

1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

The Whitehawk I & II Projects (proposed projects) Environmental Impact Report (EIR) evaluates the potential physical environmental impacts associated with two projects, referred to as Whitehawk I (WHI) and Whitehawk II (WHII). Placer County, as California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) lead agency, previously prepared separate Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declarations (IS/MNDs) for each project and released the IS/MNDs for a 30-day public review period from November 2, 2016 to December 2, 2016. A substantial number of public comments were received on the IS/MNDs, among them comments expressing the belief that WHI and WHII really comprise a single project, the combined impacts of which should be considered in a single environmental document.

It is reasonable, however, to consider WHI and WHII as separate projects under the independent utility test, meaning that neither project requires the other project in order to proceed. The courts have considered distinct activities as one CEQA project and required them to be reviewed together in two situations: (1) when the purpose of the project under review is to provide the first step toward a larger development; and (2) when development of the project under review requires or presumes completion of another activity.¹ Neither the WHI project nor WHII project meet situation 1 or 2. Thus, each project can move forward independent of the other and undergo separate environmental review. Notwithstanding this, the County has carefully considered public comments and has decided to evaluate the potential environmental effects of both projects, individually and combined, within a single EIR. There is precedent for doing so, and the appropriateness of such an approach is set forth by Kostka and Zischke, as follows:²

An agency may elect to complete a single EIR for separate projects when there is a reasonable basis for doing so and combining the separate projects for review will not lead to confusion. In *Neighbors of Cavitt Ranch v County of Placer* (2003) 106 CA4th 1092, the county had prepared a single EIR evaluating a low-density residential development on one part of the property and a new church on another part, following submittal of a single application for the two proposals. The county later decided to consider the proposals as independent projects and separately certified the EIR for each project. Opponents of the church argued that the county violated CEQA by including two projects in a single EIR and certifying the same EIR twice. The court ruled that in the absence of a showing that such a procedure would lead to confusion, CEQA does not prohibit the inclusion of

¹ Stephen L. Kostka and Michael H. Zischke. *Practice Under the California Environmental Quality Act, Second Edition* [Oakland: Continuing Education of the Bar, pg. 12-15]. March 2018 Update.

² Stephen L. Kostka and Michael H. Zischke. *Practice Under the California Environmental Quality Act, Second Edition, Vol I* [pg. 12-17]. March 2016 Update.

distinct projects requiring different governmental approval in a single EIR. 106 CA4th at 1103.

This EIR includes the following project-level analytical scenarios in a manner that avoids confusion:

- WHI only impacts;
- WHII only impacts; and
- WHI and WHII combined impacts.

This approach is also intended to provide the community, interested agencies, the Planning Commission, and Board of Supervisors with sufficient information to understand the impacts of each project separately, as well as combined. If the Board of Supervisors ultimately approves both WHI and WHII, the EIR will clearly identify the impacts and associated mitigation measures that must be implemented. On the other hand, if the Board of Supervisors approves only one of the projects, or approves one of the projects ahead of the other, the mitigation measures specific to the particular proposal can be easily isolated, and separate findings of fact/statement of overriding considerations can be prepared. To further illustrate the importance of this, it is necessary to clarify that the WHI project application is currently on hold and there is no applicant seeking entitlements at this time. Thus, it may be that the WHII project moves ahead of the WHI project and is first approved by the Board of Supervisors. It should also be noted that if the processing of the WHI project is reinitiated, but the project design is modified, then the County will need to evaluate whether this EIR continues to adequately describe, evaluate, and mitigate the potential impacts of the WHI project. This EIR adequately evaluates and mitigates impacts, to the extent feasible, for the WHI project as set forth in Chapter 3, Project Description, of this EIR.

1.2 TYPE AND PURPOSE OF THE EIR

This EIR has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970, Pub. Res. Code §§ 21000-21178, as amended and the Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, Cal. Code Regs. Title 14, §§ 15000-15387 (CEQA Guidelines). Placer County is the lead agency for the environmental review of the proposed projects evaluated herein and has the principal responsibility for approving the project(s). As required by Section 15121 of the CEQA Guidelines, this EIR will (a) inform public agency decision-makers, and the public generally, of the significant environmental effects of the project, (b) identify possible ways to minimize the significant adverse environmental effects, and (c) describe reasonable and feasible project alternatives which reduce environmental effects.

As provided in the CEQA Guidelines Section 15021, public agencies are charged with the duty to avoid or minimize environmental damage where feasible. The public agency has an obligation to balance a variety of public objectives, including economic, environmental, and social issues. CEQA requires the preparation of an EIR prior to approving any project that may have a significant effect on the environment. For the purposes of CEQA, the term *project* refers to the whole of an action, which has the potential for resulting in a direct physical change or a

reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (CEQA Guidelines Section 15378[a]). With respect to the proposed projects, the County has determined that the proposed WHI and WHII developments are *projects* within the definition of CEQA, which have the potential for resulting in significant environmental effects.

The “lead agency,” which is Placer County, is required to consider the information in the EIR along with any other available information in deciding whether to approve the WHI and WHII projects. The basic requirements for an EIR include discussions of the environmental setting, environmental impacts, mitigation measures, alternatives, growth inducing impacts, and cumulative impacts.

The CEQA Guidelines identify several types of EIRs, each applicable to different project circumstances. This EIR has been prepared as a *project-level EIR* pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15161, which is an analysis that examines the environmental impacts of specific development projects. A *project-level EIR* focuses primarily on the changes in the environment that would result from the development of the projects, and examines all phases of the projects including planning, construction, and operation.

1.3 KNOWN RESPONSIBLE AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES

“Responsible agency” means a public agency that proposes to carry out or approve a project for which a lead agency is preparing or has prepared an EIR or Negative Declaration. For the purpose of CEQA, the term responsible agency includes all California public agencies other than the lead agency that have discretionary approval power over the project or an aspect of the project. The Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board has been identified as a potential responsible agency.

“Trustee agency” means a state agency having jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by a project, which are held in trust for the people of the State of California. The only known possible trustee agency is the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW).

Although not subject to California law, and thus outside the definitions of responsible agencies or trustee agencies, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), National Marine Fisheries Service, and Federal Emergency Management Agency would also be called upon to grant approvals — under federal law — necessary for the development of the project sites. The agencies do not have duties under CEQA but rather are governed by a variety of federal statutory schemes, such as the Clean Water Act, which governs the dredging and filling of waters of the U.S. (e.g., some wetlands), and the Endangered Species Act, which requires USACE to consult with the USFWS as part of the review process for any wetland or fill permits that may be required.

1.4 PROJECT SUMMARY

As noted above, this EIR includes the evaluation of the impacts of two independent projects, WHI and WHII, as well as the impacts of the two projects combined. WHI would involve the development of a 24-unit Planned Residential Development (PD), WHII would involve the development of a 55-unit PD. Both projects would require Granite Bay Community Plan (GBCP) land use map amendments and rezoning to accommodate the proposed residential densities.

WHI

The 18.09-acre WHI site (APN 048-151-001) is located on the south side of Douglas Boulevard, approximately 200 feet east of Woodgrove Way and southeast of the Douglas Boulevard and Woodgrove Way/Quail Oaks Drive intersection. An intervening 18.7-acre parcel between the WHI site and the WHII site is located east of the WHI site (the Mac Bride Parcel) and is occupied by one single-family residence with various sheds and outbuildings. WHI would include the development of 24 single-family residences arranged along a private roadway extending through the neighborhood. A new private, gated road extending south from Douglas Boulevard would be constructed for project site access. The project would also include a 300-foot scenic setback along the south side of Douglas Boulevard on the northern boundary of the project site. The scenic setback would be maintained as open space and rezoned to Open Space to protect existing oak woodlands. The setback would create a visual separation between Douglas Boulevard and the proposed residential uses. In 2006, the Planning Commission approved a seven-lot residential Planned Development with four open space lots on this site. Approximately 9.82 acres of the site (approximately 54 percent), including Strap Ravine and the associated floodplain, would be retained as restricted and common area open space, including 5.39 acres of ‘restricted open space’, 4.10 acres of ‘open space – common area’, and a 0.33-acre park. Development would not be allowed within the 5.39 acres of restricted open space. The proposed 0.33-acre park would include active and passive recreation facilities such as seating areas, a bocce ball court, and pedestrian walkways.

An Emergency Vehicle Access (EVA) is planned along an existing sewer line easement/maintenance road at the southwest corner of the WHI site, south of Lot 24. The 20-foot sewer/EVA access road extends within a 25-foot off-site easement for approximately 525 feet west to Chestnut Court, a public road southwest of the site. Tube gates would be used where the EVA meets the adjacent property lines.

The Placer County General Plan and the GBCP designate the WHI site north of Strap Ravine as Rural Low Density Residential (0.9 – 2.3 Ac. minimum) and the portion south of Strap Ravine as Rural Residential (2.3 – 4.6 Ac. minimum). The WHI project includes a request to change the land use designations of the site to Low Density Residential (0.4 – 0.9 Ac. minimum), with the exception of the northern 3.96-acre portion of the site within 300 feet of Douglas Boulevard, which would be designated Open Space. The Placer County zoning designation for the WHI site is RA-B-100 PD=0.5 (Residential Agricultural, minimum Building Site of 100,000 square feet, combining Planned Residential Development of 0.5 units per acre). The WHI project includes a request to rezone the southern 14.3-acre portion of the WHI site to Residential Agricultural, minimum Building Site of 20,000 square feet (sf), combining Planned Residential Development

of 1.4 units per acre (RA-B-20 PD=1.4), and rezone the 3.96-acre open space area within the 300-foot setback to Open Space (O).

In addition to the proposed GBCP Amendment and Rezone, WHI would additionally require the approval of a Variance to lot coverage allowing up to 50 percent coverage for single story homes where 25 percent to 40 percent is normally allowed. Approval of a Conditional Use Permit to construct a Planned Residential Development and Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map for the subdivision of 18.09 acres would also be required. The Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map would include a 24-lot Planned Residential Development with seven open space and common area lots.

WHII

The 32.97-acre project site (APN 048-151-061) is located east of WHI, on the south side of the Douglas Boulevard/Seeno Avenue intersection. The WHII site's general northern boundary is Douglas Boulevard with intervening parcels on the northwest and northeast portions of the site. The intervening parcels to the northwest are vacant and the intervening parcels to the northeast contain vacant land and a single-family residential unit utilized for commercial purposes.

WHII would include the development of 55 single-family residences arranged along private roadways extending through the neighborhood and would be accessed from a new private, gated road extending south from the current Douglas Boulevard/Seeno Avenue intersection. The residential units are proposed as single-story residences.

The project would include a 300-foot scenic setback along the south side of Douglas Boulevard, which is the northern boundary of the project site. The scenic setback would be maintained in an open space lot and rezoned to Open Space to protect existing oak woodlands and Strap Ravine. The setback would create a visual separation between Douglas Boulevard and the proposed residential uses. WHII would include 15.47 acres of common area, restricted open space, and 0.87-acre of parkland, which would comprise 47 percent of the project site. Restricted open space lots totaling 10.8 acres within WHII are intended to protect Strap Ravine, associated wetlands, and woodland areas. The 0.87-acre park would be included within WHII, south of Strap Ravine. The park would provide active and passive recreation facilities including a covered picnic area, a bocce ball court, walkways, and seating areas.

An EVA is planned for the east side of WHII, south of Lot 45. The 20-foot access road will extend within a 25-foot off-site easement for approximately 500 feet east to Quartzite Circle, a privately-maintained public road southeast of the site. Tube gates will be used where the EVA meets the adjacent property lines.

The Placer County General Plan and the GBCP designate 32.55 acres of the WHII site as Rural Residential (2.3 – 4.6 Ac. minimum), while the northwestern 0.42-acre portion is designated Rural Low Density Residential (0.9 – 2.3 Ac. minimum). The WHII project includes a request to change the land use designation of the southern 25.17-acre portion of the site to Low Density Residential (0.4 – 0.9 Ac. minimum). The 7.80-acre portion of the WHII site north of Strap Ravine, including a 300-foot setback from Douglas Boulevard, would be designated Open Space.

The Placer County zoning designation for the WHII site is Residential Agricultural, minimum Building Site of 100,000 sf (RA-B-100). The project includes a request to rezone the southern 25.17-acre portion of the site to RA-B-20 PD=1.75 and rezone the 7.80-acre area north of Strap Ravine, including the 300-foot setback, to Open Space (O).

In addition to the proposed GBCP Amendment and Rezone, WHII would require the approval of a Variance to lot coverage allowing up to 50 percent coverage for single-story homes, where 25 percent to 40 percent is normally allowed. Approval of a Conditional Use Permit to construct a Planned Residential Development and Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map for the subdivision of 32.97 acres would also be required. The Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map would include a 55-lot Planned Residential Development with nine open space and common area lots.

A detailed project description can be found in Chapter 3, Project Description, of this EIR.

1.5 EIR PROCESS

The EIR process begins with the decision by the lead agency to prepare an EIR, either during a preliminary review of a project or at the conclusion of an Initial Study. As provided in CEQA Guidelines Section 15063, if an EIR will be required for the project, an Initial Study is not mandatory to be prepared. Once the decision is made to prepare an EIR, the lead agency sends a Notice of Preparation (NOP) to appropriate government agencies and, when required, to the State Clearinghouse (SCH) in the Office of Planning and Research (OPR), which will ensure that responsible and trustee State agencies reply within the required time. The SCH assigns an identification number to the project, which then becomes the identification number for all subsequent environmental documents on the project. Commenting agencies have 30 days to respond to the NOP and provide information regarding alternatives and mitigation measures they wish to have explored in the Draft EIR and to provide notification regarding whether the agency will be a responsible agency or a trustee agency for the project.

Upon completion of the Draft EIR and prior to circulation to State and local agencies and interested members of the public, a Notice of Completion is filed with the SCH and a public notice of availability is published to inform interested parties that a Draft EIR is available for agency and public review. In addition, the notice provides information regarding the location of copies of the Draft EIR available for public review and any public meetings or hearings that are scheduled. The Draft EIR is circulated for a minimum period of 45 days, during which time reviewers may submit comments on the document to the lead agency. The lead agency must respond to comments in writing. If significant new information, as defined in CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5, is added to an EIR after public notice of availability is given, but before certification of the EIR, the revised EIR or affected chapters must be recirculated for an additional public review period with related comments and responses.

A Final EIR will be prepared, containing public comments on the Draft EIR and written responses to those comments, as well as a list of changes to the Draft EIR text necessitated by public comments, as warranted. Before approving a project, the lead agency shall certify that the EIR (consisting of the Draft EIR and Final EIR) has been completed in compliance with CEQA, and that the EIR has been presented to the decision-making body of the lead agency, which has

reviewed and considered the EIR. The lead agency shall also certify that the EIR reflects the lead agency's independent judgment and analysis.

The findings prepared by the lead agency must be based on substantial evidence in the administrative record and must include an explanation that bridges the gap between evidence in the record and the conclusions required by CEQA. If the decision-making body elects to proceed with a project that would have unavoidable significant impacts, then a Statement of Overriding Considerations explaining the decision to balance the benefits of the project against unavoidable environmental impacts must be prepared.

1.6 SCOPE OF THE EIR

The following environmental issue areas will be addressed in the EIR:

- Aesthetics;
- Air Quality;
- Biological Resources;
- Cultural Resources;
- Geology and Soils/Mineral Resources;
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials;
- Hydrology and Water Quality;
- Land Use and Planning/Population and Housing;
- Noise;
- Public Services and Recreation;
- Transportation and Circulation;
- Utilities and Service Systems; and
- Cumulative Impacts and Other CEQA Sections, including greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and energy.

As discussed within the technical chapters of this EIR, the proposed projects would not result in impacts related to forestry, airport noise, parking capacity, and air traffic patterns. Discussions regarding such are presented in an Effects Not Found to be Significant chapter within this EIR.

The evaluation of effects is presented on a resource-by-resource basis in Chapters 4 through 15 of the EIR. Each chapter is divided into the following three sections: Existing Environmental Setting, Regulatory Context, and Impacts and Mitigation Measures. Impacts that are determined to be significant in Chapters 4 through 15, and for which feasible mitigation measures are not available to reduce those impacts to a less-than-significant level, are identified as *significant and unavoidable*. Chapter 17 of the EIR presents a discussion of the cumulative impacts, as well as a comprehensive list of all significant and unavoidable impacts identified in Chapters 4 through 15.

1.7 DEFINITION OF BASELINE

The CEQA Guidelines identify several types of EIRs, each applicable to different project circumstances. This EIR has been prepared as a project-level EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15161, which is an analysis that examines the environmental impacts of a specific development project. A project-level EIR focuses primarily on the changes in the environment that would result from the development of the project, and examines all phases of the project including planning, construction, and operation.

According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15125, an EIR must include a description of the existing physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the project to provide the “baseline physical conditions” against which project-related changes could be compared. Normally, the baseline condition is the physical condition that exists when the NOP is published. The NOP for the proposed projects was published on January 26, 2018. Therefore, conditions existing at that time are considered to be the baseline against which changes that would result from the proposed projects are evaluated. Impacts could include both direct and indirect physical changes to the baseline condition. The baseline condition for the proposed project sites is presented in Chapter 3, Project Description, of this EIR. The baseline conditions pertaining to each resource area are described in the “Existing Environmental Setting” section of the respective chapters of this EIR.

1.8 SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

The CEQA Guidelines define a significant effect on the environment 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 and aesthetic significance.” In addition, the Guidelines state, “An economic or social change by itself shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment. A social or economic change related to a physical change may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant.” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15382).

Pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, this EIR relies on the following three levels of impact significance: 1) Less-than-significant impact; 2) Less-than-significant impact with implementation of mitigation; and 3) Significant impact that cannot be mitigated to a level that is less than significant.

Each environmental area of analysis uses a distinct set of significance criteria. Where measurable and explicit quantification of significance is identified, such as violation of an ambient air quality standard, this measurement is used to assess the level of significance of a particular impact in this EIR. If criteria for determining significance relative to a specific environmental resource impact are not identified in the CEQA Guidelines, criteria were developed for this EIR.

The significance criteria are identified at the beginning of the Impacts and Mitigation Measures section in each of the technical chapters of this EIR. Although significance criteria are necessarily different for each resource considered, the provided significance levels ensure consistent evaluation of impacts for each project considered.

1.9 NOTICE OF PREPARATION AND SCOPING

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15082, an NOP was circulated to the public, local, State, and federal agencies, and other known interested parties for a 30-day public and agency review period from January 26, 2018 through February 26, 2018 (included as Appendix A to this EIR). Notice of the projects was also published in the Sacramento Bee on January 26, 2018. The purpose of the NOP was to provide notification that an EIR for the proposed projects was being prepared and to solicit public input on the scope and content of the document.

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15082, the County held a scoping meeting for the EIR during the 30-day review period on February 13, 2018 for the purpose of receiving comments on the scope of the environmental analysis to be prepared for the proposed projects. Agencies and members of the public were invited to attend and provide input on the scope of the EIR. Several comment letters were received during the 30-day review period and are provided as Appendix B to this EIR. All comments were taken into consideration during the preparation of this EIR. A summary of the NOP comments received are summarized in section 1.12 below.

1.10 COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE NOTICE OF PREPARATION

During the NOP public review period for the EIR from January 26, 2018 through February 26, 2018, Placer County received twenty-nine (29) comment letters and numerous verbal comments during the public scoping meeting held on February 13, 2018. A copy of each letter, as well as a summary of the verbal scoping meeting comments, is provided in Appendix B of this EIR.

The comment letters received during the NOP public review period were authored by the following representatives of local agencies as well as other interested parties and pertained to both Whitehawk I and II:

Public Agencies

- Placer County Air Pollution Control District – Ann Hobbs
- City of Roseville – Mark Morse
- Native American Heritage Commission – Sharaya Souza
- Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board – Stephanie Tadlock

Groups

- Granite Bay Community Association – Sandra Harris
- Pacific Gas & Electric Company – PG&E Plan Review Team
- United Auburn Indian Community – Gene Whitehouse

Individuals

- Patti Bell (February 14, 2018)
- Patti Bell (February 26, 2018)
- Alan and Cheryl Berkema
- Larissa Berry
- Jennifer Derich
- Richard Fu
- Holly Johnson
- Jared Johnson
- Jeff Keith
- Michelle Kim
- Ulysses Ludwig
- Bert Mac Bride
- Jerry and Marry Manzer
- Jane Negri
- Peggy Peterson
- Shannon Quinn (February 13, 2018)
- Shannon Quinn (February 20, 2018)
- Bob and Carol Ransford
- Richard Ryan
- Laura Scott
- Janet Thew
- Arnold Ward

A list, categorized by issue, is provided in section 1.12 below that summarizes the concerns brought forth in the comment letters and during the scoping meeting.

1.11 COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE PREVIOUSLY PREPARED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATIONS

Placer County previously prepared separate IS/MNDs for the WHI and WHII projects, which were made available for public review from November 2, 2016 to December 2, 2016. Placer County received 28 comment letters total on the IS/MNDs. The majority of the comment letters received on the previously prepared IS/MNDs addressed both the WHI and WHII projects together. Comment letters were also received that addressed either only the WHI project or only the WHII project. The comment letters received on the previous IS/MNDs were authored by the public agencies, groups, and individuals listed below. A list, categorized by issue, is provided in section 1.12 below that summarizes the concerns brought forth in the comment letters received on the previous IS/MNDs.

WHI Only

Public Agencies and Groups

- California Department of Fish and Wildlife – Angela Calderaro
- Granite Bay Community Association – Sandra Harris

Individuals

- Steve Hansen
- Bert Mac Bride

WHII Only

Public Agencies and Groups

- California Department of Fish and Wildlife – Angela Calderaro
- Granite Bay Community Association – Sandra Harris

Individuals

- Steve Hansen
- Diane Will

WHI and WHII

Individuals

- BJ Baker
- Victor and Marianna Bekhet
- Alan and Cheryl Berkema
- Larissa Berry
- Claude and Mary Bishop
- Kristen Bruque
- Jennifer Derich
- Janice Fera
- Kimberly Grahling
- Robyn Jennings
- Holly Johnson
- Jeff Keith
- Bianca Lemos
- Louise Mark
- Lindsey McManigal
- John Milburn

- Melissa Neumann
- Krissy Oliver
- Prerana and Tarang Patel
- Shannon Quinn (November 8, 2016)
- Shannon Quinn (November 29, 2016)
- Bob and Carol Ransford
- Jennifer Rexroad
- Jon Rosdail
- Richard Ryan
- Sam Savig
- Gregory and Lisa Umphenour
- Loren Weltsch

1.12 SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE NOTICE OF PREPARATION AND PREVIOUSLY PREPARED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATIONS

The following list is a summary of concerns taken from verbal comments made at the NOP scoping meeting, comment letters received prior to the close of the 30-day NOP comment period, and comment letters received on the previous IS/MNDs. Many of the comments received on the previous IS/MNDs addressed the need to prepare an EIR; such comments are not included in the summary below, as they are not relevant to this document.

<p><u>Aesthetics</u> (<i>c.f.</i> Chapter 4)</p>	<p>Comments/concerns related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintaining the rural aesthetics of the area • Light pollution
<p><u>Air Quality</u> (<i>c.f.</i> Chapter 5)</p>	<p>Comments/concerns related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area designations for the federal and State standards for the Sacramento Valley Air Basin • Use of CalEEMod when estimating the project-related air pollutants emissions from construction and operation • Appropriate mitigation to minimize or eliminate significant adverse air quality impacts • Use of CALINE 4 modeling for carbon monoxide (CO) and site-specific CO dispersion modeling analysis • Wastewater treatment plant odors
<p><u>Biological Resources</u> (<i>c.f.</i> Chapter 6)</p>	<p>Comments/concerns related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strap Ravine as a known Salmon Habitat • Additional runoff into Strap Ravine, particularly related to attracting beavers, and the associated potential for flooding • CDFW jurisdiction and proper delineation of the projects' impact • Direct impact mitigation recommended by CDFW • Changes to mitigation proposed for birds and raptors in the previous IS/MNDs • Potential for chemicals leaking into Strap Ravine

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encroachment onto existing wetlands • Existence of vernal pools on-site • Removal of protected trees and lack of effectiveness of payment of mitigation fees • Impacts on wetlands and associated wildlife
<p><u>Cultural Resources</u> (<i>c.f.</i> Chapter 7)</p>	<p>Comments/concerns related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Known Native American resources found in the area • Consultation with California Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area • Potential impact to lifeways, cultural sites, and landscapes that may be of sacred or ceremonial significance to the United Auburn Indian Community
<p><u>Geology and Soils/Mineral Resources</u> (<i>c.f.</i> Chapter 8)</p>	<p>Comments/concerns related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soil testing at adequate depths due to mining activities • Previous mining activities and on-site use of chemicals
<p><u>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</u> (<i>c.f.</i> Chapter 9)</p>	<p>Comments/concerns related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On-site soil contamination and effects on existing and future residents
<p><u>Hydrology and Water Quality</u> (<i>c.f.</i> Chapter 10)</p>	<p>Comments/concerns related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wastewater discharge and compliance with the Antidegradation Policy and the Antidegradation Implementation Policy • Development and implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan • Drainage management, including drainage into Quartzite Circle • Flooding issues on the project sites • Water quality objectives for the required Basin Plan • Compliance with all permitting requirements
<p><u>Land Use and Planning/Population and Housing</u> (<i>c.f.</i> Chapter 11)</p>	<p>Comments/concerns related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in population from the projects and other approved/pending Granite Bay projects and exceedance of the GBCP population estimate • Sufficient setbacks • Increases in density for the project sites • Impacts related to the loss of open space • Compliance with the GBCP • Access easement for the Mac Bride property adequately shown on plans and considered throughout analysis • Construction of permanent structures and roadways within the scenic setback • Approval of multiple rezones in the project vicinity • Possibility of accessory dwellings constructed on lots by future residents

<p>Noise <i>(c.f. Chapter 12)</i></p>	<p>Comments/concerns related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased noise pollution • Noise impacts to existing communities during the construction of off-site improvements • Construction noise
<p>Public Services and Recreation <i>(c.f. Chapter 13)</i></p>	<p>Comments/concerns related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effects on the Roseville School District • Staffing ratio of police officers to population • Fire service response times • Increase in crime rates
<p>Transportation and Circulation <i>(c.f. Chapter 14)</i></p>	<p>Comments/concerns related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in traffic to existing surrounding roadways • Use of 2000 vs. 2010 Highway Capacity Manual • Public access or emergency vehicle access to Quartzite Circle • Impacts to traffic in surrounding neighborhoods associated with restrictions at Douglas/Woodgrove/Quail Oaks and other changes to existing traffic patterns • Crosswalks at Douglas Boulevard and Seeno Avenue • Consideration of pedestrian counts • Site access issues related to easement for Mac Bride parcel • Accuracy of baseline traffic conditions • Construction of a median on Douglas Boulevard that would block access on both Quail Oaks and Woodgrove Way • Insufficient parking • Traffic impacts during peak periods of traffic associated with Granite Bay High School • Long-term traffic operations • Analysis of the following intersections: Douglas Boulevard/Berg Street, Barton Road/Macargo Road, Berg Street/Olive Ranch Road, Douglas Boulevard/Barton Road, and Sierra College Boulevard/Douglas Boulevard • Necessity for lane and traffic light upgrades, specifically at Woodgrove Way/Douglas Boulevard and Eureka Road/Greyhawk Drive • U-turns at Seeno Avenue and Douglas Boulevard • Increase in PM peak hour trips • Analysis of alternatives to the proposed project sites' access from Douglas Boulevard, such as improvements to Woodgrove Way • Traffic hazards associated with potential use of alternative routes from Douglas Boulevard • Traffic buildup at the proposed projects' gated entrances on Douglas Boulevard • Preference for access to the project sites via Woodgrove Way rather than Douglas Boulevard

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Widening Douglas Boulevard • Increase of traffic merging onto and off of Interstate 80 during rush hour and at school bell times
<p><u>Utilities and Service Systems</u> (<i>c.f.</i> Chapter 15)</p>	<p>Comments/concerns related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access related to sewer line construction • Impacts due to sewer line construction • Wastewater treatment plant capacity • Sufficient water supply and sewer capacity • Impacts on fire services, schools, and the need for accelerated upgrades of infrastructure
<p><u>Cumulative Impacts and Other CEQA Sections</u> (<i>c.f.</i> Chapter 17)</p>	<p>Comments/concerns related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cumulative traffic analysis to include all proposed or newly-built developments and sufficient mitigation to address impacts • Long-term effects of the proposed projects • Cumulative impacts to all issue areas, including population, sewage, water, public services, schools, animal habitat, and traffic
<p><u>Alternatives Analysis</u> (<i>c.f.</i> Chapter 18)</p>	<p>Comments/concerns related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An alternative that is consistent with the General Plan • Analysis of a No Build Alternative and a lower density alternative • Alternatives that include retention of all existing trees, retention of all existing wetlands, removal of the variance for setbacks, adequate drainage, adequate soil testing, sufficient parking, and minimal cumulative impacts • Inclusion of secondary units/rental units on the proposed lots in an alternative scenario

All of these issues are addressed in this EIR, in the relevant sections identified in the first column.

1.13 DRAFT EIR AND PUBLIC REVIEW

This Draft EIR is being circulated for public review and comment for a period of 45 days. During this period, the general public, organizations, and agencies can submit comments to the Lead Agency on the Draft EIR's accuracy and completeness. Release of the Draft EIR marks the beginning of a 45-day public review period pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15105. The public can review the Draft EIR at the County's website at:

<http://www.placer.ca.gov/departments/communitydevelopment/envcoordsvcs/eir>

or at the following address during normal business hours:

Placer County, Community Development Resource Center
3091 County Center Drive
Auburn, CA 95603

Comments may be submitted both in written form and/or orally at the public hearing on the Draft EIR. Notice of the time and location of the hearing will be published in local newspapers, mailed to property owners and residents surrounding the projects, emailed to individuals that have requested to be placed on the proposed projects' email notification list, posted on the County's website, and posted at and adjacent to the site prior to the hearing.

All comments or questions regarding the Draft EIR should be addressed to:

Placer County, Community Development Resource Agency
Environmental Coordination Services
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190
Auburn, CA 95603
(530) 745-3132
fax (530) 745-3080
cdraecs@placer.ca.gov

1.14 ORGANIZATION OF THE DRAFT EIR

The EIR is organized into the following sections:

Chapter 1 – Introduction

Provides an introduction and overview describing the intended use of the Draft EIR and the review and certification process, as well as summaries of the chapters included in the Draft EIR and summaries of the issues and concerns received from the public and public agencies during the NOP review period.

Chapter 2 – Executive Summary

Summarizes the elements of the projects and the environmental impacts that would result from implementation of the proposed projects, describes proposed mitigation measures, and indicates the level of significance of impacts after mitigation. Acknowledges alternatives that would reduce or avoid significant impacts.

Chapter 3 – Project Description

Provides a detailed description of the proposed projects, including the projects' location, background information, major objectives, and technical characteristics.

Chapter 4 – Aesthetics

The Aesthetics chapter of the EIR describes existing aesthetic resources for the project areas and the region, and evaluates potential aesthetic impacts of the projects. In addition, the GBCP goals

and policies pertaining to aesthetics are described. According to CEQA, the concept of aesthetic resources refers to scenic vistas, scenic resources (such as trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway), the existing visual character or quality of the project areas, and light and glare impacts.

Chapter 5 – Air Quality

The Air Quality chapter of the EIR describes the impacts of construction and operation of the proposed projects on local and regional air quality. The chapter describes existing air quality, construction-related air quality impacts resulting from grading and equipment emissions, direct and indirect emissions associated with the proposed projects, the impacts of these emissions on both the local and regional scale, and mitigation measures warranted to reduce or eliminate any identified significant impacts.

Chapter 6 – Biological Resources

The Biological Resources chapter of the EIR evaluates the biological resources known to occur or potentially occur within the proposed project areas. This chapter describes potential impacts to those resources, and identifies measures to eliminate or substantially reduce those impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Chapter 7 – Cultural Resources

The Cultural Resources chapter of the EIR addresses known historic and prehistoric resources in the vicinity of the proposed project areas. The chapter summarizes the existing setting with respect to cultural and paleontological resources, identifies thresholds of significance and impacts to such resources, and sets forth mitigation measures that would be necessary to reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Chapter 8 – Geology and Soils/Mineral Resources

The Geology and Soils/Mineral Resources chapter of the EIR describes the geologic and soil characteristics of the project sites and evaluates the extent to which implementation of the proposed projects could be affected by seismic hazards such as ground shaking, liquefaction, and expansive soil characteristics. In addition, the chapter evaluates known mineral resources on the project sites, and evaluates any potential adverse effects of the proposed projects on the availability of such resources.

Chapter 9 – Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The Hazards and Hazardous Materials chapter of the EIR describes existing and potentially occurring hazards and hazardous materials within the project areas. The chapter discusses potential impacts posed by these hazards to the environment, as well as to workers, visitors, and residents within and adjacent to the project areas.

Chapter 10 – Hydrology and Water Quality

The Hydrology and Water Quality chapter of the EIR describes existing drainage and water resources for the project sites, as well as current storm water flows and storm water infrastructure, and potential for flooding. The chapter evaluates potential impacts of the proposed projects with respect to increases in impervious surface area and associated stormwater flows, degradation of water quality, groundwater recharge, and on- and off-site flooding.

Chapter 11 – Land Use and Planning/Population and Housing

The Land Use and Planning chapter will evaluate the consistency of the proposed projects with the County of Placer’s adopted plans and policies, and discuss any land use compatibility issues resulting from increased by-right events allowable under the proposed projects. The chapter will also evaluate the potential for the proposed projects to induce substantial population growth either directly or indirectly, and/or displace substantial numbers of existing housing and/or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Chapter 12 – Noise

The Noise chapter of the EIR describes the existing noise environment in the project sites’ vicinity and identifies potential impacts and mitigation measures related to the construction and operation of the proposed projects. The method by which the potential impacts are analyzed is discussed, followed by the identification of potential impacts and the recommended mitigation measures designed to reduce significant impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Chapter 13 – Public Services and Recreation

The Public Services and Recreation chapter of the EIR describes the public service systems and facilities within the project areas and the associated potential impacts resulting from the proposed projects. This section will address fire and law enforcement services, schools, parks and recreation facilities, and other public facilities such as libraries.

Chapter 14 – Transportation and Circulation

The Transportation and Circulation chapter of the EIR discusses existing and cumulative transportation and circulation conditions associated with the proposed projects. The analysis includes consideration of automobile traffic impacts on roadway capacity, transit impacts, bicycle impacts, and pedestrian impacts.

Chapter 15 – Utilities and Service Systems

The Utilities and Service Systems chapter of the EIR summarizes the setting information and identifies potential new demands resulting from the proposed projects water supply, wastewater systems, and solid waste disposal.

Chapter 16 – Effects Not Found to be Significant

This chapter will include discussion of impacts determined not to be significant and warranting detailed analysis in the EIR. Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines and the County’s Initial Study Checklist, the proposed projects were determined not to result in any impacts related to the following: scenic vistas; scenic resources within a State scenic highway; agricultural and forest resources; safety hazards associated with airports; watersheds of important surface water resources; and on-site sewage systems.

Chapter 17 – Cumulative Impacts and Other CEQA Sections

The Cumulative Impacts and Other CEQA Sections chapter of the EIR includes discussions regarding those topics that are required to be included in an EIR, pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2. The majority of Chapter 17 is devoted to the cumulative impacts analysis required by Section 15130 of the CEQA Guidelines. Given its cumulative nature, greenhouse gases and climate change are discussed within Chapter 17. In addition, the chapter

evaluates growth-inducing impacts, and includes lists of significant irreversible environmental changes and significant and unavoidable impacts that would be caused by the proposed projects. Chapter 17 also includes a separate section for energy, in accordance with Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines.

Chapter 18 – Alternative Analysis

The Alternatives Analysis chapter of the EIR describes and evaluates the alternatives to the proposed projects.

Chapter 19 – References

The References chapter of the EIR provides bibliographic information for all references and resources cited.

Chapter 20 – EIR Authors and Persons Consulted

The EIR Authors and Persons Consulted chapter of the EIR lists EIR and technical report authors who provided technical assistance in the preparation and review of the Draft EIR.

Appendices

The Appendices include the NOP, comments received during the NOP comment period, and all technical reports prepared for the proposed projects.

1.15 TECHNICAL CHAPTER FORMAT

Each technical chapter addressing a specific environmental issue begins with an **introduction** describing the purpose of the section. The introduction is followed by a description of the **existing environmental setting** as the setting pertains to that particular issue. The setting description is followed by the **regulatory context** and the **impacts and mitigation measures** discussion, which contains the **standards of significance**, followed by the **method of analysis**. The **impact and mitigation** discussion includes impact statements prefaced by a number in bold-faced type (for both project-level and cumulative analyses). An explanation of each impact and an analysis of the impact's significance follow each impact statement. All mitigation measures pertinent to each individual impact follow directly after the impact statement (see below). The degree of relief provided by identified mitigation measures is also evaluated.

As discussed in Chapter 3, Project Description, of this EIR, three development scenarios for the proposed projects are currently being considered: WHI, WHII, and both WHI and WHII combined. The discussion of impacts within each technical chapter is based on implementation of each of the development scenarios. Where impacts would be similar under all three of the development scenarios, the discussion of impacts presented is applicable for all scenarios. However, where impacts would differ between the development scenarios, the impacts are discussed separately for each scenario. An example of the format is shown below:

X-1 Statement of Impact

WHI

Discussion of impact for the approval and implementation of only WHI in paragraph format. Statement of level of significance of impact prior to mitigation is included at the end of each discussion. The following levels of significance are used in the EIR: less than significant or significant. If an impact is determined to be significant, mitigation will be included in order to reduce the specific impact to the maximum extent feasible.

WHII

Discussion of impact for the approval and implementation of only WHII in paragraph format. Statement of level of significance of impact prior to mitigation is included at the end of each discussion.

WHI and WHII

Discussion of impact for the approval and implementation of both WHI & II in paragraph format. Statement of level of significance of impact prior to mitigation is included at the end of each discussion.

Conclusion

Summary of the discussions above and a statement of the *level of significance* of impact prior to mitigation is included at the end of each impact discussion.

Mitigation Measure(s)

Statement of *level of significance* after the mitigation is included immediately preceding mitigation measures. If reduction of the specific impact to a less-than-significant level is not feasible, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable. Again, where impacts would differ between the development projects, the mitigation necessary for each project are listed separately, under separate headers, for each project.

WHI

X-1(a) Required mitigation measure(s) presented in italics and listed in consecutive order.

X-1(b) Required additional mitigation measure, if necessary.

WHII

X-1(c) Required mitigation measure(s) presented in italics and listed in consecutive order.

X-1(d) Required additional mitigation measure, if necessary.

WHI and WHII

X-1(e) Required mitigation measure(s) presented in italics and listed in consecutive order.

X-1(f) Required additional mitigation measure, if necessary.

1.16 FINAL EIR AND EIR CERTIFICATION

Upon completion of the public review period, a Final EIR will be prepared that will include written comments on the Draft EIR received during the public review period and responses to those comments. The Final EIR will also include the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP) prepared in accordance with Section 21081.6 of the Public Resource Code. The Final EIR will address any revisions to the Draft EIR made in response to public comments. The Draft EIR and Final EIR together will comprise the EIR for the proposed projects. Before considering approval of the projects, the County must first certify that the EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA, that the County Board of Supervisors has reviewed and considered the information in the EIR, and that the EIR reflects the independent judgment of the County. The County also would be required to adopt Findings of Fact, and for any impacts determined to be significant and unavoidable, adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations.