LOS C or better to an unacceptable LOS D or E during the p.m. peak hour. In addition, vehicle trips generated by buildout of the proposed SAP would cause study intersections in the City of Rocklin that are already operating at LOS D to experience an increase in delay of 5 seconds or more. These degradations in LOS and increases in delay at intersections already operating at an unacceptable LOS would be a significant impact.</p>		S	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.14-5: Pay impact fees associated with signalized intersections in City of Rocklin to Placer County (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>Prior to building permit issuance, project proponents of individual development projects within the SAP area, including the PRSP area, shall pay impact fees to Placer County in amounts that constitute the SAP area’s fair share contribution to the construction of transportation facilities and/or improvements in the City of Rocklin identified below.</p> <p>Placer County, in working with the City of Rocklin to provide funding for improvements not already subject to an existing interagency fee program, shall negotiate in good faith with the City of Rocklin to enter into additional fair and reasonable arrangements with the intention of achieving, within a reasonable time period after approval of the SAP, including the PRSP, commitment for the provision of adequate fair share mitigation from the SAP/PRSP for significant impacts on City of Rocklin intersections. In reaching an accommodation with the</p>	SU

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures		Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable	
				<p>City of Rocklin, the County and City, in order to better ensure an effective sub-regional approach to mitigating transportation-related impacts, may choose to include within the same agreements or JPA (if a JPA is formed) additional public agencies with whom it must work to mitigate transportation-related impacts, such as Sacramento County, Sutter County, and Caltrans. As the County strives to achieve agreement(s) with one or more of these other agencies, the County shall insist that “fair share” fee obligations be reciprocal, in the sense that the other local agencies, in accepting fair share contributions from the SAP/PRSP developers, must agree to require new development occurring in their own jurisdictions to make fair share contributions towards mitigating the significant effects of such development on the County’s transportation network. Any such arrangement(s), with just the City of Rocklin or with additional agencies, shall account for existing inter-agency fee programs in order to avoid requiring redundant mitigation or fee payments exceeding fair share mitigation levels.</p> <p>The County intends that its arrangement(s) with the City of Rocklin and any other agencies shall permit the participating agencies’ flexibility in providing cross-jurisdictional credits and reimbursements consistent with the general “fair share” mitigation standard, and require an updated model run incorporating the best available information in order to obtain the most accurate, up-to-date impact assessment feasible and to generate the most accurate, up-to-date estimates of regional fair share contributions. These arrangements, moreover, should also include provisions that allow for periodic updates to the traffic modeling on which fair share payment calculations depend in order to account for (i) newly approved projects cumulatively contributing to transportation-related impacts and that therefore should contribute to the funding of necessary improvements, (ii) additional physical improvements necessitated in whole or in part by newly approved projects, (iii) changing cost calculations for the construction of needed improvements based on changes in the costs of materials, labor, and other inputs. The County will monitor traffic volumes and coordinate with the City of Rocklin regarding traffic mitigation fees to fund regional improvements.</p> <p>The necessary capacity enhancements to mitigate the increased delay caused by buildout of the SAP at the impacted intersections listed above would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Sunset Boulevard / Lonetree Boulevard/W. Stanford Ranch Road: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Widen the northbound approach to accommodate a third left-turn lane. ➤ Modify signal to provide right-turn overlap phase for the northbound, eastbound, and westbound right-turn movements, and prohibit the conflicting U-turn movements. ▲ Park Drive / Sunset Boulevard: 	

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Optimize the signal timing splits. ▲ Stanford Ranch Road / Sunset Boulevard: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Modify signal to provide right-turn overlap phase for the southbound, eastbound, and westbound right-turn movements, and prohibit the conflicting U-turn movements, ▲ Sunset Boulevard / University Avenue/Atherton Drive: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Widen Sunset Boulevard to 6 lanes from SR 65 to east of University Avenue, ▲ Pacific Street / Sunset Boulevard: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Widen the eastbound approach to accommodate a second left-turn lane. 	
<p>Impact 4.14-6: Impacts to intersection operations in the City of Lincoln Vehicle trips generated by the proposed project would cause study intersections in the City of Lincoln to be degraded from an acceptable LOS C or better to an unacceptable LOS F during the p.m. peak hour. This degradation in LOS would be a significant impact.</p>		S	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.14-6: Pay impact fees associated with unsignalized intersections in City of Lincoln to Placer County (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>Prior to building permit issuance, project proponents of individual development projects within the SAP area shall pay impact fees to Placer County in amounts that constitute the SAP area’s fair share contribution to the installation of a traffic signal at the Dowd Road / Moore Road intersection.</p> <p>Placer County, in working with the City of Lincoln to provide funding for improvements not already subject to an existing interagency fee program, shall negotiate in good faith with the City of Lincoln to enter into additional fair and reasonable arrangements with the intention of achieving, within a reasonable time period after approval of the SAP, including the PRSP, commitment for the provision of adequate fair share mitigation from the SAP/PRSP for significant impacts on City of Lincoln intersections. In reaching an accommodation with the City of Lincoln, the County and City, in order to better ensure an effective sub-regional approach to mitigating transportation-related impacts, may choose to include within the same agreements or JPA (if a JPA is formed) additional public agencies with whom it must work to mitigate transportation-related impacts, such as Sacramento County, Sutter County, and Caltrans. As the County strives to achieve agreement(s) with one or more of these other agencies, the County shall insist that “fair share” fee obligations be reciprocal, in the sense that the other local agencies, in accepting fair share contributions from the SAP/PRSP developers, must agree to require new development occurring in their own jurisdictions to make fair share contributions towards mitigating the significant effects of such development on the County’s transportation network. Any such arrangement(s), with just the City of Lincoln or with additional agencies, shall account for existing inter-agency fee programs in order to avoid requiring redundant mitigation or fee payments exceeding fair share mitigation levels.</p>	SU

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
			<p>The County intends that its arrangement(s) with the City of Lincoln and any other agencies shall permit the participating agencies' flexibility in providing cross-jurisdictional credits and reimbursements consistent with the general "fair share" mitigation standard, and require an updated model run incorporating the best available information in order to obtain the most accurate, up-to-date impact assessment feasible and to generate the most accurate, up-to-date estimates of regional fair share contributions. These arrangements, moreover, should also include provisions that allow for periodic updates to the traffic modeling on which fair share payment calculations depend in order to account for (i) newly approved projects cumulatively contributing to transportation-related impacts and that therefore should contribute to the funding of necessary improvements, (ii) additional physical improvements necessitated in whole or in part by newly approved projects, (iii) changing cost calculations for the construction of needed improvements based on changes in the costs of materials, labor, and other inputs. The County will monitor traffic volumes and coordinate with the City of Lincoln regarding traffic mitigation fees to fund regional improvements.</p> <p>Installation of a traffic signal at this intersection would improve operations to LOS B during the a.m. peak hour and LOS C during the p.m. peak hour. However, it is not included in any known fee program. This intersection is currently located within the unincorporated Placer County within the City of Lincoln sphere of influence. If this impact is triggered before annexation into the City of Lincoln, the County shall require the traffic signal to be installed prior to the issuance of building permits for further development that may further degrade operations at this intersection. If annexed into the City of Lincoln, this mitigation measure would require Placer County, on behalf of the project proponent, to negotiate in good faith with the City of Lincoln to identify the fair share funding contribution.</p>	
Impact 4.14-7: Impacts to intersection operations in Sutter County		S	No mitigation is available.	SU
<p>Vehicle trips generated by the proposed project would cause study intersections in Sutter County that are already operating at an unacceptable LOS F to experience a greater than 5-second increase in delay. This would be a significant impact.</p>				
Impact 4.14-8: Impacts to intersection operations in Sacramento County		LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>All study intersections in Sacramento County would continue to operate at an acceptable LOS E or better with vehicle trips generated by the proposed project. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>				

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
<p>Impact 4.14-9: Impacts to intersection operations under Caltrans jurisdiction</p> <p>Vehicle trips generated by buildout of the proposed project would cause study intersections under Caltrans Jurisdiction to be degraded to a significant degree. This would be a significant impact.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.14-9: Pay impact fees to Placer County toward construction of improvements at highway ramp terminal intersections (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>Prior to building permit issuance, project proponents of individual development projects within the SAP area, shall pay impact fees in effect to Placer County in amounts that constitute the SAP area's fair share contribution to the construction of improvements at the federal or state highway ramp terminal intersections identified below, which are needed in part because of the SAP. Placer County shall coordinate with their regional partners to modify an existing or adopt a new regional fee program to include the improvements identified that constitute the region's fair share toward the identified improvements.</p> <p>The necessary capacity enhancements to mitigate the increased delay caused by buildout of the SAP at the impacted intersections listed above would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Pleasant Grove Boulevard / SR 65 Southbound Ramps: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Widen the southbound approach to accommodate a second right-turn lane. ➤ Widen the eastbound approach to accommodate a right-turn lane. ▲ I-80 Westbound Off-Ramp / Riverside Avenue: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Widen the northbound approach to accommodate a third through lane. ➤ Widen the westbound approach to accommodate a second right-turn lane. ▲ SR 65 Northbound Ramps / Stanford Ranch Road: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Widen the northbound approach to accommodate a third through lane and two left-turn lanes. ➤ Widen the southbound approach to accommodate a right-turn lane. ▲ Eureka Road / Taylor Road/I-80 Eastbound Off-Ramp: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Widen the eastbound approach to accommodate a third through lane. ➤ Widen the southbound approach to accommodate a second right-turn lane. ▲ I-80 Eastbound Off-Ramp/Orlando Avenue / Riverside Avenue: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Widen the northbound approach to accommodate a third through lane. ▲ Sunset Boulevard / SR 65 Southbound Ramps: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Modify the eastbound approach to accommodate a second eastbound right-turn pocket. ➤ Modify the southbound approach to accommodate a second left-turn pocket. 	<p>SU</p>	

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable	
<p>Impact 4.14-10: Impacts to freeway operations</p> <p>Vehicle trips generated by the proposed project would cause traffic operations on study freeway facilities maintained by Caltrans to be degraded from an acceptable LOS E or better to an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. and/or p.m. peak hour. Furthermore, increases in traffic generated by the proposed project would exacerbate existing unacceptable LOS F conditions on study freeway facilities maintained by Caltrans. This would be a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.14-10: Contribute fair share of feasible physical improvements to freeway operations (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>Prior to building permit issuance, project proponents of individual development projects within the SAP area shall be responsible for the project’s fair share of all feasible physical improvements necessary and available to reduce the severity of the project’s significant traffic impacts to freeway operations as identified in this traffic analysis consistent with the policies and exceptions set forth in the Transportation and Circulation Element of the Placer County General Plan. This may include any, or some combination of, the following forms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Payment of impact fees to the South Placer Regional Transportation Authority (SPRTA) in amounts that constitute the SAP area’s fair share contribution to the construction of transportation facilities funded through fees collected by the SPRTA for Tier 1 and/or Tier 2 projects. This includes the following transportation projects that would directly improve operations on SR 65 and I-80: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▼ SR 65 Widening, ▼ I-80/SR 65 Interchange, and ▼ I-80/Rocklin Road Interchange ▲ Payment of other adopted and applicable regional impact fees that would provide improvements to freeway facilities that are affected by multiple jurisdictions, such as the Highway 65 JPA Fee, which provides funding for interchange improvements along SR 65. ▲ Placer County shall coordinate with their regional partners to modify an existing or adopt a new regional fee program to include the improvements identified that will constitute the regions fair share toward the identified improvements. 	SU
<p>Impact 4.14-11: Impacts to freeway off-ramp queuing</p> <p>Vehicle trips generated by the proposed project would increase queuing on freeway off-ramps. However, all queues on freeway off-ramps would remain within the length of the off-ramp and not extend beyond the ramp gore point onto the mainline. Therefore, this would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>Impact 4.14-12: Impacts to vehicle miles traveled</p> <p>Implementation of the proposed project would result in new daily vehicle travel, which would add VMT to the study area. With the proposed project’s increase in residential population and employment to the study area, the proposed project would</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.14-12a: Demonstrate compliance with Placer County’s Trip Reduction Program (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>Prior to building permit issuance, a Transportation Demand Management Plan (TDMP) shall be submitted for DPWF review and must be approved by DPWF prior to Improvement Plan</p>	SU

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures			Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable		
<p>result in a reduction in daily VMT per service population generated by the SAP area. However, since overall daily VMT would be increased, this would be a significant impact.</p>			<p>approval. Any non-residential development that is subject to the County Trip Reduction Ordinance (Chapter 10, Article 10.20, and Placer County Code) must prepare a TDMP. The number of employees at the site shall be determined by an employee-per-square-foot formula provided by DPWF in consultation with the project proponent.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.14-12b: Identify feasible steps to ensure that proposed development will comply with Placer County travel demand management policies, objectives, and performance requirements (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>Prior to building permit issuance, the County shall require project proponents of future development projects within the SAP area, including the PRSP area, to identify feasible steps to ensure that the proposed development will comply with Placer County travel demand management (TDM) policies, objectives, and performance requirements. This may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ In conjunction with tentative subdivision approval, recorded codes, covenants and restrictions (CC&Rs) shall include provisions to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Guarantee adherence to Placer County travel demand management (TDM) policies and objectives. ▶ The perpetual implementation of TCMs regardless of property ownership. ▶ Inform all subsequent property owners of the requirements imposed herein. ▶ Identify potential consequences of nonperformance. ▶ Require that space use agreements (i.e., lease documents) shall also include provisions for the site as a means to inform and commit tenants to, and participate in, helping specific applicable developments meet Placer County TDM performance requirements. <p>The TCMs identified as part of Mitigation Measures 4.14-12a and 4.14-12b would reduce VMT, as stated in the purpose of the Trip Reduction Ordinance (Article 10.20.020 of the Placer County Code) and supported by data compiled in the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) <i>Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures</i> document. Per Article 10.20.070 of the Placer County Code, the required TCMs may include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Designation of an employee transportation coordinator (ETC). ▲ Posting of ridesharing information, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Posters or flyers encouraging the use of ridesharing and referrals to sources of information concerning ridesharing. ▶ The names and phone numbers of the ETC, transportation management association, and the County TCM coordinator. 			

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Posting (by employers) or providing to employers (by project controllers) of alternative transportation mode information, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ► Current schedules, rates (including procedures for obtaining transit passes), and routes of mass transit service to the common work location or employment site. ► The location of all bicycle routes within at least a five-mile radius of the facility. ▲ Distribution of commuter matching service applications to employees (by employers) or to employers (by project controllers). The South Placer TMA and Caltrans Sacramento Rideshare each maintain regional computer databases to match commuters with common cross streets. Each provides rideshare applications to employers for distribution and then directly mails the match lists to the employees. The South Placer TMA provides rideshare matchlisting for destinations within Placer County, while Caltrans Sacramento Rideshare provides matchlisting for out-of-county destinations. Credit will be given if the ETC distributes the applications annually to all employees or employers, as applicable, and upon hiring to all new employees. ▲ Bicycle Parking Facilities. Unless there are overriding considerations specific to the employment site, sufficient bicycle parking must be supplied for employees. To receive credit, the employer must provide bicycle parking for all bicycle commuters, as determined by survey of employees, or two percent of employment, whichever is less. The bicycle parking facilities shall be, at minimum, Class II stationary bike racks. ▲ Preferential Carpool/Vanpool Parking. Unless there are overriding considerations specific to the employment site, parking spaces for four percent of employees must be painted "Carpool Parking" or "Vanpool Parking" and must be, with the exception of handicapped and customer parking, the spaces with most convenient access to the employee entrances. The ETC shall be responsible for monitoring the spaces. <p>In addition to the required TCMs identified above, Article 10.20.070 of the Placer County Code identifies 18 optional TCMs and strongly encourages the application of other trip reduction measures that are not explicitly identified in the code.</p>	
<p>Impact 4.14-13: Impacts to transit</p> <p>Implementation of the proposed project would increase residential population, non-residential employment, university faculty and students, and local and regional serving retail uses and services in the SAP area. This increase in population, employment, students, and attractions would result in an increased demand for transit use. This is a potentially significant impact.</p>		PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.14-13a: Prepare a transit master plan for SAP area (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>The County shall prepare a transit master plan for the SAP area, including the PRSP area. The transit master plan will be a County-led effort but may also be done in collaboration with PCTPA when PCTPA updates its Long-Range Transit Master Plan. Roseville Transit will also be consulted. The transit master plan shall identify how transit service will be delivered to the SAP</p>	LTS

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
			<p>and ensure that the service adequately serves transit demand in the SAP.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.14-13b: Establish a Community Service Area (CSA) Zone of Benefit (ZOB) or annex into an existing CSA ZOB to fund transit services for the PRSP area (PRSP Area)</p> <p>Prior to Improvement Plan approval or Final Map recordation for subdivision projects, a Community Service Area (CSA) Zone of Benefit (ZOB) shall be established by the project proponent, or the project proponent shall annex into an existing CSA ZOB to fund the cost of transit services proposed by the Transit Master Plan. This will include any related capital costs for buses, passenger amenities, and facilities.</p> <p>The Transit Master Plan shall identify how transit service will be delivered to the PRSP area and will be prepared in collaboration with Placer County Transit and Placer County staff and submitted to the County for approval. The County shall review the Transit Master Plan and ensure that the proposed service and facilities adequately serves transit demand in the PRSP area. The County shall also require project proponents to either form a CSA ZOB or annex into an existing CSA ZOB to fund the cost of transit services that are proposed by the Transit Master Plan.</p>	
Impact 4.14-14: Impacts to bicycle and pedestrian facilities		LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Implementation of the proposed project would not disrupt or interfere with existing or planned bicycle and pedestrian facilities, nor would it result in unsafe conditions for bicyclists or pedestrians. Further, the project would not create an inconsistency with any adopted policies related to bicycle or pedestrian systems. This would be a less-than-significant impact.				
Cumulative Impact 4.14-15: Cumulative impacts to roadway operations in Placer County		S	<p>Implement Mitigation Measures 4.14-2a (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area) and 4.14-2c (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area).</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.14-15a: Pay impact fees to Placer County toward widening Sunset Boulevard to six lanes from PRSP area to SR 65 (PRSP Area)</p> <p>Prior to building permit issuance, project proponents of individual development projects within the PRSP area shall pay impact fees to Placer County, as determined by DPWF, in amounts that constitute the PRSP's fair share towards widening Sunset Boulevard to 6 lanes from the PRSP area to SR 65.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.14-15b: Require dedication of right of way to widen Fiddymont Road to six lanes from Athens Avenue to E. Catlett Road (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>Prior to Improvement Plan approval or Final Map recordation for subdivision projects, project</p>	SU

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures			Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable		
						<p>proponents of individual development projects within the SAP area, including the PRSP area, shall dedicate sufficient right-of-way to widen Fiddymont Road to 6 lanes from Athens Avenue to E. Catlett Road in the future.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.14-15c: Require dedication of right-of-way to widen Sunset Boulevard to eight lanes from Placer Corporate Drive/South Loop Road to SR 65 (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>Prior to Improvement Plan approval or Final Map recordation for subdivision projects, project proponents of individual development projects within the SAP area, including the PRSP area, shall dedicate sufficient right-of-way to widen Sunset Boulevard to 8 lanes from Placer Corporate Drive/South Loop Road to SR 65 in the future. Any development proposed on parcels affected by the future 8 lane facility shall be required as a condition of approval to provide an irrevocable offer of dedication to Placer County for a highway easement to accommodate the future 8 lane roadway improvements.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.14-15d: Preserve right-of-way on major arterials in the unincorporated County to accommodate forecasted ADT levels (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>In addition to the widening and preservation of right-of-way identified in Mitigation Measures 4.14-15a through 4.14-15c, Placer County shall preserve right-of-way on major arterials in the unincorporated County to accommodate the forecasted ADT levels with buildout of the SAP. Prior to Improvement Plan approval or Final Map recordation for subdivision projects, project proponents of individual development projects within the SAP area, including the PRSP area, shall provide an irrevocable offer of dedication to Placer County for highway easements as necessary to accommodate the future roadway improvements. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Fiddymont Road: Roseville city limits to Sunset Area Plan boundary – 6 lanes, ▲ Foothills Boulevard: Sunset Boulevard to Athens Avenue – 8 lanes, and ▲ Dowd Road: Sunset Boulevard West to Athens Avenue – 6 lanes <p>Placer County shall monitor development conditions in the SAP area, including the PRSP area, using dwelling unit equivalents. When dwelling unit equivalents exceed the amount analyzed in the cumulative plus PRSP plus SAP (20-year project) scenario, the County shall implement a traffic monitoring program that at a minimum includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Fiddymont Road: Roseville city limits to Sunset Area Plan boundary, ▲ Foothills Boulevard: Sunset Boulevard to Athens Avenue, and ▲ Dowd Road: Sunset Boulevard West to Athens Avenue.

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable	
Cumulative Impact 4.14-16: Cumulative impacts to intersection operations in Placer County	S	Implement Mitigation Measures 4.14-2a and 4.14-2c (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area). Mitigation Measure 4.14-16: Adopt update to Placer County Countywide CIP and countywide traffic impact fee to include installing traffic signals and capacity-enhancing improvements currently not included in known fee program (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area) Consistent with Mitigation Measure 4.14-2a, the County shall adopt an update to the Placer County Countywide CIP and countywide traffic impact fee concurrently with the SAP and PRSP to include installing traffic signals and capacity-enhancing improvements currently not included in any known fee program at the following intersections: ▲ Sunset Boulevard / South Loop Road/Placer Corporate Drive (net SAP and PRSP areas), ▲ Athens Avenue / Fiddymont Road (net SAP area), ▲ Athens Avenue / Industrial Avenue (net SAP area), ▲ Athens Avenue / Foothills Boulevard North (net SAP area), and ▲ Sunset Boulevard / Cincinnati Avenue (net SAP area). Prior to the issuance of building permits, project proponents of future development projects within the SAP area, including the PRSP area, shall pay the applicable countywide traffic impact fees, as determined by DPWF, which will provide funding for improvements at the above intersections.	LTS
Cumulative Impact 4.14-17: Cumulative impacts to intersection operations in City of Roseville	S	Implement Mitigation Measure 4.14-3 (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area). Mitigation Measure 4.14-17: Pay impact fees to Placer County toward construction of transportation facilities and/or improvements at intersections in City of Roseville (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area) Prior to building permit issuance, project proponents of future development projects within the SAP area, including the PRSP area, shall pay impact fees to Placer County, as determined by DPWF, in amounts that constitute the SAP area’s fair share contribution to the construction of transportation facilities and/or improvements at the following intersections within the City of Roseville. ▲ Blue Oaks Boulevard / Foothills Boulevard, ▲ Blue Oaks Boulevard / Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard, ▲ Pleasant Grove Boulevard / Roseville Parkway, ▲ Fiddymont Road / Parkland Way/Angus Drive, ▲ Roseville Parkway / Washington Boulevard, ▲ Blue Oaks Boulevard / Fidelity Way, and	SU

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures			Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable		
			<p>▲ Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard / Hop Scotch Way.</p> <p>Placer County, in working with the City of Roseville to provide funding for improvements not already subject to an existing interagency fee program, shall negotiate in good faith with the City of Roseville to enter into additional fair and reasonable arrangements with the intention of achieving, within a reasonable time period after approval of the SAP, including the PRSP, commitment for the provision of adequate fair share mitigation from the SAP/PRSP for significant impacts on City of Roseville transportation facilities and improvements at intersections. In reaching an accommodation with the City of Roseville, the County and City, in order to better ensure an effective sub-regional approach to mitigating transportation-related impacts, may choose to include within the same agreements or JPA (if a JPA is formed) additional public agencies with whom it must work to mitigate transportation-related impacts, such as Sacramento County, Sutter County, and Caltrans. As the County strives to achieve agreement(s) with one or more of these other agencies, the County shall insist that “fair share” fee obligations be reciprocal, in the sense that the other local agencies, in accepting fair share contributions from the SAP/PRSP developers, must agree to require new development occurring in their own jurisdictions to make fair share contributions towards mitigating the significant effects of such development on the County’s transportation network. Any such arrangement(s), with just the City of Roseville or with additional agencies, shall account for existing inter-agency fee programs in order to avoid requiring redundant mitigation or fee payments exceeding fair share mitigation levels.</p> <p>The County intends that its arrangement(s) with the City of Roseville and any other agencies shall permit the participating agencies’ flexibility in providing cross-jurisdictional credits and reimbursements consistent with the general “fair share” mitigation standard, and require an updated model run incorporating the best available information in order to obtain the most accurate, up-to-date impact assessment feasible and to generate the most accurate, up-to-date estimates of regional fair share contributions. These arrangements, moreover, should also include provisions that allow for periodic updates to the traffic modeling on which fair share payment calculations depend in order to account for (i) newly approved projects cumulatively contributing to transportation-related impacts and that therefore should contribute to the funding of necessary improvements, (ii) additional physical improvements necessitated in whole or in part by newly approved projects, (iii) changing cost calculations for the construction of needed improvements based on changes in the costs of materials, labor, and other inputs. The County will monitor traffic volumes and coordinate with the City of Roseville regarding traffic mitigation fees to fund regional improvements.</p>			

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
			<p>The necessary capacity enhancements to mitigate the project's cumulatively considerable effects at the impacted intersections listed above would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Blue Oaks Boulevard / Foothills Boulevard: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▸ Widen the southbound approach to accommodate a third southbound left-turn lane. ▸ Modify signal to provide right-turn overlap phase for westbound and eastbound right-turn movements, and prohibit conflicting U-turn movements. ▲ Blue Oaks Boulevard / Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▸ Increase the storage for the westbound left-turn lanes to a minimum of 500 feet. ▲ Pleasant Grove Boulevard / Roseville Parkway: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▸ Modify the signal operations from the existing split phasing on Roseville Parkway to protected left-turn phasing. ▲ Fiddymont Road / Parkland Way/Angus Drive: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▸ Modify the eastbound and westbound left-turn phasing from protected phasing to permitted phasing. ▲ Roseville Parkway / Washington Boulevard: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▸ Widen the westbound and eastbound approaches to accommodate a third through lane. ▲ Blue Oaks Boulevard / Fidelity Way: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▸ Widen the northbound approach to accommodate a second right-turn lane. ▲ Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard / Hop Scotch Way: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▸ Install a traffic signal. <p>There are no feasible mitigations available for the remaining impacted intersection of Baseline Road / Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard. The intersection would be built to its ultimate configuration with four lanes on Baseline Road and westbound and eastbound left-turn and right-turn pockets under cumulative conditions. The south leg of the intersection is constrained by existing development, making it infeasible to widen the northbound or southbound approaches to accommodate additional through lanes or turn pockets. Signal timing adjustments would not reduce delay sufficiently to restore operations to a better LOS F.</p>	
Cumulative Impact 4.14-18: Cumulative impacts to intersection operations in City of Rocklin		S	Implement Mitigation Measure 4.14-10 (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area). Implementation of Phase 4 of the SR 65 Widening project identified under the mitigation discussion of Impact 4.14-23 would result in a shift of traffic from Wildcat Boulevard onto SR 65. This would result in acceptable LOS C operations during the p.m. peak hour at both Whitney Ranch Parkway /	SU

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures			Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable		
			<p>Wildcat Boulevard and Stanford Ranch Road / Wildcat Boulevard intersections under cumulative conditions. Mitigation Measure 4.14-23 would obligate project proponents of future development projects within the SAP area, including the PRSP area, to pay their fair share towards this improvement through the SPRTA fee program, applicable regional impact fee programs, and/or impact fees to Placer County.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.14-18a: Pay fair share cost toward modifying Sunset Boulevard/Lonetree Boulevard/W. Stanford Ranch Road intersection (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>Prior to building permit issuance, the project proponent shall pay their fair share cost towards modifying the Sunset Boulevard / Lonetree Boulevard/W. Stanford Ranch Road intersection as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Widen the southbound approach to add a second southbound right-turn lane, and ▲ Widen the northbound approach to add a second northbound left-turn lane. <p>This improvement would restore operations to LOS D during the p.m. peak hour.</p> <p>Placer County, in working with the City of Rocklin to provide funding for improvements not already subject to an existing interagency fee program, shall negotiate in good faith with the City of Rocklin to enter into additional fair and reasonable arrangements with the intention of achieving, within a reasonable time period after approval of the SAP, including the PRSP, commitment for the provision of adequate fair share mitigation from the SAP/PRSP for significant impacts on City of Rocklin intersections. In reaching an accommodation with the City of Rocklin, the County and City, in order to better ensure an effective sub-regional approach to mitigating transportation-related impacts, may choose to include within the same agreements or JPA (if a JPA is formed) additional public agencies with whom it must work to mitigate transportation-related impacts, such as Sacramento County, Sutter County, and Caltrans. As the County strives to achieve agreement(s) with one or more of these other agencies, the County shall insist that “fair share” fee obligations be reciprocal, in the sense that the other local agencies, in accepting fair share contributions from the SAP/PRSP developers, must agree to require new development occurring in their own jurisdictions to make fair share contributions towards mitigating the significant effects of such development on the County’s transportation network. Any such arrangement(s), with just the City of Rocklin or with additional agencies, shall account for existing inter-agency fee programs in order to avoid requiring redundant mitigation or fee payments exceeding fair share mitigation levels.</p> <p>The County intends that its arrangement(s) with the City of Rocklin and any other agencies shall permit the participating agencies’ flexibility in providing cross-jurisdictional credits and</p>			

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures			Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable		
						<p>reimbursements consistent with the general “fair share” mitigation standard, and require an updated model run incorporating the best available information in order to obtain the most accurate, up-to-date impact assessment feasible and to generate the most accurate, up-to-date estimates of regional fair share contributions. These arrangements, moreover, should also include provisions that allow for periodic updates to the traffic modeling on which fair share payment calculations depend in order to account for (i) newly approved projects cumulatively contributing to transportation-related impacts and that therefore should contribute to the funding of necessary improvements, (ii) additional physical improvements necessitated in whole or in part by newly approved projects, (iii) changing cost calculations for the construction of needed improvements based on changes in the costs of materials, labor, and other inputs. The County will monitor traffic volumes and coordinate with the City of Rocklin regarding traffic mitigation fees to fund regional improvements.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.14-18b: Pay fair share cost toward modifying Pacific Street/Sunset Boulevard intersection (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>Prior to building permit issuance, the project proponent shall pay their fair share cost towards modifying the Pacific Street / Sunset Boulevard intersection as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Restripe the eastbound approach of Sunset Boulevard to feature the following lane configuration as it approaches Pacific Street: two left-turn lanes, one shared through-left turn lane, and one right-turn pocket. <p>This improvement would restore operations to LOS E during the p.m. peak hour.</p> <p>Placer County, in working with the City of Rocklin to provide funding for improvements not already subject to an existing interagency fee program, shall negotiate in good faith with the City of Rocklin to enter into additional fair and reasonable arrangements with the intention of achieving, within a reasonable time period after approval of the SAP, including the PRSP, commitment for the provision of adequate fair share mitigation from the SAP/PRSP for significant impacts on City of Rocklin intersections. In reaching an accommodation with the City of Rocklin, the County and City, in order to better ensure an effective sub-regional approach to mitigating transportation-related impacts, may choose to include within the same agreements or JPA (if a JPA is formed) additional public agencies with whom it must work to mitigate transportation-related impacts, such as Sacramento County, Sutter County, and Caltrans. As the County strives to achieve agreement(s) with one or more of these other agencies, the County shall insist that “fair share” fee obligations be reciprocal, in the sense that the other local agencies, in accepting fair share contributions from the SAP/PRSP</p>

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures			Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable		
			<p>developers, must agree to require new development occurring in their own jurisdictions to make fair share contributions towards mitigating the significant effects of such development on the County's transportation network. Any such arrangement(s), with just the City of Rocklin or with additional agencies, shall account for existing inter-agency fee programs in order to avoid requiring redundant mitigation or fee payments exceeding fair share mitigation levels.</p> <p>The County intends that its arrangement(s) with the City of Rocklin and any other agencies shall permit the participating agencies' flexibility in providing cross-jurisdictional credits and reimbursements consistent with the general "fair share" mitigation standard, and require an updated model run incorporating the best available information in order to obtain the most accurate, up-to-date impact assessment feasible and to generate the most accurate, up-to-date estimates of regional fair share contributions. These arrangements, moreover, should also include provisions that allow for periodic updates to the traffic modeling on which fair share payment calculations depend in order to account for (i) newly approved projects cumulatively contributing to transportation-related impacts and that therefore should contribute to the funding of necessary improvements, (ii) additional physical improvements necessitated in whole or in part by newly approved projects, (iii) changing cost calculations for the construction of needed improvements based on changes in the costs of materials, labor, and other inputs. The County will monitor traffic volumes and coordinate with the City of Rocklin regarding traffic mitigation fees to fund regional improvements.</p>			
<p>Cumulative Impact 4.14-19: Cumulative impacts to intersection operations in City of Lincoln</p>		S	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.14-19: Pay fair share cost toward striping second eastbound left-turn lane at Joiner Parkway/Twelve Bridges Drive intersection (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>Prior to building permit issuance, the project proponent shall pay their fair share cost towards striping a second eastbound left-turn lane at the Joiner Parkway / Twelve Bridges Drive intersection.</p> <p>This improvement would restore operations to LOS D during the p.m. peak hour. The eastbound approach currently has a turn pocket wide enough to support dual eastbound left-turn lanes along with loop detectors to support this improvement. In addition, Joiner Parkway is planned to be widened to a four-lane roadway north of Twelve Bridges Drive, as identified in the Tier 1 SACOG MTP/SCS project list, which will provide adequate receiving lanes.</p> <p>Placer County, in working with the City of Lincoln to provide funding for improvements not already subject to an existing interagency fee program, shall negotiate in good faith with the City of Lincoln to enter into additional fair and reasonable arrangements with the intention of achieving, within a reasonable time period after approval of the SAP, including the PRSP,</p>			LTS

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
			<p>commitment for the provision of adequate fair share mitigation from the SAP/PRSP for significant impacts on City of Lincoln intersections. In reaching an accommodation with the City of Lincoln, the County and City, in order to better ensure an effective sub-regional approach to mitigating transportation-related impacts, may choose to include within the same agreements or JPA (if a JPA is formed) additional public agencies with whom it must work to mitigate transportation-related impacts, such as Sacramento County, Sutter County, and Caltrans. As the County strives to achieve agreement(s) with one or more of these other agencies, the County shall insist that “fair share” fee obligations be reciprocal, in the sense that the other local agencies, in accepting fair share contributions from the SAP/PRSP developers, must agree to require new development occurring in their own jurisdictions to make fair share contributions towards mitigating the significant effects of such development on the County’s transportation network. Any such arrangement(s), with just the City of Lincoln or with additional agencies, shall account for existing inter-agency fee programs in order to avoid requiring redundant mitigation or fee payments exceeding fair share mitigation levels.</p> <p>The County intends that its arrangement(s) with the City of Lincoln and any other agencies shall permit the participating agencies’ flexibility in providing cross-jurisdictional credits and reimbursements consistent with the general “fair share” mitigation standard, and require an updated model run incorporating the best available information in order to obtain the most accurate, up-to-date impact assessment feasible and to generate the most accurate, up-to-date estimates of regional fair share contributions. These arrangements, moreover, should also include provisions that allow for periodic updates to the traffic modeling on which fair share payment calculations depend in order to account for (i) newly approved projects cumulatively contributing to transportation-related impacts and that therefore should contribute to the funding of necessary improvements, (ii) additional physical improvements necessitated in whole or in part by newly approved projects, (iii) changing cost calculations for the construction of needed improvements based on changes in the costs of materials, labor, and other inputs. The County will monitor traffic volumes and coordinate with the City of Lincoln regarding traffic mitigation fees to fund regional improvements.</p>	
Cumulative Impact 4.14-20: Cumulative impacts to intersection operations in Sutter County		LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Cumulative Impact 4.14-21: Cumulative impacts to intersection operations in Sacramento County		LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
<p>Cumulative Impact 4.14-22: Cumulative impacts to intersection operations under Caltrans jurisdiction</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.14-22: Pay fair share cost toward signal modification at Placer Parkway/SR 65 southbound ramps intersection (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>Prior to building permit issuance, the project proponent shall pay their fair share cost towards the following signal modification at the Placer Parkway / SR 65 Southbound Ramps intersection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Restripe the southbound off-ramp approach to feature the following lane configuration: one left-turn lane, one shared through-right turn lane, and one right-turn lane. <p>This modification would improve operations to LOS B during the p.m. peak hour and maintain LOS B operations during the a.m. peak hour. This mitigation requires Placer County, on behalf of the project proponent, to negotiate in good faith with Caltrans to identify the fair share funding contribution and establish a means to provide this funding to Caltrans.</p>	SU	
<p>Cumulative Impact 4.14-23: Cumulative impacts to freeway operations</p>	S	<p>Implement Mitigation Measure 4.14-10 (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area).</p>	SU	
<p>Cumulative Impact 4.14-24: Cumulative impacts to freeway off-ramp queuing</p>	LTS	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	LTS	
<p>Cumulative Impact 4.14-25: Cumulative impacts to vehicle miles traveled</p>	S	<p>Implement Mitigation Measures 4.14-12a and 4.14-12b (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area).</p>	SU	
<p>4.15 Utilities</p>				
<p>Impact 4.15-1: Increased demand for water supply</p> <p>Buildout of the net SAP and the PRSP areas would generate an estimated demand of 4,330 afy and 4,085 afy, respectively, for a total estimated demand of 8,415 afy. These water demand estimates consider system losses, the use of recycled water in the net SAP and PRSP areas, and water conservation measures anticipated for the PRSP. As described in the WSA for the SAP, the net SAP and PRSP areas were included in PCWA's 2015 UWMP as having a system demand of 9,656 afy, for which there is adequate supply in normal, dry, and multiple dry years. PCWA anticipates that water would be supplied through surface water supplies with groundwater supplies to be used as backup in drought or other water supply emergencies. The net SAP and PRSP water demand would be less than the water demand projected in the 2015 UWMP; thus, there would be sufficient water supply to meet demands of buildout of the net SAP and PRSP areas. Implementation of the project would have a less-than-significant impact on demand for water supply.</p>	LTS	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	LTS	

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures			Significance after Mitigation
		NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	
<p>Impact 4.15-2: Increased demand for water supply conveyance and water treatment services</p> <p>Buildout of the net SAP and PRSP areas would generate the need for water treatment and conveyance infrastructure, including pipelines and increased water treatment capacity. While existing WTPs have some capacity to serve new development, the amount of treatment capacity needed exceeds current available capacity. This impact would be potentially significant.</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.15-2: Ensure adequate water treatment capacity (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>Prior to approval of each small lot tentative map within the net SAP or PRSP areas, water demand shall be identified and water treatment capacity necessary to serve the proposed development in the small lot tentative map area shall be identified. No small lot tentative map(s) shall be approved within the net SAP or PRSP unless and until adequate water treatment capacity is identified.</p>			SU
<p>Impact 4.15-3: Increased demand for wastewater collection and conveyance services</p> <p>Wastewater flows of 11.76 mgd PWWF and 5.95 mgd PWWF generated by buildout of the net SAP and the PRSP areas, respectively, would be served by new facilities within the plan areas and new off-site sewer lines that would connect to existing sewer conveyance infrastructure to carry wastewater to the PGWWTP. The necessary wastewater collection and conveyance facilities would be constructed and accepted by the County prior to building occupancy and in accordance with requirements of the agency providing service. With proposed upsizing of the 24-inch pipe crossing Pleasant Grove Creek, the existing City of Roseville sewer lines downstream from the net SAP and PRSP areas have sufficient capacity to convey wastewater flows from the project (HydroScience 2017:6), and the planned wastewater collection system would be designed to accommodate wastewater flows from the net SAP and PRSP areas. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.			LTS
<p>Impact 4.15-4: Increased demand for wastewater treatment services</p> <p>The wastewater flows generated by buildout of the PRSP and net SAP areas are estimated to be 1.99 and 3.78 mgd, respectively, for a combined total of 5.77 mgd ADWF. The PGWWTP currently treats 7.1 mgd ADWF, has an operating treatment capacity of 9.5 mgd ADWF, and is permitted to discharge 12 mgd ADWF in compliance with its NPDES Permit. The plant has available capacity to treat an estimated 2.4 mgd. While wastewater flows from the PRSP area alone could be treated at the PGWWTP, the wastewater collection system would be designed to convey combined buildout flows from both the net SAP and PRSP areas to the PGWWTP. Therefore, any volume beyond that allowed by the PGWWTP's existing NPDES permit would be require additional capacity and a new permit that would identify wastewater treatment requirements. Wastewater flows from the PRSP area</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.15-4a: Annex to SPWA's regional service area and PGWWTP's service area (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>Prior to improvement plan approval for development in the net SAP and PRSP areas that are outside the service boundaries of SPWA and PGWWTP, project proponents shall demonstrate to Placer County that the SPWA has approved expansion of the SPWA 2005 Regional Service Area Boundary to include the affected areas. Also, the project proponents shall demonstrate that SPWA has approved expansions of the PGWWTP service boundary to include the affected areas.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.15-4b: Confirm infrastructure capacity (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)</p> <p>Prior to improvement plan approval for development in the net SAP or PRSP areas, project proponents shall provide confirmation from SPWA and the City of Roseville that there is sufficient infrastructure and treatment capacity to serve the final design plan flows for the proposed development.</p>			LTS

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation	
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
<p>would not cause permit limits to be exceeded, but the PGWWTP would not have sufficient capacity to treat the estimated combined wastewater flows from buildout of the net SAP and the PRSP areas. Placer County requires project proponents to obtain written confirmation from SPWA to demonstrate that wastewater treatment services would be provided. While wastewater treatment capacity is sufficient in the nearer term to accommodate buildout of the PRSP area (over approximately 20 years), it is currently insufficient to serve treatment needs from ultimate buildout of the net SAP (over approximately 80 years) and PRSP areas. The project’s wastewater flows would require eventual expansion of the PGWWTP. The impact of increased demand for wastewater treatment services would be significant.</p>		<p>Future projects within the net SAP and PRSP areas shall participate financially in the construction of additional wastewater treatment capacity sufficient to accommodate projected flows through payment of connection fees facilitated through annexation into CSA 28, Zone 2A3. Project proponents shall also participate on a fair share basis in other financing mechanisms for any additional environmental review required to secure approvals necessary to increase wastewater discharges from the plant, including approval by the SPWA for expansion of the service area boundary. It is recognized that the project proponents shall rely on the City of Roseville (on behalf of the SPWA partners) to construct the wastewater treatment expansion needed to treat and discharge wastewater produced within the PGWWTP service area boundary, including buildout of the net SAP and PRSP areas.</p>		
<p>Impact 4.15-5: Construction of stormwater drainage infrastructure Implementation of the SAP, including the PRSP, would increase impervious surfaces in the project area, which would increase stormwater runoff. SAP policies require new development to comply with County requirements, including the Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District’s Stormwater Management Manual and the County Land Development Manual. Modeling and analysis indicate that compliance with these policies is achievable and feasible. Therefore, implementation of the SAP, including the PRSP, would have a potentially significant impact regarding stormwater infrastructure.</p>	PS	<p>Implement Mitigation Measures 4.6-1a and 4.6-1b, as well as 4.6-1c, identified in Section 4.6, “Geology and Soils,” and Mitigation Measures 4.9-1a and 4.9-1b, identified in Section 4.9, “Hydrology and Water Quality.”</p>	LTS	
<p>Impact 4.15-6: Increased demand for solid waste services Buildout of the net SAP area and the PRSP area would create new sources of solid waste generation, including construction waste. Development in the net SAP area and PRSP area would comply with state-mandated solid waste recycling and diversion requirements for construction waste and operational waste of 65 percent and 50 percent, respectively. After the recycling and diversion requirements for construction waste in the net SAP area and PRSP area are met, a total of 192,695 cubic yards of construction waste would remain, which would be 0.8 percent of the remaining capacity at WRSL. Combined, operation of new uses in the net SAP area and PRSP area would generate 201 tons of solid waste on a daily basis, which would be 36 percent of the remaining available daily permitted processing capacity at the MRF. Annually, buildout of the net SAP area and PRSP area would result in the disposal of an estimated 49,004 cubic yards, which would be 0.2 percent of the</p>	LTS	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	LTS	

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable	
remaining capacity at WRSL. Because implementation of the SAP, including the PRSP, would comply with all regulatory requirements that relate to the disposal and recycling of solid waste and because the MRF and WRSL have adequate capacity for disposal of solid waste generated by construction and operation of the net SAP area and PRSP area, this impact would be less than significant.			
<p>Impact 4.15-7: Increased demand for electricity</p> Implementation of the SAP, including the PRSP, would increase demand for electricity by bringing new residential and non-residential electricity users to the area. The increased demand for electricity could require additional electricity generation and transmission facilities, as well as the need for distribution infrastructure. PG&E has existing and planned substations in the SAP area that would have sufficient capacity to serve the new development in the net SAP and PRSP areas. Distribution infrastructure would be installed concurrently with net SAP and PRSP development, thereby reducing potential environmental impacts. The impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>Impact 4.15-8: Increased demand for natural gas</p> Implementation of the SAP, including the PRSP, would increase demand for natural gas by bringing new customers to the area. The increased demand for natural gas would require new distribution infrastructure. PG&E's existing Line 123 transmission main runs through the project area, and new development would be able to connect to the existing system. Distribution infrastructure would be installed concurrently with net SAP and PRSP development, thereby reducing potential environmental impacts. The impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>Impact 4.15-9: Increased demand for communication services</p> Buildout of the net SAP area and PRSP area would increase demand for communications services and would require new communications infrastructure to provide cable, voice, and data services to these areas. These additional services would be provided by private telecommunications companies and would be funded through developer fees and future customer billing. All communications lines would be installed in roadway rights-of-way, so there would not be any environmental impacts beyond the construction impacts identified in this EIR. Therefore, the demand for communications services would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures			Significance after Mitigation
		NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	
<p>Impact 4.15-10: Consistency with applicable general plan policies</p> <p>The project was reviewed for consistency with the policies of the Placer County General Plan relating to utilities and found to be consistent. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.			LTS
<p>Impact 4.15-11: Potential impact on Western Regional Sanitary Landfill from incompatible land use that results in insufficient permitted capacity to serve waste disposal needs</p> <p>The close proximity of incompatible land uses and the resulting increased odor complaints that are likely to occur with project implementation could result in increased public pressure and enforcement action. It is possible, but not likely, that such pressure could result in the need for WPWMA to modify WRSL operations, including possible diversion of waste to other facilities. Additionally, complaints related to the landfill and co-located operations could cause opposition to future expansion plans, and could jeopardize approval of the expansion. However, these are unlikely scenarios. WPWMA and its member agencies have a substantial investment in the WRSL and MRF, which are benefits to the region; WPWMA is planning near-term facility improvements; WPWMA remains actively engaged with the community and stakeholders about nuisance odor issues; and WPWMA continues to be proactive about implementing odor control measures, including pilot studies to investigate the feasibility of specific technologies. For these reasons, it would be speculative to conclude that public pressure would mount to such a degree to cause something as severe as diversion of waste to other facilities, landfill closure, or denial of expansion plans. Importantly, the results of research into similar facilities indicate that landfills that are the subject of odor complaints have been allowed to expand. For these reasons, this impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.			LTS
<p>Cumulative Impact 4.15-12: Cumulative increase in demand for water supply</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.			LTS
<p>Cumulative Impact 4.15-13: Cumulative increase in demand for water supply conveyance and water treatment services</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.			LTS
<p>Cumulative Impact 4.15-14: Cumulative increase in demand for wastewater collection and conveyance services</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.15-14: Ensure sufficient capacity in City of Roseville wastewater conveyance lines</p> <p>Prior to development project improvement plans approval for the first development phase of the</p>			LTS

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts		Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact	LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant	SU = Significant and unavoidable
			<p>net SAP area and the first development phase of the PRSP area, the project proponents for future development within these plan areas shall update the net SAP area and PRSP area buildout peak wastewater flows based on each project's final design. If the project proponents find that the project-generated peak wastewater flows exceed the capacity of the Pleasant Grove Creek crossing sewer line and/or the Pleasant Grove sewer trunk line downstream of the net SAP area and PRSP area points of connection, the project proponents shall develop plans for and construct improvements that would allow for conveyance of each project's buildout wastewater flows. Development within the net SAP and PRSP areas shall pay its fair share toward the development, construction, and operation of any upsizing of these existing facilities or additional wastewater conveyance lines if existing facilities are not upsized. There is an existing reimbursement agreement for additional capacity in the Pleasant Grove Creek crossing between Placer County and West Roseville Development Company, Inc., dated May 3, 2008. Any negotiation of fair share fees associated with the crossing shall be in compliance with this agreement. The improvements shall be constructed to meet peak wet weather flows determined by final design plans, in the sewer lines downstream of the net SAP area and PRSP area points of connection with the Pleasant Grove Creek crossing sewer line and/or the Pleasant Grove sewer trunk line. The plans shall identify the timing of the improvements and confirm that the capacity of the lines would be available when needed by development within the net SAP and PRSP areas. Improvements shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ replacing the existing City of Roseville wastewater conveyance lines with larger sewer lines that would increase capacity to serve future demand for wastewater conveyance or ▲ installing an additional wastewater conveyance line parallel to the existing City of Roseville lines that increases capacity to serve future demand for wastewater conveyance. 	
Cumulative Impact 4.15-15: Cumulative increase in demand for wastewater treatment services		S	Implement Mitigation Measure 4.15-4a: Annex to SPWA's regional service area and PGWWTP's service area, and Mitigation Measure 4.15-4b: Confirm infrastructure capacity.	LTS
Cumulative Impact 4.15-16: Cumulative increase in demand for stormwater drainage infrastructure		LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Cumulative Impact 4.15-17: Cumulative increase in demand for solid waste services		LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Cumulative Impact 4.15-18: Cumulative increase in demand for electricity		LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Cumulative Impact 4.15-19: Cumulative increase in demand for natural gas		LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NI = No impact LTS = Less than significant	PS = Potentially significant	S = Significant SU = Significant and unavoidable	
Cumulative Impact 4.15-20: Cumulative increase in demand for communication services	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
4.16 Energy			
Impact 4.16-1: Wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy, during construction or operation Land uses developed and operated under the project would increase electricity and natural gas consumption. Buildings developed under the project would comply with CCR Title 24 standards for building energy efficiency that are in effect at the time of construction. The project would include bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure that would promote reductions to VMT and associated consumption of automotive fuel. Implementation of mitigation measures addressing GHG and transit needs would further improve the energy efficiency of these land uses. Construction-related energy consumption would be temporary and would not require additional capacity or increased peak or base period demands for electricity or other forms of energy. Thus, energy consumption associated with development under the project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy; this impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 4.16-2: Consistency with applicable general plan policies The project is consistent with the policies of the Placer County General Plan relating to energy efficiency. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Cumulative Impact 4.16-3: Cumulative wasteful and inefficient consumption of energy	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

This page intentionally left blank.