CHAPTER 3
TEXT REVISIONS TO THE DRAFT EIR

This chapter provides those pages from the Draft EIR on which text revisions or additions were made. The revisions are shown in blue and underlined font for new text and red strikethrough font for deleted text. The pages on which changes have been made are listed in Table 1-2 in Chapter 1, Introduction.

nine distinct areas, as shown in Figure 3-8, Thematic Areas: Multifamily Residential, Mixed Use, General Commercial, Community, DeWitt Heritage, Government Services 1, Government Services 2, Corporation Yard, and Open Space. The proposed land uses reflect the square footage needed to support future County facility needs and the County's ability to capitalize on likely market opportunities. The County also proposes to adopt Design Guidelines and Development Standards for the PCGC campus as part of the PCGC Master Plan Update. The proposed Master Plan Update would require General Plan, Community Plan, and zoning ordinance amendments. This would allow a maximum allowable residential density of 30 dwelling units/acre.

The PCGC Master Plan Draft Strategic Vision, Development Standards, and Design Guidelines are available for review on the County's website (http://www.placer.ca.gov/pcgc).

Health and Human Services Building

Under the proposed PCGC Master Plan Update, a new Health and Human Services building would be constructed near the center of the PCGC campus, southwest of the proposed roundabout that would connect County Center Drive with B Avenue. This would require demolition of buildings 107, 108, and 109.

The new Health and Human Services building is expected to consist of approximately 135,700 square feet in 3 stories. The building would house the existing approximately 435 Health and Human Services employees, and would accommodate the anticipated employee growth over the next 20 years, with a projected 577 employees in 2035.

Multifamily Residential Project

The proposed PCGC Master Plan Update includes development of a Multifamily Residential project along 1st Street at the northeastern end of B Avenue. This location defines the easternmost portion of the PCGC campus adjacent to Bell Road. The project is expected to develop 100 or fewer multifamily residential dwelling units.

1.5 AREAS OF KNOWN CONTROVERSY AND ISSUES RAISED

Section 15123 (b)(2) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.) requires the executive summary of an environmental impact report (EIR) to disclose areas of controversy known to the lead agency that have been raised by the agencies and the public. The County circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) to solicit agency and public comments on the scope and environmental analysis to be included in the EIR. A total of 22 letters were received in response to the NOP. The NOP and the comments received by the County are included in Appendix A of this Draft EIR. The following comments were raised in the responses to the NOP and at the public scoping meeting for this EIR:

1.6 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

The alternatives chapter of the EIR (Chapter 20, Project Alternatives) was prepared in accordance with Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines. The alternatives analyzed in this EIR in addition to the proposed project are as follows:

1. **Alternative 1: No Project/No Build Alternative.** This alternative assumes no development would occur, and the site would remain in its current condition. All buildings would be retained at existing locations. No changes to land use designations under the Auburn Bowman Community Plan would occur. Interior modifications could occur.

2. **Alternative 2: Greater Historic District Retention through Increased Residential Intensity Alternative.** This alternative seeks to reduce impacts to the DeWitt General Hospital Historic District by retaining more of the existing buildings which is accomplished by increasing the intensity of the proposed residential buildings. The increased intensity is expressed through increased building height and introduction of structured parking. This increases the land coverage and floor-area-ratios through some of the residential and mixed use portions of the site. Further, the total number of dwelling units and therefore the overall residential density would increase compared to the proposed project.

   This alternative would retain buildings 114 through 118, consistent with the proposed project, and buildings in the 300 ramp, which is the area between D Avenue and F Avenue. This alternative would retain the DeWitt Theater (building 315) and the 12 buildings to the west and southwest of the theater (buildings 309 through 314, and 318 through 323; refer to Figure 3-3, Existing Site Plan, in Chapter 3, Project Description). It would also introduce structured parking to the site and increase the height of the proposed multifamily residential buildings in the southeast portion of the site to 5 stories. This alternative would result in the following land uses: 97,156 square feet of retained buildings that are contributing features to the historic district, approximately half of which would be used for residential space and half of which would be used for private commercial and government offices, 242,100 square feet of new government office buildings, 652,900 square feet of new residential space (in combination with the retained buildings in the historic district, this alternative would accommodate 699 dwelling units), 64,900 square feet of new mixed use buildings, 60,600 square feet of hotel space, and a 30,000 square feet ~~of event~~ Community/Events C~~e~~enter.

3. **Alternative 3: Greater Historic District Retention through Increased Non-Residential Intensity Alternative.** This alternative seeks to reduce impacts to the DeWitt General Hospital Historic District by retaining more of the existing buildings, which is accomplished by increasing the intensity of the areas that would support new County

government offices within the project site. The increased intensity is expressed through increased building height and introducing structured parking. This increases the land coverage and floor-area-ratios through some of the non-residential portions of the site. This alternative would retain most of the 100 ramp buildings (buildings 107 through 118), and a portion of the 300 ramp buildings, including the DeWitt Theater (building 315) and the 6 buildings to the west and southwest of the theater (buildings 311 through 314, 321, and 322). It would result in the following land uses: 145,562 square feet of retained buildings that are contributing features to the historic district, all of which would be used for private commercial and government offices, 220,200 square feet of new government office buildings, 318,800 square feet of new residential space (providing 319 dwelling units), 79,800 square feet of new mixed use buildings, 60,600 square feet of hotel space, and 30,000 square feet of Community/~~e~~Events~~event c~~ Center.

1.7 INTENDED USES OF THE PCGC MASTER PLAN UPDATE EIR

The Draft EIR has been prepared in accordance with CEQA (California Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.), the CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.) and the County's Environmental Review Ordinance. The Draft EIR is an informational document prepared to provide public disclosure of potential impacts of the project and is not intended to serve as a recommendation of either approval or denial of the project. As lead agency, the County "is responsible for the adequacy and objectivity of the draft EIR" (14 CCR 15084(e)). Section 15121(a) of the CEQA Guidelines states:

> An EIR is an informational document which will inform public agency decision-makers and the public generally of the significant environmental effect of the project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project.

This Draft EIR provides both a programmatic analysis of the impacts of implementation of the PCGC Master Plan Update and project-level environmental review of two individual projects included in the Master Plan Update – a new Health and Human Services building and the Multifamily Residential project, as described above and in Chapter 3, Project Description. This Draft EIR evaluates the changes in the environment that would result from implementation of each of these three projects.

As the lead agency for this project, the County is required to consider the information in the EIR along with any other available information in deciding whether to approve the project entitlements requested. The basic requirements for an EIR include providing information that establishes the environmental setting (or project baseline), and identifying environmental impacts, mitigation measures, project alternatives, growth-inducing impacts, and cumulative impacts. In a practical

sense, an EIR functions as a method of fact-finding, allowing an applicant, the public, other public agencies, and agency staff an opportunity to collectively review and evaluate baseline conditions and project impacts through a process of full disclosure. Additionally, this EIR provides the primary source of environmental information for the lead agency to consider when exercising any permitting authority or approval power directly related to implementation of this project.

Required Permits and Approvals

Table 1-1 lists the entitlements and approvals required from the County and from other responsible agencies for the proposed project.

Table 1-1
Required Approvals/Permits for the PCGC Master Plan Update

Required Permit/Approval	Responsible Agency
Certify the EIR	County of Placer
General Plan Amendment	County of Placer
Zoning Text Amendment and Rezone	County of Placer
Development Standards	County of Placer
Design Guidelines	County of Placer
Improvement Plan Approval	County of Placer
Building Permit(s)*	County of Placer
Minor Boundary Line Adjustment for Multifamily Residential Project	County of Placer
Tree Removal Permit(s)*	County of Placer
Section 404 Nationwide Permit	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Section 401 Certification	Regional Water Quality Control Board–Central Valley Region
Section 402 National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Compliance	Regional Water Quality Control Board–Central Valley Region
Section 1062 Streambed Alteration Agreement	California Department of Fish and Wildlife

* Ministerial permits.

1.8 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Table 1-2 lists the acronyms used in Table 1-3, which identifies each of the impacts associated with the proposed PCGC Master Plan Update, the Health and Human Services Building, and the Multifamily Residential project, as evaluated in this EIR. Table 1-3 also identifies the level of significance of each impact and presents the mitigation measures necessary to reduce impacts to a less than significant level, where feasible.

Table 1-3
Summary of Project Impacts

Environmental Effect	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Land Use and Planning			
Would the project physically divide an established community?	**MPU:** No impact **HHS:** No impact **MFR:** No impact	**MPU:** None Required **HHS:** None Required **MFR:** None Required	**MPU:** No impact **HHS:** No impact **MFR:** No impact
Would the project create land use incompatibilities or conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	**MPU:** ~~No impact~~LTS **HHS:** ~~No impact~~ LTS **MFR:** ~~No impact~~LTS	**MPU:** None Required **HHS:** None Required **MFR:** None Required	**MPU:** ~~No impact~~LTS **HHS:** ~~No impact~~ LTS **MFR:** ~~No impact~~LTS
Would the project substantially contribute to cumulative land use impacts, including dividing existing communities, creating land use incompatibilities, or creating conflicts with adopted planning documents?	**MPU:** No significant cumulative impact **HHS:** No significant cumulative impact **MFR:** No significant cumulative impact	**MPU:** None Required **HHS:** None Required **MFR:** None Required	**MPU:** No impact **HHS:** No impact **MFR:** No impact
Population and Housing			
Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	**MPU:** LTS **HHS:** No impact **MFR:** LTS	**MPU:** None Required **HHS:** None Required **MFR:** None Required	**MPU:** LTS **HHS:** No impact **MFR:** LTS

Table 1-3
Summary of Project Impacts

Environmental Effect	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Would the project impair the County's ability to meet RHNA targets or increase demand for affordable housing	**MPU:** LTS **HHS:** No impact **MFR:** No impact	**MPU:** None Required **HHS:** None Required **MFR:** None Required	**MPU:** LTS **HHS:** No impact **MFR:** No impact
Would the project induce substantial population growth in the cumulative scenario	**MPU:** LTS **HHS:** No impact **MFR:** LTS	**MPU:** None Required **HHS:** None Required **MFR:** None Required	**MPU:** LTS **HHS:** No impact **MFR:** LTS
Would the project impair the County's ability to meet RHNA targets or increase demand for affordable housing in the cumulative scenario?	**MPU:** LTS **HHS:** No impact **MFR:** ~~LTS~~No impact	**MPU:** None Required **HHS:** None Required **MFR:** None Required	**MPU:** LTS **HHS:** No impact **MFR:** ~~LTS~~No impact
Biological Resources			
Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on special status species?	**MPU:** PS **HHS:** PS **MFR:** PS	**MPU:** **Mitigation Measure 7a:** All construction workers involved in vegetation removal, clearing, and earthmoving activities shall receive worker environmental awareness program training conducted by a qualified biologist. Worker environmental awareness program training may also be conducted through a video created by a qualified biologist specifically for this project. Worker environmental awareness program training shall instruct workers to be familiar with	**MPU:** LTS **HHS:** LTS **MFR:** LTS

Table 1-3
Summary of Project Impacts

Environmental Effect	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		every 1 acre affected (3:1). This ratio shall include creation of 1 acre of vernal pool habitat for every 1 acre impacts (1:1), and preservation of 2 acres of vernal pools for every 1 acre impacted (2:1), as described in the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) programmatic biological opinion issued to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for small impacts to listed branchiopods (USFWS 1996). Mitigation for impacts to listed branchiopods shall be implemented according to one of the following three options, to be determined and completed prior to impact: participation in a USFWS approved mitigation bank, off-site mitigation at a non-bank location approved by USFWS and subject to preservation in perpetuity such as through a conservation easement, or contribution to the USFWS Species Fund. In the event that protocol-level surveys demonstrate the absence of listed vernal pool branchiopods, mitigation shall not be required. **HHS:** **Mitigation Measure 7a** (see above); **Mitigation Measure 7c~~b~~** (see above); and **Mitigation Measure 7d** (see above) **MFR:** **Mitigation Measure 7a** (see above); and **Mitigation Measure 7b~~c~~** (see above)	

Table 1-3
Summary of Project Impacts

Environmental Effect	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community?	**MPU:** ~~Significant~~ PS **HHS:** No Impact **MFR:** ~~Significant~~ PS	**MPU:** **Mitigation Measure 7f**: Prior to issuance of any grading permits or approval of improvement plans for activities that would remove riparian habitat, the County of Placer (County) or project applicant shall comply with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Lake and Streambed Alteration Program (California Fish and Game Code Sections 1600–1616), including notification, submission of all required plans and documents, and payment of required fees to CDFW. The applicant shall either confirm that the proposed activities would not result in substantial effects related to the obstruction, diversion, or introduction of debris into any stream, or shall provide compensatory mitigation to ensure that no significant effects result from stream diversion or modification. Compensatory mitigation shall be provided through creation of like habitat either on site or at a CDFW-approved off-site location. ~~**Mitigation Measure 7e**: Prior to issuance of any grading permits or approval of Improvement Plans and removal of vegetation from any blue oak woodland vegetation communities, the County of Placer (County) or individual project applicant shall undertake on-site or off-site oak woodland~~	**MPU:** LTS **HHS:** No impact **MFR:** LTS

Table 1-3
Summary of Project Impacts

Environmental Effect	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		~~restoration or creation, and/or contribute to the County's oak woodland conservation fund, and/or obtain a conservation easement over an off-site property that includes blue oak woodland. In combination, the total amount of blue oak woodland restored, created, and/or protected under a conservation easement shall be twice the size of the amount of blue oak woodland lost to development within the PCGC campus. Any on-site or off-site oak woodland restoration or creation must occur subject to a planting and irrigation plan that is approved by Placer County prior to implementation. Tree planting, obtaining a conservation easement, and/or payment into the County's oak woodland conservation fund shall occur prior to approval of Improvement Plans for each individual development project.~~ **HHS:** None Required **MFR:** **Mitigation Measure 7f** (see above)~~:~~ ~~Prior to issuance of any grading permits or approval of improvement plans for activities that would remove riparian habitat, the County of Placer (County) or project applicant shall comply with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife~~	

Table 1-3
Summary of Project Impacts

Environmental Effect	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		~~(CDFW) Lake and Streambed Alteration Program (California Fish and Game Code Sections 1600–1616), including notification, submission of all required plans and documents, and payment of required fees to CDFW. The applicant shall either confirm that the proposed activities would not result in substantial effects related to the obstruction, diversion, or introduction of debris into any stream, or shall provide compensatory mitigation to ensure that no significant effects result from stream diversion or modification. Compensatory mitigation shall be provided through creation of like habitat either on site or at a CDFW-approved off-site location.~~	
Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands?	**MPU:** PS **HHS:** PS **MFR:** PS	**MPU:** **Mitigation Measure 7a** (see above), ~~**Mitigation Measure 7f** (see above),~~ **Mitigation Measure 7g**: A Clean Water Act Section 404 permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification shall be acquired prior to issuance of a grading permit or approval of improvement plans for any proposed activities that will result in fill or discharges within jurisdictional wetlands. To compensate for the loss of jurisdictional wetlands or waters of the U.S. that are not exempt from mitigation under the Clean Water Act, the	**MPU:** LTS **HHS:** LTS **MFR:** LTS

Table 1-3
Summary of Project Impacts

Environmental Effect	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		HHS: ~~**Mitigation Measure 7a** (see above),~~ **Mitigation Measure 7g** (see above)~~, and **Mitigation Measure 7h** (see above)~~ **MFR:** ~~**Mitigation Measure 7a** (see above)~~, and **Mitigation Measure 7g** (see above), and **Mitigation Measure 7h** (see above)	
Would the project interfere substantially with wildlife movement, migration, or nursery sites?	**MPU:** No impact **HHS:** No impact **MFR:** No impact	**MPU:** None Required **HHS:** None Required **MFR:** None Required	**MPU:** No impact **HHS:** No impact **MFR:** No impact
Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	**MPU:** ~~No impact~~PS **HHS:** No impact **MFR:** ~~No impact~~PS	**MPU:** **Mitigation Measure 7e**: Prior to issuance of any grading permits or approval of Improvement Plans and removal of vegetation from any blue oak woodland vegetation communities, the County of Placer (County) or individual project applicant shall identify any on-site woodland restoration on the project's Improvement Plans and/or undertake off-site oak woodland restoration or creation, and/or contribute to the County's oak woodland conservation fund, and/or obtain a conservation easement over an off-site property that includes blue oak woodland. In combination, the total amount of blue oak woodland restored, created, and/or protected under a conservation easement	**MPU:** ~~No impact~~LTS **HHS:** No impact **MFR:** ~~No impact~~LTS

Table 1-3
Summary of Project Impacts

Environmental Effect	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		shall be twice the size of the amount of blue oak woodland lost to development within the PCGC campus. Any on-site or off-site oak woodland restoration or creation must occur subject to a planting and irrigation plan that is approved by Placer County prior to implementation. Any on-site tree planting must be documented on the Improvement Plans for each individual development project. When compensation for loss of oak woodland would include off-site restoration,, obtaining a conservation easement, and/or payment into the County's oak woodland conservation fund shall occur prior to approval of Improvement Plans for each individual development project. ~~None Required~~ **HHS:** None Required **MFR:** ~~None Required~~ **Mitigation Measure 7e** (see above)	
Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved	**MPU:** No impact **HHS:** No impact **MFR:** No impact	**MPU:** None Required **HHS:** None Required **MFR:** None Required	**MPU:** No impact **HHS:** No impact **MFR:** No impact

Table 1-3
Summary of Project Impacts

Environmental Effect	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?			
Would the project contribute to loss of special-status species, riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities, wetlands, wildlife movement corridors, or trees and oak woodlands protected under the County's ordinances and policies in the cumulative condition?	**MPU:** No impact **HHS:** No impact **MFR:** No impact	**MPU:** None Required **HHS:** None Required **MFR:** None Required	**MPU:** No impact **HHS:** No impact **MFR:** No impact
Cultural Resources			
Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource?	**MPU:** Significant **HHS:** Significant **MFR:** ~~LTS~~No impact	**MPU:** **Mitigation Measure 8a**: At the time that building maintenance and repair needs are identified for any building within the project site that is identified as a contributing feature to the DeWitt General Hospital Historic District, the County of Placer shall implement all applicable and feasible provisions of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, codified as 36 Code of Federal Regulations Part 67, and shall review and implement any appropriate Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings and Guidelines on Sustainability for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings.	**MPU:** SU **HHS:** SU **MFR:** ~~LTS~~No impact

Table 1-3
Summary of Project Impacts

Environmental Effect	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		HHS: No feasible mitigation available **MFR:** None Required	
Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?	**MPU:** ~~Significant~~ PS **HHS:** ~~Significant~~ PS **MFR:** ~~Significant~~PS	**MPU:** **Mitigation Measure 8b**: Tribal Cultural Resource Awareness Training: Prior to initiation of construction, all construction crew members, consultants, and other personnel involved in project implementation shall receive project-specific Tribal Cultural Resource (TCR) awareness training. The training shall be conducted in coordination with qualified cultural resource specialists and representatives from culturally-affiliated Native American Tribes. The training will emphasize the requirement for confidentiality and culturally-appropriate, respectful treatment of any find of significance to culturally-affiliated Native Americans Tribes. 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: ▪ Field indicators of potential archaeological or cultural resources (i.e., what to look for;	**MPU:** LTS **HHS:** LTS **MFR:** LTS

Table 1-3
Summary of Project Impacts

Environmental Effect	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		Mitigation Measure 8d (see above); and **Mitigation Measure 8e** (see above) **MFR:** **Mitigation Measure 8b** (see above); **Mitigation Measure 8c** (see above); **Mitigation Measure 8d** (see above); and **Mitigation Measure 8e** (see above)	
Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource?	**MPU:** ~~Significant~~ PS **HHS:** ~~Significant~~ PS **MFR:** ~~Significant~~PS	**MPU:** **Mitigation Measure 8b** (see above); **Mitigation Measure 8c** (see above); **Mitigation Measure 8d** (see above); and **Mitigation Measure 8e** (see above) **HHS:** **Mitigation Measure 8b** (see above); **Mitigation Measure 8c** (see above); **Mitigation Measure 8d** (see above); and **Mitigation Measure 8e** (see above) **MFR:** **Mitigation Measure 8b** (see above); **Mitigation Measure 8c (**see above); **Mitigation Measure 8d** (see above); and **Mitigation Measure 8e** (see above)	**MPU:** LTS **HHS:** LTS **MFR:** LTS
Would the project disturb any human remains?	**MPU:** PS **HHS:** PS **MFR:** PS	**MPU**: **Mitigation Measure 8b** (see above) **HHS**: **Mitigation Measure 8b** (see above) **MFR**: **Mitigation Measure 8b** (see above)	**MPU:** LTS **HHS:** LTS **MFR:** LTS

Table 1-3
Summary of Project Impacts

Environmental Effect	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Would the project make a considerable contribution to loss of scenic vistas, loss of scenic resources, changes in visual character, or creation of substantial sources of light and glare in the cumulative scenario?	**MPU:** No impact **HHS:** No impact **MFR:** No impact	**MPU:** None Required **HHS:** None Required **MFR:** None Required	**MPU:** No impact **HHS:** No impact **MFR:** No impact
Traffic and Circulation			
Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance or the circulation system?	**MPU:** Significant **HHS:** Significant **MFR:** Significant	**MPU:** **Mitigation Measure 10a**: Prior to issuance of a building permit~~s~~ for the Health and Human Services building, Placer County shall work with Caltrans to optimize the signal timings at the SR 49/Bell Road intersection to provide additional green time to the northbound and southbound through, southbound left-turn, and westbound through movements sufficient to improve operations to LOS D during the AM peak hour. **Mitigation Measure 10b**: Prior to issuance of the first building permits for implementation of the PCGC Master Plan Update, Placer County shall work with Caltrans to optimize the signal timings at the SR 49/Kemper Road/New Airport Road intersection to provide additional green time to the	**MPU:** SU **HHS:** SU **MFR:** SU

Table 1-3
Summary of Project Impacts

Environmental Effect	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		northbound and southbound through movements sufficient to improve operations to LOS D. **Mitigation Measure 10c:** Prior to issuance of a building permit~~s~~ for the Health and Human Services building, Placer County shall work with Caltrans to optimize the signal timings at the SR 49/Luther Road intersection to provide additional green time to the northbound and southbound through movements sufficient to improve operations to LOS C during the AM and PM peak hours. **HHS:** **Mitigation Measure 10a** (see above); **Mitigation Measure 10b** (see above); and **Mitigation Measure 10c** (see above) **MFR:** **Mitigation Measure 10b** (see above)	
Would the project conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	**MPU:** ~~Significant~~ PS **HHS:** ~~Significant~~ PS **MFR:** ~~Significant~~LTS	**MPU:** **Mitigation Measure 10d**: Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans for any individual project other than the Multifamily Residential project undertaken in implementation of the PCGC Master Plan Update, Placer County shall either require the project proponent (including the County for a County-sponsored project) to construct a third northbound lane on SR 49 from	**MPU:** SU **HHS:** SU **MFR:** ~~SU~~LTS

Table 1-3
Summary of Project Impacts

Environmental Effect	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		Bell Road to north of Education Street or to post a security for the improvements if at the time of Improvement Plan approval, the Auburn Creekside Center project is determined to be active and progressing with their frontage improvements. ~~If the County requires a project proponent for development within the PCGC Master Plan Update area to ultimately construct this improvement, the County should consider incorporation of this funding into the traffic mitigation fee program; allowing for fee credits associate with the applicable countywide traffic impact fees, as applicable.~~ **HHS: Mitigation Measure 10d** (see above): **MFR: Mitigation Measure 10d** (see above):	
Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy during construction?	**MPU:** PS **HHS:** PS **MFR:** PS	**MPU:** **Mitigation Measure 10e**: Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans or issuance of any grading or building permits, whichever comes first, the project applicant for each future construction project undertaken in implementation of the PCGC Master Plan Update shall prepare a Construction Traffic Management Plan (TMP) to the satisfaction of the Placer County Department	**MPU:** LTS **HHS:** LTS **MFR:** LTS

Table 1-3
Summary of Project Impacts

Environmental Effect	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		• 1st Street to A Avenue to County Center Drive to Bell Road • Atwood Road to Richardson Drive to Bell Road. These routes provide similar travel times from Fire Station 180 to Bell Road northwest of the PCGC campus as well as Blue Oaks Drive north of the PCGC campus. **HHS:** None Required **MFR: Mitigation Measure 10e**: (see above)	
Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycles, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	**MPU:** LTS **HHS:** LTS **MFR:** LTS	**MPU:** None Required **HHS:** None Required **MFR:** None Required	**MPU:** LTS **HHS:** LTS **MFR:** LTS
Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance or the circulation system in a cumulative scenario?	**MPU:** Significant **HHS:** Significant **MFR:** Significant	**MPU:** **Mitigation Measure 10g**: Prior to issuance of building permits for any individual project undertaken in implementation of the PCGC Master Plan Update, Placer County and applicants for private development within the PCGC Master Plan Update shall contribute a fair share amount towards ~~Prior to issuance of~~	**MPU:** SU **HHS:** SU **MFR:** SU

Table 1-3
Summary of Project Impacts

Environmental Effect	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		~~building permits for any individual project undertaken in implementation of the PCGC Master Plan Update, the County Board of Supervisors shall consider amending the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) to add funding for~~ widening the Richardson Drive/Bell Road intersection to provide a northbound right-turn pocket consistent with the Auburn/Bowman CIP. ~~to the Auburn/Bowman Benefit District of the Placer County Countywide CIP and require the County and applicants for private development within the PCGC Master Plan Update to pay a fair share of funding towards this improvement at the time that building permits are issued.~~ **Mitigation Measure 10h**: Upon further project level review for any individual projects other than the Health and Human Services building and the Multifamily Residential project, the County shall require a traffic analysis to determine if the need to modify the County Center Drive/Bell Road intersection is warranted with the project. If it is determined to be warranted with development of the project, the County shall require either of the following modifications as a condition of approval: 1. Provide a separate northbound left-turn lane and right-turn lane while modifying	

Table 1-3
Summary of Project Impacts

Environmental Effect	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		Bell Road to include a westbound receiving lane in the center two-way left-turn lane for northbound left-turn movements; or 2. Prohibit northbound left-turn movements from County Center Drive. **Mitigation Measure 10i:** Prior to issuance of building permits for any individual project undertaken in implementation of the PCGC Master Plan Update, Placer County and applicants for private development within the PCGC Master Plan Update shall contribute a fair share amount towards widening of the SR 49/Bell Road intersection, consistent with the Auburn/Bowman CIP, to accommodate a third southbound through lane, a third southbound receiving lane, and a northbound right-turn lane. This includes extending the existing third southbound lane that begins just south of Bell Road north to Bell Road. ~~Placer County and applicants for private development within the PGCC Master Plan Update shall pay the applicable countywide traffic impact fees at the time that building permits are issued, which will provide funding for this improvement.~~	

Table 1-3
Summary of Project Impacts

Environmental Effect	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		Mitigation Measure 10j: Placer County shall incorporate Transportation Demand Management strategies in the PCGC Master Plan Update, consistent with the Placer County Trip Reduction Program. These may include alternative work schedules and telecommuting, vanpool/shuttle, ride share programs, and bike share programs. **Mitigation Measure 10k**: Prior to issuance of building permits for any individual project undertaken in implementation of the PCGC Master Plan Update, ~~the Placer County Board of Supervisors shall consider amending the Capital Improvement Program to add funding to the Auburn/Bowman Benefit District for widening of the SR 49/Kemper Road/New Airport Road intersection to provide a northbound right-turn pocket and an eastbound left-turn lane. If the CIP is amended,~~ the County and developers of individual projects within the PCGC Master Plan Update shall contribute a fair share amount to construction widening of the SR 49/Kemper Road/New Airport Road intersection ~~of these improvements~~ at the time that building permits are issued, consistent with the Auburn/Bowman CIP. **Mitigation Measure 10l:** Placer County shall implement signal timing optimization at the Bell	

Table 1-3
Summary of Project Impacts

Environmental Effect	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		Road/Quartz Drive intersection to provide additional green time to the eastbound through, westbound through, and southbound movements sufficient to improve operations to LOS D during the PM peak hour. **Mitigation Measure 10m:** Prior to issuance of building permits for any individual project undertaken in implementation of the PCGC Master Plan Update, Placer County and applicants for private development within the PCGC Master Plan Update shall contribute a fair share amount towards improvements at the Bell Road/New Airport Drive intersection, consistent with the Auburn/Bowman CIP, to reconfigure~~ing~~ the southbound approach lane to the Bell Road/New Airport Drive intersection to provide one left-turn lane and one shared through/right-turn lane and optimize the existing signal operations to efficiently allocate green time among different movements sufficient to reduce the average control delay to less than cumulative no project conditions. **Mitigation Measure 10n:** Placer County shall coordinate with Caltrans to optimize the signal timing at the SR 49/Luther Road intersection to provide additional green time to the northbound	

Table 1-3
Summary of Project Impacts

Environmental Effect	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		and southbound through, southbound left-turn, and westbound right-turn movements sufficient to improve operations to LOS C during the AM peak hour and LOS D during the PM peak hour. **Mitigation Measure 10o:** Placer County shall coordinate with Caltrans to explore options to optimize the signal timings at the SR 49/Kemper Road/New Airport Road intersection to provide additional green time to the northbound left-turn and southbound through movements sufficient to restore delay to cumulative no project conditions. **Mitigation Measure 10p**: Placer County shall coordinate with Caltrans to explore options to optimize the signal operations at the SR 49/Atwood Road intersection to provide additional green time to the northbound through movement sufficient to restore delay to cumulative no project conditions. **HHS:** **Mitigation Measure 10g** (see above), **Mitigation Measure 10i** (see above), **Mitigation Measure 10j** (see above), **Mitigation Measure 10l** (see above), **Mitigation Measure 10n** (see above), and **Mitigation Measure 10o** (see above)	

Table 1-3
Summary of Project Impacts

Environmental Effect	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		~~**Mitigation Measure 10o:** Placer County shall coordinate with Caltrans to explore options to optimize the signal timings at the SR 49/Kemper Road/New Airport Road intersection to provide additional green time to the northbound left-turn and southbound through movements sufficient to restore delay to cumulative no project conditions.~~ **MFR:** ~~**Mitigation Measure 10i** (see above),~~ **Mitigation Measure 10n** (see above), and **Mitigation Measure 10p** (see above) ~~**Mitigation Measure 10p**: Placer County shall coordinate with Caltrans to explore options to optimize the signal optimize the signal operations at the SR 49/Atwood Road intersection to provide additional green time to the northbound through movement sufficient to restore delay to cumulative no project conditions.~~	
Would the project conflict with an applicable congestion management program in a cumulative scenario	**MPU:** PS **HHS:** LTS **MFR:** LTS	**MPU:** **Mitigation Measure 10j** (see above) **HHS:** None Required **MFR:** None Required	**MPU:** SU **HHS:** LTS **MFR:** LTS

Table 1-3
Summary of Project Impacts

Environmental Effect	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Noise			
Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies or a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	**MPU:** LTS **HHS:** LTS **MFR:** LTS	**MPU:** None Required **HHS:** None Required **MFR:** None Required	**MPU:** LTS **HHS:** LTS **MFR:** LTS
Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	**MPU:** LTS **HHS:** LTS **MFR:** LTS	**MPU:** None Required **HHS:** None Required **MFR:** None Required	**MPU:** LTS **HHS:** LTS **MFR:** LTS
Would the project result a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	**MPU:** PS **HHS:** LTS **MFR:** ~~P~~Significant	**MPU:** **Mitigation Measure 11a:** Prior to approval of Improvement Plans or issuance of grading permits for any project construction that would occur within 200 feet of on-site or off-site sensitive receptors, the County or project applicant shall prepare construction noise modeling that documents the existing Community Noise Environment Level at the sensitive receptor locations, provides a construction schedule and anticipated equipment usage, and calculates	**MPU:** LTS **HHS:** LTS **MFR:** LTS

Table 1-3
Summary of Project Impacts

Environmental Effect	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		allow the use of electrically-powered landscape equipment. • Provide secure bicycle racks and/or storage within nonresidential and residential building entrances. • Provide preferential parking for carpool, shared, electric, and hydrogen vehicles. • Include pedestrian-friendly paths and cross walks in all parking lots. • Install two 110/208 volt power outlets for every two loading docks. **Mitigation Measure 12b:** The County and future project applicants for individual projects shall implement one of the following off-site mitigation measures prior to issuance of ~~certificates of occupancy~~ a building permit for each building constructed on-site: 1. Establish mitigation off-site within the portion of Placer County that is within the SVAB by participating in an off-site mitigation program, coordinated through PCAPCD. Examples include, but are not limited to retrofitting, repowering, or replacing heavy duty engines from mobile	

Table 1-3
Summary of Project Impacts

Environmental Effect	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		sources (e.g., busses, construction equipment, on-road haulers); or other programs that the project proponent may propose to reduce emissions. 2. Participate in PCAPCD's Off-site Mitigation Program by paying the equivalent amount of fees for the project's contribution of NO_x that exceeds the operational threshold of 55 lbs/day. The applicable fee rates changes over time. At the time of writing this EIR, the fee rate is $18,260 per ton emitted during the ozone season. The actual amount to be paid shall be determined, and satisfied per current CARB guidelines, at the time of recordation of the Final Map (residential projects), or issuance of a Building Permit (non-residential projects). **HHS:** None Required **MFR:** None Required	
Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable new increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality	**MPU:** ~~LTS~~ PS **HHS:** LTS **MFR:** LTS	**MPU:** **Mitigation Measure 12a** (see above) and **Mitigation Measure 12b** ~~None Required~~ **HHS:** None Required	**MPU:** LTS **HHS:** LTS **MFR:** LTS

Table 1-3
Summary of Project Impacts

Environmental Effect	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Would the project be at risk for inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	**MPU:** No impact **HHS:** No impact **MFR:** No impact	**MPU:** None Required **HHS:** None Required **MFR:** None Required	**MPU:** No impact **HHS:** No impact **MFR:** No impact
Would the Master Plan Update result in an impact to Hydrology or Water Quality in a cumulative scenario?	**MPU:** LTS **HHS:** ~~N/A~~ LTS **MFR:** N/~~A~~LTS	**MPU:** None Required **HHS:** None Required~~/A~~ **MFR:** ~~N/A~~ None Required	**MPU:** LTS **HHS:** ~~N/A~~ LTS **MFR:** ~~N/A~~LTS
Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or through reasonably foreseeable accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment?	**MPU:** PS **HHS:** PS **MFR:** PS	**MPU:** **Mitigation Measures 16a**: Placer County and any future applicant for permits to demolish or renovate buildings within the PCGC campus shall prepare an Asbestos and Lead Abatement Program in accordance with the U.S. EPA's National Emission Standard for Hazardous Air Pollutants (Asbestos NESHAP) (Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations, Subpart M § 61.145). The Asbestos and Lead Abatement Program shall include the following requirements: a. Prior to beginning renovation or demolition, a thorough asbestos inspection must be conducted by a California Division of Occupational Safety	**MPU:** LTS **HHS:** LTS **MFR:** LTS

Table 1-3
Summary of Project Impacts

Environmental Effect	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Would the project contribute to cumulative impacts to public services and recreation?	**MPU:** LTS **HHS:** LTS **MFR:** LTS	**MPU:** None Required **HHS:** None Required **MFR:** None Required	**MPU:** LTS **HHS:** LTS **MFR:** LTS
Utilities and Service Systems			
Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	**MPU:** No impact **HHS:** No impact **MFR:** No impact	**MPU:** None Required **HHS:** None Required **MFR:** None Required	**MPU:** No impact **HHS:** No impact **MFR:** No impact
Would the project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities, expansion of existing facilities, or demand for new or expanded water supplies?	**MPU:** PS **HHS:** PS **MFR:** LTS	**MPU:** **Mitigation Measure 18a**: The County shall develop and implement an off-site mitigation program that will replace and/or rehabilitate sewer infrastructure in order to reduce inflow and infiltration in areas tributary to the DeWitt trunk line within Sewer Maintenance District No. 1. The off-site mitigation program will create capacity within the existing system equivalent to the project's peak wet weather flows. The off-site mitigation program shall consist of upsizing of the DeWitt Trunk line as identified in Table 5-2 of the North Auburn DeWitt Trunk Sewer Capacity Evaluation Report. The off-site mitigation program shall be coordinated, reviewed, and approved by the ~~Facility Services~~ Department of Public Works,	**MPU:** LTS **HHS:** LTS **MFR:** LTS

their comment letters to the County during the NOP public review period. The County received 22 comment letters, which included comments from the California Department of Transportation, the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, the Placer County Local Agency Formation Commission, the Placer County Airport Land Use Commission, the Placer County Air Pollution Control District, the Nevada Irrigation District, and several individuals and representatives of local organizations.

It is noted that the NOP stated the project site would retain the current mixed-use land use designation under the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan. However, the project (as described in Draft EIR Chapter 3, Project Description) has evolved slightly to include a new land use designation and combining zone district. These changes have not altered the conceptual land use plan or anticipated land uses; thus the project has remained largely consistent with the project description provided in the NOP.

In addition, the County has engaged in many public outreach efforts outside of the EIR process. Since the start of the PCGC Master Plan Update process in April 2016, the public outreach process has had a multifaceted approach to informing and gathering feedback from a wide range of community members and stakeholders. The following are examples of the varied approaches the County and its consultant team have used to engage the public.

Community Workshops

Several public open houses were hosted by the County and the master planning consultant team to gather feedback from the community on the draft PCGC Master Plan Update. Three workshops were held; April and August, 2016 and January, 2017.

Board Meetings

The Placer County Board of Supervisors has reviewed and provided direction and feedback on various elements of the draft PCGC Master Plan Update at several Board Meetings since March of 2016. At each of these meetings the public was given an opportunity to see the progress of the project and provide comment.

County Meetings

At various stages of planning over the last two years, the draft PCGC Master Plan Update has been presented at the Placer County Planning Commission, North Auburn Municipal Advisory Group, Foresthill Forum, Meadow Vista Municipal Advisory Council, Weimar/Applegate/Colfax Municipal Advisory Council and the Historical Advisory Board. These meetings provided additional opportunities for the public to see and provide input on the master plan progress.

A number of buildings that were constructed as part of the original DeWitt General Hospital were demolished between 2004 and 2014, as shown in Table 3-2. Several of these buildings were identified for demolition in the 2003 DeWitt Government Center Facility Plan EIR (County of Placer 2003) (2003 Facility Plan EIR). As required by that EIR, the County retained an architectural historian to conduct photographic recordation of the entire PCGC campus. The recordation was prepared in compliance with the Historic American Buildings Survey standards, and was completed prior to demolition of the buildings identified for removal in the 2003 Facility Plan EIR. Subsequent to completion of the photographic recordation, as part of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' consideration of the County's application for permits to impact wetlands and waters of the U.S. under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, the State Historic Preservation Office issued a determination that the PCGC campus did not qualify as a historic district or support any historic buildings (Mikesell 2004). The County relied on this determination to demolish additional structures (beyond those identified for removal in the 2003 Facility Plan EIR), with no need for further environmental analysis. Buildings that were demolished but were not identified in the 2003 Facility Plan EIR for removal are Buildings 6, 9, 10, 27, 102–106, 201–203, and 416.

Table 3-2
Placer County Government Center Building Demolition by Year

Building Number	Year Demolished	Use Prior to Demolition
2, 3, 4, 5, 503, 504, 506	2004	Building 2 – 5 Bell Gardens Apartments, prior to demolition, these buildings contained 13 occupied low-income and very-low income dwelling units and 79 unoccupied units (County of Placer 2003) Buildings 503, 504, 506 decommissioned wastewater treatment plant and accessory structures
401, original DeWitt water treatment plant, existing gas station is now labeled 401	2008 (as part of the Home Depot project)	Decommissioned water treatment plant
1, 6, 7, 8, 416	2009	County offices (Placer County Sheriff's Office) and storage
213, 214, 215, 216, 217	2010	County offices (planning, building, public works, District Attorney, probation)
102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 207	2011	County offices and storage
9, 10, 27, 203A, 204, 206	2013	County offices and storage, social services
201, 202, 203B, 205	2014	County offices and storage

Source: County of Placer 2017

County facility needs and the County's ability to capitalize on likely market opportunities. The PCGC Master Plan Draft Strategic Vision is available for review on the County's website (http://www.placer.ca.gov/pcgc). The PCGC Master Plan Update provides a conceptual site plan for the PCGC property and establishes allowable land uses, development standards, and design guidelines that will shape future development projects. Build-out of the PCGC Master Plan Update is anticipated to take approximately 20 years. It is not possible to precisely predict the specific mix of land uses that will develop within the project site. For the purposes of the impact analysis throughout this EIR, development projections for the PCGC property were determined based on a detailed assessment of the existing and future space needs for each County department located at the site (County of Placer 2018a Appendix A) as well as a local market analysis that considered the potential for the site to support private commercial and residential uses (County of Placer 2018a Appendix G). These considerations were used to determine a reasonable development scenario for the PCGC property. The development scenario does not reflect full maximum potential build-out of the property. For example, the Development Standards allow a maximum building height of 50 feet, but the development scenario does not assume that all new construction onsite would achieve this maximum height. The actual amount of development may vary from the assumptions used in this EIR. As discussed in Chapter 2 and Section 3.5, as each individual development project is proposed, Placer County would review the proposed project for consistency with the PCGC Master Plan Update and the assumptions used in this EIR to determine if additional environmental review is needed. The analysis throughout this EIR assumes that development under the PCGC Master Plan Update would include:

- Retaining 650,000 square feet of existing buildings, of which 324,000 square feet would continue to house County offices and facilities;
- Demolishing the following buildings currently located within the DeWitt General Hospital District: 107 to 113, 208 to 212, 306 to 315, 318 to 324, 410 to 413, and 417;
- Retaining the following buildings within the DeWitt General Hospital District: 114 to 118, 301 to 305, 401 to 403, 416, 418 to 420, 423, 424, 425, and 430;
- Constructing a total of 1,123,400 square feet of new buildings, of which 351,100 square feet would house County offices and facilities providing a total of 675,100 square feet of County offices and facilities, including expanding Fire Station #180 by 3,300 square feet;
- Constructing 182,800 square feet of new mixed-use buildings in the mixed-use area which would support 61,150 square feet of retail, 30,575 square feet of office, and 30,575 square feet of residential (31 units) and constructing a 60,500-square foot hotel with 101 guest rooms;

- Constructing a total of 485 multifamily dwelling units, including 100 in the Multifamily Residential project located at 1st Street and B Avenue, 354 in other multifamily residential buildings, and 31 in the mixed-use area; and

- Allowing for adaptive reuse of some of the retained buildings, with 23,950 square feet each of office and retail uses; combined with the mixed-use area development, the PCGC Master Plan Update is projected to accommodate a total of 85,100 square feet of retail space and 54,525 square feet of office use.

General Plan and Zoning

The PCGC Master Plan Update anticipates that the existing land use designations throughout the project site would be changed to a land use designation of Placer County Government Center Master Plan under the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan, as shown on Figure 3-5. These amendments would allow a maximum allowable residential density of 30 dwelling units per acre.

The County also proposes to modify the zoning designations for portions of the campus, as shown in Figure 3-6, Proposed Zoning Designations. In the areas at the eastern side of the campus where mixed-use development is proposed, the existing CPD-Dc-AO (Commercial Planned Development) is proposed to be expanded to include the proposed Multifamily Residential Thematic Area on the eastern side of the property, the Mixed-Use Thematic Area, the DeWitt Heritage Area, and the portion of the Community Thematic Area that would include the proposed Community/Eevents ~~center~~ Center and community green. Additionally, the Town Center Commercial (TC) combining zone~~ing overlay~~ district is proposed to be applied to all of the land zoned CPD to allow greater flexibility in accommodating the desired mix of uses. In addition, the area currently designated as Office Professional (OP-Dc-AO) is proposed to be changed to Heavy Commercial (C3-Dc); this zoning designation would be applied to all areas proposed for future County government buildings. The AO zoning overlay would also be applied to those areas that are within the aircraft overflight zones as identified by the Placer County Airport Land Use Commission, as shown on Figure 3-6. The open space zone currently applied to the area around the existing pond in the western portion of the site is proposed to be expanded to the east, to encompass the oak woodland habitat between Atwood Road and the new Animal Services Center. Finally, the westernmost portion of the PCGC property is proposed to be zoned C1-Dc, Neighborhood Commercial.

Development Standards and Design Guidelines

The PCGC Master Plan Update proposes the adoption of project-specific Development Standards (County of Placer 2018c) and Design Guidelines (County of Placer 2018d) that define allowable land uses, maximum building heights and site coverage, and maximum average density and intensity assumptions for future development within the project site. The Development Standards

segment of the Kemper Canal that would be encased and placed in a pipe below ground as part of construction projects that occur adjacent to the canal.

General Commercial

The General Commercial Thematic Area is proposed in the northeastern portion of the PCGC property and is primarily occupied by the Home Depot and associated parking lot. No changes to this parcel are expected and none of the proposed PCGC Master Plan Update content, including the Development Standards and Design Guidelines would be applicable to the General Commercial area.

Community

The Community Thematic Area is proposed on 10 acres in the middle of the PCGC campus to serve as a key organizing element – providing opportunities for building and open space that accommodate public gathering and promotes health. It is bordered by the Government Services areas, the Mixed-Use area, and the DeWitt Heritage area and provides connectivity between and among all parts of the PCGC campus. The Development Standards limit site coverage in the Community Thematic Area to 15% and allow a maximum building height of 50 feet. This area is planned to include a 30,000 square foot ~~Events Center~~Community/Events Center surrounded by landscaped areas to the north and south. It is expected that the Community/Events Center could serve as a meeting and training space for County employees, provide meeting and activity space for community groups, and could be rented out for private events such as weddings or cooperate retreats. The landscaping north of the ~~Events Center~~Community/Events Center would include retention of existing trees and planting of additional trees and vegetation to create an urban forest crossed by a robust network of pedestrian and bicycle paths. The landscaping to the south of the Community/E~~e~~vents C~~c~~enter is anticipated to consist of an approximately 3-acre turfed space that would be available for informal gathering and planned events. The Community Area would also include an intermodal transit station at County Center Drive north of B Avenue (County of Placer 2018a, d, and e).

DeWitt Heritage

The DeWitt Heritage Thematic Area is proposed in the northeastern portion of the PCGC campus and is planned to include five existing, original DeWitt General Hospital buildings that would be retained on site and would be available for adaptive reuse. A portion of these buildings could be converted to include museum space that would provide educational and interpretive exhibits regarding the area's pre-history and history. The buildings proposed to be retained within the DeWitt Heritage Area are the Army Chapel located on B Avenue and the four hospital wing buildings located south of the chapel. As described in the Potential County Projects discussion in the draft PCGC Master Plan Update (County of Placer 2018a), this museum would include a

- Improve the urban forest to create a unified campus identity, provide shade to reduce heat islands, and encourage walking.
- Develop a consistent set of landscaping treatments recommendations that can reinforce organization and design intent, and enhance the overall sense of place.

Off-Site Improvements

As discussed in Chapter 10, Transportation, and Chapter 18, Utilities and Service Systems, implementation of the proposed PCGC Master Plan Update would require off-site improvements to transportation and sewage conveyance infrastructure. This includes widening a segment of State Route 49, intersection modifications along State Route 49, and upsizing several segments of the DeWitt Trunk sewer line. The widening of a segment of State Route 49 is anticipated to be completed by a previously approved project, Auburn Creekside Center. However, in the event that this project does not proceed, construction of this improvement may become a responsibility of Placer County and/or applicants for private development within the PCGC property. Similarly, upsizing several segments of the DeWitt Trunk sewer line is expected to be completed by the previously approved Timberline Senior Housing project, located north of the PCGC property. In the event that the Timberline project does not complete these improvements prior to construction of the Health and Human Services building, construction of these improvements would become the responsibility of Placer County.

Tiering

It is expected that the facilities and site improvements described in the PCGC Master Plan Update will be constructed over an approximate20-year implementation timeline. The initial implementation, Tier 1 is anticipated to include the two project-level components described below (i.e., Human Health Services Building and Multifamily Residential at 1st Street and B Avenue) as well as the multifamily residential in the southwest corner of the PCGC campus. Actual phasing and timing of individual projects will be dependent on funding availability. As shown in Figure 3-9, Tiering Plan, it is anticipated that construction would occur in four 5-year tiers, with remaining County facilities and private development occurring in Tiers 2 and 3, and development of the ~~Event Center~~Community/Events Center and Community Green in Tier 4.

PCGC Master Plan Update Project-Level Components

Health and Human Services Building

The proposed PCGC Master Plan Update would involve construction of a new Health and Human Services building near the center of the PCGC campus, southwest of the proposed roundabout that would connect County Center Drive with B Avenue. It would be bounded by existing B Avenue,

that the Health and Human Services building would house up to approximately 577 employees in 2035 (County of Placer 2016b).

The building is planned to consist of three stories. Building height (maximum of 50 feet), design, materials, colors, and landscaping would conform to the Development Standards and Design Guidelines proposed with the PCGC Master Plan Update. Site improvements would include parking, vehicle and pedestrian circulation, landscaping, and stormwater infrastructure. The building and associated improvements would be located on 5.6 acres. Building space would include a main lobby, conference and team rooms, open and private office areas, training and interview rooms, storage and work rooms, break rooms, central storage, and a receiving area. Outdoor spaces for the facility would include patios, a play area, a garden, and a service/loading dock. The building site is anticipated to accommodate parking for 406 employees initially, with the potential to add 56 spaces in the future. Parking would also be provided for 48 visitors and 40 fleet vehicles. The parking lot would extend from the building westerly to Richardson Drive.

A public health lab or clinic is not being considered as part of the Health and Human Services building or the overall PCGC Master Plan Update.

Multifamily Residential

The proposed PCGC Master Plan Update would provide multifamily residential use in the northeastern portion of the project site on the east side of 1st Street. The Multifamily Residential project would include four buildings fronting on 1st Street, a parking lot running along the eastern site boundary, and site landscaping. The boundaries of this site and a conceptual building layout are indicated on Figure 3-7, Conceptual Land Use Plan. This portion of the site is zoned Office Professional (OP-Dc-AO) and Commercial Planned Development (CPD-Dc-AO). The project proposes to remove the OP designation from this site, expand the CPD designation to cover the site, and add a Town Center (TC) combining zone~~ing overlay~~ district to this designation. Under the proposed Allowed Uses and Permit Requirements for the PCGC Master Plan Update provided in Table 2-1 of the Development Standards, development of multifamily residences within the CPD zone would require zoning clearance approval if the project meets all of the proposed Development Standards or issuance of a Minor Use Permit if it does not.

This site consists of approximately 3 acres. Under the current CPD zoning for the site, residential density is limited to a maximum of one unit for each 2,000 square feet of lot area, which correlates to 21.78 units per acre. Under these standards, the site could accommodate a maximum of 65 dwelling units. However, the proposed modification of the zoning for this area to include the Town Center (TC) combining zone district~~overlay~~ would allow for increased density, with a maximum of 30 dwelling units per acre, allowing approximately 90 dwelling units. The Multifamily Residential project located at 1st Street and B Avenue is currently proposed to include 79 dwelling

- Amend the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan to replace and supersede all references to the Dewitt Center with the Placer County Government Center Master Plan Update Revise the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan land use designations for the site as shown in Figure 3-5.
- Amend text within Placer County Code Section 17.52.135 Town Center Commercial to allow modified development standards for development in areas that include the Town Center combining zone district ~~zoning overlay~~ subject to approval of an area plan, master plan or specific plan, as shown in Appendix B.
- Rezone portions of the PCGC campus as shown in Figure 3-6.

To authorize construction of the Health and Human Services building and the Multifamily Residential project at 1st Street and B Avenue, in addition to the actions taken by the Board of Supervisors to approve the PCGC Master Plan Update, the following additional permits and approvals would be needed:

- Design/Site Review Approval
- Minor Boundary Line Adjustment for Multifamily Residential project
- Improvement Plan Approval
- Tree Removal Permit
- Building Permit

Further, the County may need to approve a Minor Use Permit for the Multifamily Residential project at 1st Street and B Avenue if the project does not meet the PCGC Master Plan Update Development Standards.

The same permits and approvals listed for the Health and Human Services building and the Multifamily Residential project at 1st Street and B Avenue would be needed for each subsequent action taken in implementation of the PCGC Master Plan Update, except that the need for a Minor Boundary Line Adjustment for each future project would have to be considered on a case–by-case basis and the need for a Minor Use Permit or Conditional Use Permit would be determined based on the requirements of Table 2-1 in the PCGC Master Plan Update Development Standards. Further, it is expected that the County may approve Commercial Parcel Maps to modify parcel boundaries and create new parcels within the mixed-use and multifamily residential areas to more specifically define project sites for individual construction projects, ensure that buildings and other improvements are not constructed across parcel boundaries, and facilitate application of the PCGC Master Plan Update Development Standards (site cover and setbacks) to each individual project. This EIR serves as the base CEQA document analyzing the future commercial Tentative Parcel

5 LAND USE AND PLANNING

This section describes the existing land use and planning setting of the project site, identifies associated regulatory requirements, evaluates potential impacts, and identifies mitigation measures related to implementation of the proposed Placer County Government Center Master Plan Update Project (PCGC Master Plan Update or project) and construction of the proposed Health and Human Services building and Multifamily Residential project at 1st Street and B Avenue.

Several comments received in response to the Notice of Preparation for this EIR addressed land use and planning. These comments included recommendations to consider increased residential densities within the project site, the need to maintain walkability and transit service, retention of the existing community garden, consistency with the Auburn Municipal Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, compliance with the Surplus Lands Act, and requests for clarification regarding use of the Town Center combining zone~~ing overlay~~ district and proposed amendments to the General Plan and Auburn/Bowman Community Plan. The Surplus Lands Act is not applicable to the analysis of the physical environmental effects of the proposed project and is not discussed in this chapter.

5.1 EXISTING CONDITIONS

The project site is located in the North Auburn area within unincorporated Placer County. The PCGC campus encompasses approximately 200 acres, including land leased to The Home Depot, located in the northeast corner of 1st Street and Willow Creek Drive. The Home Depot site is not subject to any of the land use and zoning changes, allowable land uses, or development standards proposed under the PCGC Master Plan Update.

The PCGC campus is bound on the east by a mix of commercial and residential uses and medical offices adjacent to State Route 49 (SR 49), Bell Road on the north, Atwood Road on the south, and a self-storage facility and rural residential land uses on the west. This location is approximately three miles northwest of the City of Auburn downtown area. The project site and vicinity are shown in Figure 3-1 in Chapter 3, Project Description.

The property is located within the planning area of the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan (County of Placer 1999). The Auburn/Bowman Community Plan provides guidance for land use within an approximately 40-square-mile area at the base of the Sierra Nevada foothills. Land development over the past 25 years has shifted the dominant land use pattern from rural residential and agricultural to more urbanized residential, commercial, and public uses. The project site is also within the City of Auburn's sphere of influence—the City's General Plan designates the site for mixed-use development and public uses (County of Placer 1999).

Community Development Resource Center. This would extend the government services presence on Bell Road. This use is compatible with the medical offices located on the north side of Bell Road. The conceptual land use plan places multifamily residential uses in the southwest corner of the site, which is adjacent to existing rural residential and low-density residential uses. The multifamily residential uses planned for the northeast corner of the site would not be adjacent to any other residences, but would be located adjacent to existing offices and the proposed DeWitt Heritage area and would have easy access to Bell Road and Willow Creek Drive. It would also be close to the Community area and Mixed-Use area of the PCGC property. These uses would be compatible with the proposed residential use. Finally, the conceptual land use plan places multifamily residential uses in the southeast corner of the site, which is adjacent to commercial uses on Willow Creek Drive and an existing single-family residential neighborhood. Implementation of the PCGC Master Plan Update would not significantly disrupt or divide an existing community and would not create a divided community internal to the site. The PCGC Master Plan Update would have **no impact** related to dividing communities.

Health and Human Services Building

The Health and Human Services building would be constructed generally in the central portion of the PCGC Master Plan Update project site, specifically in the eastern portion of the Government Services 2 Thematic Area and adjacent to the Community area. The building would be across County Center Drive from the proposed Community/E~~e~~vents ~~c~~Center and ~~central~~ community green in the Community area. The Health and Human Services Building is frequented by members of the public utilizing County services. Vehicle access to the site would be available from both County Center Drive and Richardson Drive, which would not require visitors to the site to drive through any existing or proposed residential areas. The location would be in walking distance of the intermodal transit station which would facilitate use of public transit for people obtaining County services. Placement of the building near the Community Area provides convenient access to open space for individuals and families using the Health and Human Services department.

Existing buildings located in the proposed site for the Health and Human Services Building include 107, 108, and 109. These buildings include 29,195 square feet and are currently occupied by the Health and Human Services department. They would be demolished to accommodate the new building. The current Health and Human Services staff within buildings 107, 108, and 109 would be relocated to other vacant buildings within the PCGC campus during construction.

The Health and Human Services building would be located interior to the PCGC Master Plan Update project site, would be consistent with the Conceptual Land Use Plan, and would have **no impact** related to dividing existing or planned communities.

Multifamily Residential Project

The Multifamily Residential project located at 1st Street and B Avenue would be constructed in the northeastern corner of the PCGC Master Plan Update site. It would place a small (±3-acre) multifamily residential community in this location, bounded by the realigned 1st Street on the west and the PCGC property boundary on the east. Professional office land uses exist to the east of this site. The housing would be located adjacent to the proposed DeWitt Heritage Area and within walking distance of the Community Area and the commercial land uses proposed within the Mixed-Use District. The currently vacant ±3-acre site would contain all of this multifamily development and thus the proposed community would not be physically divided and this community would not physically divide any existing communities. The Multifamily Residential project would be located interior to the PCGC Master Plan Update project site, would be consistent with the Conceptual Land Use Plan, and would have **no impact** related to dividing existing or planned communities.

Impact 5-2	**Would the project create land use incompatibilities or conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?**		
	PCGC Master Plan Update	*Health and Human Services Building*	*Multifamily Residential Project*
Level of Significance:	~~No impact~~Less than Significant	~~No impact~~Less than Significant	~~No impact~~Less than Significant
Mitigation Measures:	None required	None required	None required
Significance after Mitigation:	~~No impact~~Less than Significant	~~No impact~~Less than Significant	~~No impact~~Less than Significant

PCGC Master Plan Update

The potential for the project to create land use compatibilities is evaluated by considering the existing land uses adjacent to the PCGC campus and determining whether the proposed land uses within the project site could result in adverse environmental effects to those existing adjacent land uses.

Land use planning impacts are evaluated in this section by determining whether the proposed project is in compliance with the land use designations for the site under the Community Plan, as well as considering the project's consistency with goals and policies of the General Plan, Community Plan, County zoning requirements, and other relevant policy documents. The analysis focuses specifically on policies that, if violated, may contribute to some direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect environmental impact (as defined by the CEQA Statutes and Guidelines) compared to what would be anticipated with full policy compliance. The focus of this section is

on policies that apply to land use development projects, not on policies that apply to other regulatory and advisory actions that the County may undertake in implementation of the General Plan and Community Plan. The County's environmental policies do not always allow qualitative or definitive evaluation. Therefore, although this EIR does thoroughly analyze and report on project consistency with environmental policies, it will be the task of the Placer County Board of Supervisors to make the ultimate determination in this regard.

Land Use and Zoning Consistency

As discussed in Section 5.2, Regulatory Setting, land uses at the project site are governed by the County's General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. Existing land use designations adjacent to the project site and proposed land use designations for the project site are shown on Figure 3-6, in Chapter 3, Project Description. The project proposes to modify the land use designation under the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan by designating the entire site Placer County Government Center Master Plan. In addition to modifying the Community Plan land use designation for the site, the project proposes to amend the text of the Community Plan to increase the maximum allowable residential density within the portions of the PCGC Master Plan Update planning area that carry the Town Center combining zone district~~overlay~~ (discussed in the following paragraph) from 15 units per acre to 30 units per acre.

The existing zoning designations for the project site, pursuant to the Placer County Zoning Ordinance, include Office Professional (OP-DR-Dc-AO), Commercial Planned Development (CPD-Dc-AO), Heavy Commercial (C3-Dc-AO), Medium Density Residential (RM-DL6-AO), and Open Space (O-AO). The PCGC Master Plan Update proposes to add a Town Center (TC) combining zone district ~~overlay zone~~ to the eastern portion of the campus, omit the AO zoning overlay from the western portion of the site, consistent with the aircraft overflight zones established in the Airport Land Use Compatibility plan, and slightly expand the O district in the western portion of the site. Other than expanding the O district and reducing the C3 district in that area, the proposed PCGC Master Plan Update would not alter the other underlying zoning designations throughout the site, as shown in Figure 3-7 in Chapter 3, Project Description.

The TC combining zone district~~overlay~~ would allow residential development within the CPD zone district within the PCGC property to achieve higher densities than are typically allowed in this zone. The County also proposes to amend the description of the TC combining zone district~~overlay~~ within the Zoning Ordinance, as shown in Appendix B.

The proposed amendments to the land use and zoning designations within the project site and the proposed community plan and zoning ordinance text amendment would not substantially change the types of land uses that may be accommodated within the site or alter the land use development patterns in the project vicinity.

Land Use Compatibility

Land uses adjacent to the site include a mix of commercial and residential uses and medical offices to the east, and north, and southeast, with rural residential land uses extending to the west and southwest. The project site and vicinity are shown in Figure 3-1 in Chapter 3, Project Description. The proposed PCGC Master Plan Update would maintain the existing interface of county facilities with the residential uses to the north, on Corinthian Lane, and to the south along Atwood Road. Along the PCGC's eastern boundary, the project would introduce a new mixture of land uses by placing multifamily residential uses adjacent to office professional uses, including medical offices; placing a mixed-use area (to include residential, office, and commercial uses) adjacent to the existing Home Depot, other retail development along SR 49, and the single-family residential neighborhood on Cottage Drive. The project would also include expansion of the existing fire station located at 10800 Atwood Road, which is adjacent to the residential neighborhood on Cottage Drive. Potential conflicts between the proposed and existing land uses include changes in views, potential for lighting from the proposed uses to spillover onto adjacent properties, and noise exposure. Impacts related to changes in views and lighting are evaluated in Chapter 9, Visual Resources, while impacts related to noise exposure are evaluated in Chapter 11, Noise. All impacts associated with visual resources and noise were determined to be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Consistency with Plans and Policies

As noted previously, the project would also the zoning designations within the site to apply a TC combining zone district ~~zoning overlay~~ to the eastern portion of the campus, as shown in Figure 3-6 in Chapter 3, Project Description. To allow development within the TC combining zone district ~~zoning overlay~~ area to exceed the densities of the underlying Commercial Planned Development zoning district, the County also proposes to amend the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan to add an updated land use designation map, and replace all references to the Dewitt Center with references to the PCGC Master Plan Update. This amendment would affect only the PCGC campus and would bring the proposed PCGC Master Plan Update into consistency with the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan and with the Placer County Zoning Ordinance. The proposed text amendments to the Placer County General Plan, Auburn/Bowman Community Plan, and zoning ordinance are provided in Appendix B.

The proposed land uses are consistent with the *Placer County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan* for the Auburn Municipal Airport (Placer County Airport Land Use Commission 2014). As described previously, the majority of the PCGC campus is within compatibility Zone D, for which the primary compatibility concern is building height, while Multifamily Residential project located at 1st Street and B Avenue would be located within compatibility Zone C2. The proposed PCGC Master Plan Update Design Guidelines establish a maximum building height of 50 feet. This is

Center, the Community/Events Center, and the community green included in the proposed PCGC Master Plan Update. The Community Plan recognizes that the County's ownership of the 200-acre PCGC campus provides a unique opportunity for the County to promote and shape development in the vicinity. The Community Plan notes that a key assumption in the development of the PCGC campus as a mixed-use area is that a large portion of the County's services will continue to be housed here and that the area surrounding the PCGC campus will continue to develop.

The environmental effects of the proposed demolition of historic resources are evaluated in detail in Chapter 8 Cultural Resources while consideration of two project alternatives that would retain a greater amount of the DeWitt General Hospital historic district is provided in Chapter 20 Alternatives. The project proposes to retain 15 of the buildings that are contributing features to the DeWitt General Hospital Historic District. This includes the 5 buildings proposed to comprise the DeWitt Heritage Thematic Area and 10 buildings within the existing Corporation Yard. The project is consistent with the County's policies regarding historic resources because all of the existing structures within the site have already been identified and documented, the proposed PCGC Master Plan Update would implement the Development Vision enumerated in the Community Plan, and the proposed project includes retention of 15 of the contributing features within the historic district.

The project is expected to be consistent with the County's policies regarding noise. As discussed in Chapter 11, Noise, while construction noise is typically exempt from the County's noise ordinance requirements, there is a possibility that construction noise could exceed the maximum allowable noise levels, which would result in a significant impact. This would be avoided through implementation of mitigation measures that require project-specific modeling of construction noise and use of noise attenuation measures to ensure that project construction does not expose residents, offices, and other sensitive receptors to unacceptable noise levels.

The project is consistent with the County's policies regarding air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and energy conservation and all associated impacts were determined to be less than significant without implementation of mitigation measures**.**

Existing and planned utilities for and surrounding the project site would be capable of supporting the ongoing use of the site for government services and commercial uses as well as the residential population that could be accommodated under the proposed Master Plan Update, as discussed in Chapter 17, Public Services and Recreation and Chapter 18, Public Utilities and Service Systems. Preparation of the proposed PCGC Master Plan Update has included detailed assessments of the condition and capacity of existing infrastructure, the likely demands for additional service that would result from build-out of the proposed Master Plan Update, and planning for provision of the necessary infrastructure to deliver those service demands.

In conclusion, impacts related to creation of land use incompatibilities and consistency with land use plans, policies, and regulations would be **less than significant**.

Health and Human Services Building

The Health and Human Services building would be constructed within the central portion of the project site and would be consistent with the PCGC Master Plan Update. Land uses that are planned to be adjacent to the Health and Human Services building include additional government offices to the north and south, the existing Auburn Justice Center to the west, and the proposed Community/-Events Center and Community Green to the east. These uses would be compatible with the government office and public services functions of the Health and Human Services building. Additionally, this building would be within less than 750 feet of the intermodal transit station, which would ensure easy access to the building for customers of the Health and Human Services department. Construction and operation of the Health and Human Services building would not alter the land use patterns and project design features described above and would not result in any new or more severe potential conflicts with the County's General Plan, Community Plan, and other regulations. Therefore the Health and Human Services building would result in a **less than significant** impact related to land use compatibility and consistency with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations.

Multifamily Residential Project

The Multifamily Residential project located at 1st Street and B Avenue in the northeastern portion of the project site and would be consistent with the Master Plan Update. Office professional land uses are present to the east and north of this site while the proposed DeWitt Heritage Area would be adjacent to the west, internal to the PCGC campus. As discussed in Chapter 9, Visual Resources, the Multifamily Residential project developer would be required to use site landscaping and grading to ensure that changes in viewsheds do not cause any adverse effects, and to design site lighting to avoid spillover to adjacent properties. As discussed in Chapter 11, Noise, construction and operation of the Multifamily Residential project could expose the office professional uses to excessive noise levels. Mitigation is included in Chapter 11 to ensure that construction noise levels are reduced to the extent feasible. Further, construction and operation of the Multifamily Residential project would not the alter the land use patterns and project design features described above and would not result in any new or more severe potential conflicts with the County's General Plan, Community Plan, and other regulations. Therefore the Multifamily Residential project would result in a **less than significant** impact related to land use compatibility and consistency with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations.

Auburn Bowman Community Plan

The Auburn/Bowman Community Plan (County of Placer 1999) identifies housing stock within the planning area in 1990 as including 4,793 single-family units, 1,672 multifamily units, and 1,062 mobile home units. The Community Plan also identifies a goal of increasing the percentage of multifamily units and decreasing the percentage of mobile home units within the planning area. To accommodate this change in demographics and projected population growth, the Community Plan identified a target of adding between 983 and 1,539 multifamily units by 2010.

Affordable Housing

Housing is considered affordable when occupants pay no more than 30% of their incomes on the rent or mortgage payment. Affordable rental housing programs are typically targeted toward lower income households (those earning less than 80% of the area's median income), while affordable owner occupied housing is targeted toward low- or moderate-income households (those earning less than 120% of area median income). Based on federal guidelines for 2012, a Placer County family of three earning $54,850 or less would be defined as low income. Monthly housing expenses of $1,371 or less would be considered affordable for that household (County of Placer 2013b).

State law requires each community in California to address its "fair share" of the region's housing needs through its Housing Element. The County's Housing Element is required to be updated every 5 years and provides the County's plan for providing affordable housing, including the County's "fair-share" of affordable housing units. The County's current Housing Element was adopted in 2013.

The Sacramento Area Council of Governments determined there would be a need for 5,031 new housing units within unincorporated Placer County, minus the Tahoe region, for the 2013 to 2021 planning period. This is equal to approximately 575 housing units per year. The Sacramento Area Council of Governments broke down the County's RHNA into 3,258 units that would be affordable to moderate-income households and below, including 1,365 very low-income units, 957 low-income units, and 936 moderate-income units (County of Placer 2013b).

As shown in the County's Annual Housing Element Progress Report for 2017 (County of Placer 2018a), the County added 3 dwelling units that would be affordable for low-income households, 30 dwelling units that would be affordable for moderate-income households, and 6 dwelling units that would be affordable for above-moderate income households in 2017. As of 2017, construction of 3,366 new housing units would be needed to attain the County's RHNA—this would include 1,329 very-low-income households, 872 low-income households, 864 moderate-income households, and 301 above-moderate income households, in order to meet its 2021 goal. In order

to meet the RHNA, the County would need to create approximately 1,122 new housing units per year (County of Placer 2017).

The median household income in Placer County in 2009 was $74,447, while the median home value was $427,600 and the median residential rental rate was $1,044 (not including utilities) (County of Placer 2013a). In 2016, the median household income in Placer County had risen slightly to $76,926 (US Census Bureau 2018). In August 2017, the Board approved the 2017–2018 Annual Housing Program Work Plan. The plan includes four main focus areas: creating more incentives to build affordable and workforce housing, changing regulations to make building easier, advocating for state and federal assistance and furthering partnerships for meeting regional housing needs. In a presentation to the County Board of Supervisors regarding this plan, the Placer County Deputy County Executive Officer for the Lake Tahoe area (and leader of the county's housing unit), Jennifer Merchant noted that the median income in the county is not enough to afford a median-priced home, and that rents are increasingly unaffordable, too (County of Placer 2017). This statement helps to characterize the difference between affordable housing, which is intended to be affordable for households earning less than 80% of the area's median income, and workforce housing, which is intended to be affordable for households that may exceed that limit but are still struggling to find housing that is affordable at their income level. As part of implementing the Annual Housing Program Work Plan, the Board approved a contract with BAE Urban Economics to develop a new affordable housing strategy (County of Placer 2018b).

Residential Uses within the Project Site

The PCGC was originally constructed between 1943 and 1945 as a military medical hospital, known as DeWitt General Hospital. Following World War II, ownership of DeWitt Center was transferred to the State of California for use as a mental hospital. The PCGC campus was purchased by the County of Placer in 1972 upon the closure of the on-site mental hospital and has served as a government center since that time.

Currently, the PCGC campus contains approximately 196,000 square feet of land uses associated with residential and residential/institutional uses. This total includes the Gathering Inn and Yolo Community Care and Continuum residential facilities, women's shelter, emergency shelter, Juvenile Detention Center, and Main Jail. Other than the institutional uses, there is no housing currently located within the project site. The emergency shelter for homeless individuals is operated by a private non-profit organization subject to a use permit and in space that is leased from the County under an annual contract.

Employment/Housing Balance

The Auburn/Bowman Community Plan (County of Placer 1999) identified that the Community Plan area has more housing than employment, with a jobs/housing ratio in 1999 of 0.93:1. In

are escaping the high-cost urban centers and looking for greater outdoor opportunities." In addition, EPS found that "the medical industry in North Auburn has many young professionals that may be interested in a housing product near Auburn Faith Hospital that would allow them to walk to work on many days. The North Auburn area has many low paying retail and service sector employees." Based on these demographics, EPS recommends that that the residential components within the master plan include options for a variety of income levels and target a mix of age classes because "this approach would help maximize the market segments captured by the project. Offering a mix of market-rate and below market-rate residential units meets the housing needs of both professional and low-income residents. A representative of Auburn Faith Hospital indicated that a lack of new rental and affordable for-sale housing supply places the hospital at a competitive disadvantage when recruiting medical professionals against other locations" that have a larger housing stock (County of Placer 2016b).

It is anticipated that the number of County employees will increase over time to meet the County services needs of an increasing population. The proposed PCGC Master Plan Update would accommodate this growth at the PCGC campus by increasing the amount of government office space within the project site. As described in the proposed PCGC Master Plan Update, the conceptual land use plan is based on the facility needs assessment conducted as part of the proposed PCGC Master Plan Update (County of Placer 2018c Appendix A), which documents the existing and projected employment levels for each County division and department. The employment projections indicate that the PCGC campus could reach 2,102 County employees at full build-out (2037), which is an increase of 410 employees compared to current staffing levels. The conceptual land use plan accommodates these new employees by proposing to increase the amount of government office space within the PCGC campus by 183,200 square feet to provide a total of 675,200 square feet of government office space. The increase in government office space is necessary to meet demands for service that rise commensurate with increases in the residential and employment population of the County. Thus, construction of the County government office space anticipated under the PCGC Master Plan Update would not directly lead to any increases in demand for housing, including affordable housing. Additionally, the project site currently supports government office space and is zoned for commercial development. Thus construction of government office space within the project site would not reduce the amount of land available for construction of affordable housing or create a new residential population that may object to construction of affordable housing.

At build-out of the PCGC Master Plan Update, the PCGC campus would also support a 30,000-square-foot Community/~~e~~Events ~~C~~Center, 85,100 square feet of retail space, 54,525 square feet of private office space, a 101-room hotel, and 485 dwelling units within 468,800 square feet. These uses could support a range of jobs. Assuming one job for every 300 square feet of retail space, approximately 284 new retail jobs could be accommodated. A large portion of these employees would be expected to be within the very-low to moderate income levels and thus could increase

Impact 6-4	Impair the County's ability to meet RHNA targets or increase demand for affordable housing in the cumulative scenario		
	PCGC Master Plan Update	*HHS Building*	*Multifamily Residential*
Level of Significance:	Less than significant	No impact	~~Less than significant~~No impact
Mitigation Measures:	None	None	None
Significance After Mitigation:	Less than significant	No impact	~~Less than significant~~No impact

PCGC Master Plan Update

The geographic range for assessing cumulative impacts associated with population and housing is the Auburn/Bowman Community Planning Area. The Auburn/Bowman Community Plan and Placer County General Plan provide overarching guidance for development within the Auburn/Bowman Community Planning Area. As discussed previously, the reasonably foreseeable projects included in the cumulative scenario include construction of over 850 units of senior housing, 113 single-family detached dwelling units, and over 400,000 square feet of commercial and industrial space. The senior housing project could provide some units that are affordable to households earning less than the County median income, which would help the County attain its RHNA targets. The commercial and industrial projects included in the cumulative scenario would generate some additional employment opportunities, but most of the associated jobs would likely be at wage levels that are near or below the County's median income. The employment opportunities within the PCGC Master Plan Update would be at a wide range of wage levels, with some employees that could be within the very-low to moderate income levels and thus could increase demand for affordable housing and others that would be within the median to upper income levels. The increase in low-wage jobs in the cumulative scenario would increase the demand for affordable housing in the Auburn/Bowman community. This would be a significant cumulative impact. The proposed PCGC Master Plan Update anticipates construction of up to 485 residential units, some of which would be affordable to households earning less than the median income level in the County and therefore would contribute to the County's attainment of its RHNA targets. Some of this increased need could be met on site, while some would be met with the County's continued implementation of its Housing Element and Affordable Housing Work Plan. Table A-2 of the Placer County Housing Element Background Report reports on the vacant lands within Placer County that have land use and zoning designations that would allow for multifamily residential development. It identifies a maximum potential of five units for moderate-income households within one of the parcels that comprise the PCGC property. Four other parcels within the PCGC property are included in the Placer County Housing Element vacant lands inventory as having the potential to support affordable housing development but the Housing Element does not assume any units would be constructed on those parcels~~The Housing Element does not assume~~

~~that any of the affordable housing demand would be met within the PCGC campus~~. Thus, while the project could contribute to the significant cumulative impact associated with demand for affordable housing, the project's contribution to the impact would be less than cumulatively considerable because a portion of the increased demand for affordable housing would be met on site, and because the project would not develop land that has been assumed to be available for affordable housing development, thus it would not impair the County's ability to implement the Housing Element and meet its RHNA targets.

Health and Human Services Building

The Health and Human Services building would not include any residential uses and would not contribute to any population growth. The employment growth accommodated by the proposed Health and Human Services building would be necessary to meet increasing demands for service over time. The proposed location of the Health and Human Services building is not designated for residential uses and is not identified as a potential location for affordable housing under the County's Housing Element. Construction of the Health and Human Services building would have no contribution to cumulative impacts associated with increasing demand for affordable housing or impairing the County's ability to meet its RHNA targets. Thus, this project component would have no impact with respect to contributing to this significant cumulative impact.

Multifamily Residential

The apartments within the Multifamily Residential development located at 1st Street and B Avenue are proposed to be rental units offered at below-market rates. Thus, this component of the PCGC Master Plan Update would contribute to the County's attainment of the RHNA targets defined for the County by providing up to 100 dwelling units that could be affordable to the County's low- and very low-income residents. One other project in the cumulative scenario would construct senior housing, some of which may be affordable to households earning less than the County's median income. While the demand for affordable housing remains a significant cumulative impact, the Multifamily Residential project would not contribute to those increased demands, and in fact would help meet a portion of the demand. Thus the Multifamily Residential project would have no impact with respect to increased demand for affordable housing or impairing the County's ability to achieve its RHNA targets.

Impact Analysis

Impact 7-1	Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on special status species?		
	PCGC Master Plan Update	*Health and Human Services Building*	*Multifamily Residential*
Level of Significance:	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant
Mitigation Measures:	Mitigation Measures 7a, 7b, 7c, and 7d	Mitigation Measures 7a, ~~7b~~7c, and 7d	Mitigation Measures 7a and 7b~~c~~
Significance after Mitigation:	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant

PCGC Master Plan Update

The Biological Resources Assessment (Appendix C) prepared for the project determined that five special-status wildlife species have some potential to occur on the project site: loggerhead shrike, Townsend's big-eared bat, California black rail, vernal pool fairy shrimp, and vernal pool tadpole shrimp. In addition, migratory birds and raptors are considered special-status species, and several individual species of such birds could occur on site. Activities associated with implementation of the PCGC Master Plan Update that could adversely affect these species include building demolition, vegetation removal, grading, and construction within currently undeveloped areas.

Loggerhead shrike

Loggerhead shrike relies on open habitats for foraging, with elevated perches and shrubs or trees for nesting. Therefore, development of an area with trees or woodlands, especially next to open habitat, would negatively impact loggerhead shrike. Therefore, development that could alter or remove the oak woodland habitat on site would negatively impact potential loggerhead shrike habitat. The PCGC Master Plan Update would retain approximately 14 acres of the 25.05 acres of blue oak woodland on site within the open space zoned area in the western portion of the PCGC property. The blue oak woodland areas in the northeast and southeast corners of the site would be removed, as well as up to four acres of blue oak woodland in the southwest corner of the site.

Direct impacts to loggerhead shrike, such as disturbance to nesting birds or take of individual birds, would be considered a significant impact. Mitigation Measure 7a requires that all construction workers who would be involved in vegetation removal, site clearing, and earthmoving activities participate in a worker environmental awareness program training conducted by a qualified biologist or an environmentally trained construction manager. The training must instruct workers on the nature and purpose of protective measures, including best management practices and other required mitigation measures. This would help reduce and avoid potential direct and indirect impacts to sensitive biological resources throughout construction.

Plan Update would have a **less-than-significant** impact to vernal pool fairy shrimp and vernal pool tadpole shrimp because the project would comply with the requirements of the FESA and CESA.

Raptors and Native Nesting Birds

The annual grassland habitat and woodland habitat within the project site could provide nesting and foraging habitat for avian species that are protected under the California Fish and Game Code. The annual grassland within the site provides foraging habitat for raptors and other avian species; however, dominant vegetation species include non-native weeds such as yellow star thistle, ripgut brome, and soft brume (Appendix C). The dense cover and tall stature of this habitat reduce prey availability for raptors. Raptors that are not threatened or endangered are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and as birds of prey. Loss of foraging habitat is not considered a significant impact.

Disturbance to active nests or individual raptors would be a significant impact. As stated previously, the PCGC Master Plan Update would retain approximately 14 acres of the 25.05 acres of blue oak woodland on site within the open space zoned area in the western portion of the PCGC property. The blue oak woodland areas in the northeast and southeast corners of the site would be removed, as well as up to four acres of blue oak woodland in the southwest corner of the site. In addition, construction of either of the two offsite improvements that may be required of the project could result in disturbance to individual raptors and to active nests of white tailed kite or migratory bird species.

To avoid impacts to raptors, white tailed kite and native nesting birds, Mitigation Measure 7a requires all construction workers who would be involved in vegetation removal, site clearing, and earthmoving activities to participate in a worker environmental awareness program training, as described previously, and Mitigation Measure 7b requires that a pre-construction nesting bird survey be completed and stipulates measures that must be taken to protect any active nests. With implementation of Mitigation Measures 7a and 7b, build-out of the PCGC Master Plan Update would have a **less-than-significant** impact on raptors.

Health and Human Services Building

Development of the Health and Human Services building and associated parking lot would require removal of three existing buildings (Buildings 107, 108, and 109) and approximately 6.61 acres of annual grassland, including 0.22 acre of seasonal wetland. Although removal of the annual grassland would not impact any special-status species, building demolition might have a significant adverse impact on Townsend's big-eared bat if any active roosting colonies are disturbed during demolition. Additionally, creation of the parking lot may impact vernal pool fairy

shrimp and/or vernal pool tadpole shrimp if these species are present in the seasonal wetlands on the project site. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 7a, 7c, and 7d would reduce these impacts to **less than significant** by ensuring that the project complies with the requirements of the FESA and CESA by requiring environmental awareness training for all construction workers; a survey of buildings prior to demolition; postponement of any actions that would disturb an identified roost until the maternity colonies have dispersed, usually between late August and the end of September; and a survey for vernal pool fairy shrimp and vernal pool tadpole shrimp.

Multifamily Residential Project

Construction of the multifamily residential project would require development of a blue oak woodland area (1.9 acres), a seasonal wetland (0.02 acre) with associated ephemeral drainages (227.67 linear feet), and a detention basin. The vegetation community associated with the detention basin is annual grassland. Although removal of the annual grassland would not impact any special-status species, removal of the blue oak woodland might have a significant adverse impact on loggerhead shrike. Mitigation Measure 7a requires environmental awareness training for all construction workers who would be involved in vegetation removal, site clearing, and earthmoving activities, and Mitigation Measure 7~~c~~b requires a pre-construction survey of the habitat and subsequent avoidance of any raptor or native bird nests, including loggerhead shrike nests. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 7a and 7b~~c~~ would reduce this impact to **less than significant** by ensuring that the project complies with the requirements of the FESA and CESA.

Impact 7-2	**Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community?**		
	PCGC Master Plan Update	*Health and Human Services Building*	*Multifamily Residential Project*
Level of Significance:	Potentially Significant	No Impact	Potentially Significant
Mitigation Measures:	Mitigation Measure 7f	None required	Mitigation Measure 7f
Significance after Mitigation:	Less than Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant

PCGC Master Plan Update

The project site includes two CDFW sensitive natural communities: wetlands and riparian habitat. Additionally, oak woodlands are protected under the Placer County Tree Preservation Ordinance and the Placer County General Plan. All impacts associated with wetlands are discussed in Impact 7-3 while impacts associated with loss of oak trees and oak woodland are evaluated in Impact 7-5.

The PCGC Master Plan Update proposes construction of the Multifamily Residential project in the northeast corner of the PCGC property that would result in the loss of 1.9 acres of blue oak

would have **no impact** related to sensitive natural communities. Impacts associated with the loss of blue oak woodland are evaluated under Impact 7-5.

As shown in Figure 7-2, the Multifamily Residential project site supports limited riparian habitat associated with ephemeral drainage (ED) 01. The intermittent riparian zone associated with this drainage supports Gooding's willow (*Salix gooddingii*), Oregon ash (*Fraxinus latifolia*), and blue oak. This portion of the site would be subject to grading and paving, and, thus, the riparian vegetation in this area would be removed and the Multifamily Residential project would have a **potentially significant** impact related to the loss of sensitive natural communities. Mitigation Measure 7f requires the project applicant to comply with CDFW's Lake and Streambed Alteration Program and either 1) confirm that the proposed activities do not result in substantial effects related to the obstruction, diversion, or introduction of debris into any stream, or 2) provide compensatory mitigation to ensure no significant effects result from stream diversion or modification. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 7f, construction of the Multifamily Residential project would have **less-than-significant** impacts to riparian habitat. Impacts associated with the loss of wetlands within this site are evaluated under Impact 7-3.

Impact 7-3	**Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands?**		
	PCGC Master Plan Update	*Health and Human Services Building*	*Multifamily Residential Project*
Level of Significance:	Significant	Significant	Significant
Mitigation Measures:	Mitigation Measures 7a, ~~7f,~~ 7g, and 7h	Mitigation Measure~~s 7a,~~ 7g~~, and 7h~~	Mitigation Measures 7a, 7g, and 7h
Significance after Mitigation:	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant

PCGC Master Plan Update

According to the preliminary Jurisdictional Delineation for the project site (Appendix C), potentially jurisdictional features within the project site consist of two ephemeral drainages, several seasonal wetlands, three detention basins, one freshwater pond, and two freshwater emergent wetlands, for a total of 6.70 acres of wetlands and 231 linear feet of other waters of the United States. Table 7-2 identifies the type and size of each feature, and Figure 7-2 presents the wetland delineation map. These features could be adversely affected by the vegetation removal, grading, and construction within these areas anticipated under the PCGC Master Plan Update.

Neither of the two offsite improvements that may be required of the project are expected to result in adverse effects to wetlands or waters of the U.S.

a Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the Central Valley RWQCB, as required under Mitigation Measure 7g~~f~~. If the canal is determined jurisdictional, no permits would be needed for maintenance or construction activities due to exemptions described in Section 404(f)(1)(C) of the Clean Water Act.

Implementation of the PCGC Master Plan Update would result in significant direct impacts to wetlands and potentially significant indirect impacts to wetlands when construction occurs in proximity to these features. As described in Chapter 3, Project Description, the Nevada Irrigation District requires that the Ophir Canal be encased as part of construction of any land uses adjacent to it. This ensures that indirect impacts to water quality within the canal associated with runoff and siltation are avoided. In addition, indirect impacts would be avoided through implementation of Mitigation Measure 7a, which requires worker environmental awareness training to help persons working within the site identify sensitive habitats and to understand the use of Best Management Practices to avoid wetland impacts, including water quality degradation. Mitigation Measure 7g~~f~~ requires the appropriate permits be obtained before impacting any jurisdictional feature that is not exempt from mitigation under the Clean Water Act. Mitigation Measure 7g also requires the County or individual project applicant to carry out on-site replacement or off-site banking at a minimum replacement ratio of 1:1 for wetland habitat to compensate for direct impacts to wetlands that are no exempt from mitigation under the Clean Water Act. Further, Mitigation Measure 7h would require use of best management practices to protect wetlands within the PCGC campus from any unanticipated indirect impacts.

With implementation of Mitigation Measures 7a, ~~7f,~~ 7g, and 7h, impacts to federally protected wetlands associated with build-out of the PCGC Master Plan Update would be reduced to a **less-than-significant** level by ensuring that impacts are reduced to the extent feasible, indirect impacts are avoided, and compensation is provided for those impacts that cannot be avoided.

Health and Human Services Building

Development of the Health and Human Services building and associated parking lot would require the removal of an existing building, a turf area, and removal of 0.22 acre of wetlands in the southwestern portion of the project site. To authorize the project to impact wetlands and waters of the United States, the County must obtain a Clean Water Act Section 404 permit from USACE, and a Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the Central Valley RWQCB. The project's direct impacts to wetlands would be significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 7g would provide compensation for the direct impacts to wetlands by requiring the project applicant to carry out on-site replacement or off-site banking at a minimum replacement ratio of 1:1 for wetland habitat. This would reduce impacts from construction of the Health and Human Services building to federally protected wetlands to **less than significant**. Since there are no other

wetlands in proximity to the Health and Human Services building site, this project has no potential to cause indirect impacts to wetlands.

Multifamily Residential Project

Construction of the Multifamily Residential project located at 1st Street and B Avenue would impact 0.02 acre of seasonal wetlands and ~~,~~ 227.67 linear feet of ephemeral drainage~~, and 0.07 acre of DB 01~~. Construction of the multifamily residential project would result in the removal of the seasonal wetland and both ephemeral drainages within the site. ~~, and would require t~~Trenching to extend stormwater drainage lines to outfall within the detention basin but outside of the delineated wetland within the basin would not result in any direct impacts to the wetland in DB01 ~~to install storm drainage infrastructure~~. If the canal is determined to be jurisdictional feature, this project would result in the loss of an additional 1,823 linear feet of waters of the U.S. To authorize the project to impact wetlands and waters of the United States, the project applicant must obtain a Clean Water Act Section 404 permit from USACE, and a Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the Central Valley RWQCB. The project's direct impacts to wetlands would be significant, and the project would have potentially significant indirect impacts to the detention basin and the riparian vegetation near this basin's outlet. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 7g would provide compensation for direct impacts to wetlands that are not exempt from mitigation requirements under the Clean Water Act by requiring the project applicant to carry out on-site replacement or off-site banking at a minimum replacement ratio of 1:1 for wetland habitat. Additionally, implementation of Mitigation Measure 7a, which requires worker environmental awareness training, and Mitigation Measure 7h, which requires use of best management practices for construction proximate to wetlands, would reduce the potential for indirect impacts to wetlands. With implementation of Mitigation Measures 7a, 7g, and 7h, the Multifamily Residential project's impacts to federally protected wetlands would be reduced to **less than significant**.

Impact 7-4	**Would the project interfere substantially with wildlife movement, migration, or nursery sites?**		
	PCGC Master Plan Update	*Health and Human Services Building*	*Multifamily Residential Project*
Level of Significance:	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact
Mitigation Measures:	None required	None required	None required
Significance after Mitigation:	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact

PCGC Master Plan Update

In addition to retention of approximately 650,000 square feet of existing building space, the project would involve construction of approximately 410,000 square feet of new County facilities, 30,000

Several of the projects identified in Table 5-1 would result in the development of currently vacant land, which would result in the loss of oak woodlands, grassland, and wetland resources.

PCGC Master Plan Update

The PCGC Master Plan Update would involve retention of approximately 650,000 square feet of existing building space, and construction of approximately 410,000 square feet of new County facilities, 30,000 square feet of community use, and approximately 510,000 square feet of commercial, office, and residential elements. As described previously, construction and operation of the PCGC Master Plan Update would result in the loss of habitat that provides foraging and nesting value to special-status species, sensitive natural communities, wetlands, and oak woodlands.

As development continues in the region under the County's General Plan and the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan, additional loss of biological resources would continue to occur. Pending and future projects within this area would be required to comply with applicable laws, regulations, and policies with regard to biological resources. Compliance with FESA and CESA would ensure that take of endangered species is avoided, or compensation is provided with each individual project; thus, cumulative impacts to endangered species would be less than significant. Compliance with the Clean Water Act and the County's no net loss policy would ensure that individual projects provide compensation for any loss of wetlands that may result from development. With each project compensating for this loss through off-site preservation and creation of wetlands, cumulative impacts to federally protected wetlands would also be less than significant. Ongoing development in the region could result in a loss of oak woodland habitat. However, under the County's Oak Woodland Management Plan (County of Placer 2018e), all projects that impact oak woodlands must provide for off-site conservation and restoration of oak woodlands. Implementation of the off-site conservation requirements would ensure that cumulative impacts to oak woodlands would be less than significant. Thus, there would be no significant cumulative impacts to endangered species, federally protected wetlands, or oak woodlands to which the PCGC Master Plan Update, including the Health and Human Services building and the Multifamily Residential project, could contribute. In addition, all projects undertaken within the PCGC Master Plan Update would be required to provide compensation for direct impacts to sensitive habitats, including wetlands, and special status species as required under Mitigation Measures 7a through 7h.

7.5 MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure 7a All construction workers involved in vegetation removal, site clearing, and earthmoving activities shall receive worker environmental awareness program training conducted by a qualified biologist. Worker environmental

August and the end of September. Project activities shall be confined to daylight hours to prevent impacts to foraging bats.

Mitigation Measure 7d Prior to issuance of a grading permit or approval of Improvement Plans for any activities within seasonal wetlands 02, 03, 04, or 05, a protocol-level vernal pool branchiopod survey shall be performed by a qualified biologist (i.e., a biologist with several years' experience performing vernal pool surveys, capable of identifying signs of vernal pool fairy shrimp and/or vernal pool tadpole shrimp activity) to determine if vernal pool fairy shrimp and/or vernal pool tadpole shrimp are present on the project site. Alternatively, presence can be assumed. Where vernal pool fairy shrimp and/or vernal pool tadpole shrimp presence is identified or assumed, compensation for the loss of habitat for these species shall be provided at a ratio of 3 acres for every 1 acre affected (3:1). This ratio shall include creation of 1 acre of vernal pool habitat for every 1 acre impacts (1:1), and preservation of 2 acres of vernal pools for every 1 acre impacted (2:1), as described in the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) programmatic biological opinion issued to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for small impacts to listed branchiopods (USFWS 1996). Mitigation for impacts to listed branchiopods shall be implemented according to one of the following three options, to be determined and completed prior to impact: participation in a USFWS approved mitigation bank, off-site mitigation at a non-bank location approved by USFWS and subject to preservation in perpetuity such as through a conservation easement, or contribution to the USFWS Species Fund. In the event that protocol-level surveys demonstrate the absence of listed vernal pool branchiopods, mitigation shall not be required.

Mitigation Measure 7e Prior to issuance of any grading permits or approval of Improvement Plans and removal of vegetation from any blue oak woodland vegetation communities, the County of Placer (County) or individual project applicant shall identify any on-site woodland restoration on the project's Improvement Plans and/or undertake ~~on-site or~~ off-site oak woodland restoration or creation, and/or contribute to the County's oak woodland conservation fund, and/or obtain a conservation easement over an off-site property that includes blue oak woodland. In combination, the total amount of blue oak woodland restored, created, and/or protected under a conservation easement shall be twice the size of the amount of blue oak woodland lost to development within the PCGC campus. Any on-site or off-site oak woodland restoration or creation must occur subject to a planting and irrigation plan that is approved by Placer County prior to implementation. Any onsite tree planting must be documented on the Improvement Plans for each individual development project. When compensation for loss of oak woodland would include off-site restoration~~Tree planting~~, obtaining a conservation easement,

and/or payment into the County's oak woodland conservation fund, these shall occur prior to approval of Improvement Plans for each individual development project.

Mitigation Measure 7f Prior to issuance of any grading permits or approval of improvement plans for activities that would remove riparian habitat, the County of Placer (County) or project applicant shall comply with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Lake and Streambed Alteration Program (California Fish and Game Code Sections 1600–1616), including notification, submission of all required plans and documents, and payment of required fees to CDFW. The applicant shall either confirm that the proposed activities would not result in substantial effects related to the obstruction, diversion, or introduction of debris into any stream, or shall provide compensatory mitigation to ensure that no significant effects result from stream diversion or modification. Compensatory mitigation shall be provided through creation of like habitat either on site or at a CDFW-approved off-site location.

Mitigation Measure 7g A Clean Water Act Section 404 permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification shall be acquired prior to issuance of a grading permit or approval of improvement plans for any proposed activities that will result in fill or discharges within jurisdictional wetlands.

To compensate for the loss of jurisdictional wetlands or waters of the U.S. that are not exempt from mitigation under the Clean Water Act, the County of Placer (County) or individual project applicant shall (1) restore and/or create wetlands on site; (2) create wetlands at an off-site location acceptable to the resource agencies; (3) purchase compensatory mitigation credits at an agency-approved mitigation bank; or (4) a combination of 1, 2, or 3. The County or individual project applicant shall develop the mitigation approach in conjunction with the resource agencies during the permitting process. The mitigation requirements shall be in compliance with federal and state Clean Water Act laws, and the Placer County General Plan "no net loss" of wetlands policy (Policy 6.B.1). The final mitigation ratios, design, and implementation shall comply with the terms and conditions of the Section 404 permit issued by the Sacramento District U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Section 401 Water Quality Certification and Waste Discharge Requirements issued by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Mitigation Measure 7h Installation of silt fencing shall be required for any construction activity that occurs within 100 feet of a seasonal wetland or detention basin, other than where direct impacts have been authorized through permits obtained from the

part due to its eligibility under Criterion A, with a period of significance from 1944 to 1945, which are the two years the complex functioned as an Army hospital.

The 2015 NRHP Registration Form, as completed by the applicant for historic designation, describes that the DeWitt General Hospital retains much of its historic integrity, including the materials (about ~~half~~ 60% of the unreinforced brick buildings within the historic district boundaries have been retained, and some original wood windows and doorframes remain), the simple and utilitarian workmanship borne out of the speed and economy at which the unreinforced brick and wood campus was constructed, and the historic military and institutional feel, noting that the "majority of building façades remain largely intact, contributing to their feeling and appearance as World War II military hospital structures" (NPS 2015). The 2015 NRHP Registration Form also states that "approximately half of the patient wards, all of the enlisted men's barracks (later converted to wards), and nearly all service and utility type buildings remain, as do the theater, chapel, gymnasium, and swimming pool. Buildings no longer in existence include the administration building, six officer's quarters, four medical buildings, and seventeen patient wards" (NPS 2015).

The 2015 NRHP Registration Form identifies the following contributing and non-contributing buildings within the DeWitt General Hospital Historic District: 13 patient wards; 11 enlisted men's barracks that were later converted to patient wards; 10 staff and patient services building (such as mess halls, the chapel, post office, and theater); and 15 additional buildings, including warehouses, laundry, and shop buildings (NPS 2015).

Contributing Structures

1. Patient Ward Building 107
2. Patient Ward Building 108
3. Patient Ward Building 109
4. Patient Ward Building 110
5. Patient Ward Building 111
6. Patient Ward Building 112
7. Patient Ward Building 113
8. Patient Ward Building 114
9. Patient Ward Building 115
10. Patient Ward Building 116
11. Patient Ward Building 117

40. Gymnasium, Building 410
41. Swimming Pool
42. Swimming Pool Changing Room, Building 411
43. Swimming Pool Storage, Building 412
44. Auto Shop, Building 413
45. Fire Station, Building 417
46. Mason's Storage, Building 418
47. Engineer's Department and Utility Yard, Building 419
48. Engineer's Department and Utility Yard, Building 420
49. Engineer's Department and Utility Yard, Building 423
50. Powerhouse, Building 430

List of Noncontributing Structures

51. Maintenance Garage
52. Garage
53. Garage
54. Garage
55. Garage

In addition to the significance of the DeWitt General Hospital under Criterion A associated with its use as an Army General Hospital, the property is significant under Criterion A associated with its use as a state mental hospital. Dr. Norman Freeman pioneered vascular surgical techniques while stationed at DeWitt General Hospital and the property is associated with Tarmo Pasto, who was a notable early pioneer in the study of artistic expression and psychology theory. Mr. Pasto's research was important to the establishment of art therapy as a treatment for mental illness. Thus, the DeWitt General Hospital Historic District also has a period of significance from 1946 to 1963, which are the years the complex functioned as a state mental hospital.

National Register of Historic Places Criterion B

Properties may be eligible for the NRHP under Criterion B if they "are associated with the lives of significant persons in our past" (National Register Bulletin 15, p.2.). One of the patients who resided at the DeWitt State Hospital, Martin Ramirez, became an important artist who achieved recognition through local and national art exhibits as early as 1951. His work was first noticed by

Policy IV.E.3.c Encourage the development of multipurpose facilities which can function as recreational sites, open space areas and for historic, cultural, and archeological preservation.

Policy IV.E.3.d Require site-specific studies for archaeological or historical sites within the federal government's definition of "historical context" in all instances where land development has the potential to have a detrimental impact on these sites.

Policy IV.E.3.e Protection of significant cultural resources is a priority over recordation and/or destruction.

Placer County General Plan

The Placer County General Plan also establishes goals and policies regarding the preservation of historical, archaeological, and cultural resources in Section 5, Recreation and Cultural Resources. Those goals and policies pertinent to the proposed project are listed below (County of Placer 2013):

Goal 1.I To establish and maintain interconnected greenbelts and open spaces for the protection of native vegetation and wildlife and for the community's enjoyment.

Policy 1.I.1 The County shall require that significant natural, open space, and cultural resources be identified in advance of development and incorporated into site-specific development project design. The Planned Residential Developments (PDs) and the Commercial Planned Developments (CPD) provisions of the Zoning Ordinance can be used to allow flexibility for this integration with valuable site features.

Policy 1.O.6 Historically or architecturally significant buildings should be preserved and not be substantially changed in exterior appearance in ways that diminish their historical character, unless doing so is necessary to avoid or mitigate hazards, and other means of mitigation are infeasible. Such structures should be preserved and used as focal points of community design.

Policy 1.O.7 The County shall require that mixed-use areas include community focal points to serve as and/or destination points. Examples of focal points include civic centers, parks, fountains, monuments, and street vistas. On-site natural features, such as wetlands and streams, can also function as focal points.

Goal 5.D To identify, protect, and enhance Placer County's important historical, archaeological, paleontological, and cultural sites and their contributing environment.

Policy 5.D.2 The County shall solicit the cooperation of the owners of cultural and paleontological resources, encourage those owners to treat these resources as assets rather than liabilities, and encourage the support of the general public for the preservation and enhancement of these resources.

Policy 5.D.3 The County shall solicit the views of the Native American Heritage Commission and/or the local Native American community in cases where development may result in disturbance to sites containing evidence of Native American activity and/or to sites of cultural importance.

Policy 5.D.6 The County shall require that discretionary development projects identify and protect from damage, destruction, and abuse, important historical, archaeological, paleontological, and cultural sites and their contributing environment. Such assessments shall be incorporated into a countywide cultural resource data base, to be maintained by the Department of Museums.

Policy 5.D.7 The County shall require that discretionary development projects are designed to avoid potential impacts to significant paleontological or cultural resources whenever possible. Unavoidable impacts, whenever possible, shall be reduced to a less than significant level and/or shall be mitigated by extracting maximum recoverable data. Determinations of impacts, significance, and mitigation shall be made by qualified archaeological (in consultation with recognized local Native American groups), historical, or paleontological consultants, depending on the type of resource in question.

Policy 5.D.8 The County shall, within its power, maintain confidentiality regarding the locations of archaeological sites in order to preserve and protect these resources from vandalism and the unauthorized removal of artifacts.

Policy 5.D.9 The County shall use the State Historic Building Code to encourage the preservation of historic structures.

standards until the specific maintenance needs arise. Additionally, some of the Corporation Yard functions may require building modifications that do not meet Secretary of Interior standards, such as modification of existing openings or building features to allow for effective and efficient management of County equipment, materials, and resources. No additional mitigation measures are available to reduce the significant impact that would result from building demolition and future building modifications and this impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. Project alternatives that would reduce and avoid this demolition are discussed in Chapter 20, Alternatives, of this EIR.

Health and Human Services Building

Construction of the Health and Human Services building would require demolition of three buildings (106, 107, and 108) that are identified as contributing features to the DeWitt General Hospital Historic District. As discussed above, this would result in a **significant** impact. The Health and Human Services building would be constructed consistent with the PCGC Master Plan Update, including the design guidelines. The project would maintain the existing grid street pattern and implement building and landscape design measures to create a building that is consistent with the overall campus identity and character.

Photographic recordation of the three existing buildings has already been completed. No additional mitigation measures are available for the Health and Human Services building as proposed to reduce the significant impact that would result from building demolition. As established by CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4, when a historic resource is demolished, documentation (such as through photographic recordation) may not be sufficient to reduce the adverse effects from demolition to a less than significant level. Thus, the most effective way to avoid the impact associated with demolition of the existing buildings within the Health and Human Services building site would be to relocate the proposed Health and Human Services building or to reuse the existing buildings to house the Health and Human Services department. Relocating the proposed Health and Human Services building would require substantial changes to the overall PCGC Master Plan Update conceptual land use plan, and therefore require revisions to the Project Description. This is not considered a reasonable mitigation measure. Adaptive reuse of the existing buildings to house the Health and Human Services department is not a feasible mitigation measure because the existing buildings provide substantially less room than is needed for this department and the buildings are not configured to provide the internal spaces that are critical to the department's functions. Construction of additional buildings next to the existing buildings to provide sufficient space would consume land that is needed for parking for the Health and Human Services department. There is no feasible mitigation measure that would avoid demolition of the existing buildings, thus there is no feasible mitigation measure that would reduce the impact due to demolition and this impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. A project alternative that would avoid this demolition is discussed in Chapter 20 of this EIR.

Buildings and Guidelines on Sustainability for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings. Additionally, the County may rely on the California Historic Building Code for future building modifications.

Mitigation Measure 8b Tribal Cultural Resource Awareness Training: Prior to initiation of construction, all construction crew members, consultants, and other personnel involved in project implementation shall receive project-specific Tribal Cultural Resource (TCR) awareness training. The training shall be conducted in coordination with qualified cultural resource specialists and representatives from culturally-affiliated Native American Tribes. The training will emphasize the requirement for confidentiality and culturally-appropriate, respectful treatment of any find of significance to culturally-affiliated Native Americans Tribes.

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:

- Field indicators of potential archaeological or cultural resources (i.e., what to look for; for example: archaeological artifacts, exotic or non-native rock, unusually large amounts of shell or bone, significant soil color variation, etc.)
- Regulations governing archaeological resources and tribal cultural resources
- Consequences of disregarding or violating laws protecting archaeological or tribal cultural resources
- Steps to take if a worker encounters a possible resource

The training shall include project-specific guidance for on-site personnel including agreed upon protocols for resource avoidance, when to stop work, and who to contact if potential archaeological resources or TCRs are identified. The training shall also direct work to stop, and contact with the County Coroner and the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to occur immediately, in the event that potential human remains are identified. NAHC will assign a Most Likely Descendant if the remains are determined by the Coroner to be Native American in origin.

Mitigation Measure 8c Inadvertent Discoveries: If potential Native American prehistoric, historic, archaeological or cultural resources including midden soil, artifacts,

Impact Analysis

Impact 10-1	Would the project result in intersection operations that conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance or the circulation system?		
	PCGC Master Plan Update	*Health and Human Services Building*	*Multifamily Residential Project*
Level of Significance:	~~Potentially~~ Significant	~~Potentially~~ Significant	~~Potentially~~ Significant
Mitigation Measures:	Mitigation Measure 10a through 10c	Mitigation Measure 10a through 10c	Mitigation Measure 10b
Significance after Mitigation:	Significant and Unavoidable	Significant and Unavoidable	Significant and Unavoidable

PCGC Master Plan Update

The PCGC Master Plan Update proposes the retention of approximately 650,000 square feet of existing building space, as well as construction of approximately 410,000 square feet of new County facilities, 30,000 square feet of community use, and approximately 182,800 square feet of new mixed use, including retail and office space, a hotel with 101 guest rooms, and 485 multifamily dwelling units in 486,800 square feet; the construction of the new land uses would affect the number of daily trips to and from the PCGC property.

The project proposes several changes to the internal roadway and circulation system, including extending County Center Drive. Additionally, the existing B Avenue and C Avenue would be modified to connect Richardson Drive to the newly extended County Center Drive and remove the existing connection to 1st Street. D Avenue would connect Richardson Drive to 1st Street through the center of the PCGC campus. The PCGC Master Plan Update also proposes to realign 1st Street to the east between B Avenue and Bell Road, resulting in a new three-leg intersection at Bell Road approximately 150 feet east of Blue Oaks Drive. Due to the proximity of this new intersection to the Bell Road/Blue Oaks Drive intersection, left turns from 1st Street to Bell Road would be prohibited.

Figure 10-6 shows the distribution of traffic generated by the proposed PCGC Master Plan Update in the AM peak hour and Figure 10-7 shows the distribution of project-generated project in the PM peak hour. The peak hour average delay and LOS at the study intersections that results from the addition of project-generated traffic under existing plus PCGC Master Plan Update conditions is shown in Table 10-5 and on Figure 10-8A and Figure 10-8B.

At the SR 49/Bell Road intersection, the project would increase delay by 0.2 seconds in both the AM and PM peak hours. This increase in delay is considered a less than significant impact. At the SR 49/Luther Road intersection, the LOS would remain at an acceptable level in the PM peak hour. In the AM peak hour, the project would increase delay by 0.4 seconds. This increase in delay is considered a less than significant impact.

The project would result in a **significant** impact at the SR 49/Kemper Road/New Airport Road intersection because it would increase delay during the PM peak hour by 2.1 seconds. The Transportation Impact Study found that this impact could be mitigated through signal optimization, as identified in Mitigation Measure 10b. Providing additional green time to the northbound and southbound through movements, which would improve operations to LOS D. However, as discussed previously, this action is not within the purview of Placer County and would require action by Caltrans as part of regular traffic signal maintenance. It is reasonable to expect that these mitigation measures would be implemented by Caltrans, but because Placer County cannot guarantee that the actions would be implemented, the impact of the Multifamily Residential project is considered to be **significant and unavoidable**.

Impact 10-2	**Would the project result in roadway segment operations that conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance or the circulation system?**		
	PCGC Master Plan Update	*Health and Human Services Building*	*Multifamily Residential Project*
Level of Significance:	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	~~Potentially Significant~~Less than Significant
Mitigation Measures:	Mitigation Measure 10d	Mitigation Measure 10d	~~Mitigation Measure 10d~~None required
Significance after Mitigation:	Significant and Unavoidable	Significant and Unavoidable	~~Significant and Unavoidable~~Less than Significant

PCGC Master Plan Update

The PCGC Master Plan Update proposes the retention of approximately 650,000 square feet of existing building space, as well as construction of approximately 410,000 square feet of new County facilities, 30,000 square feet of community use, and approximately 182,800 square feet of new mixed use, including retail and office space, a hotel with 101 guest rooms, and 485 multifamily dwelling units in 486,800 square feet; the construction of the new land uses would affect the number of daily trips to and from the PCGC campus. Table 10-8 presents the Transportation Impact Study forecasts for the 7 study roadway segments under existing plus PCGC

Multifamily Residential Project

The Multifamily Residential Project located at 1st Street and B Avenue currently proposes development of 79 multifamily dwelling units; however the Traffic Impact Study evaluated impacts associated with development of 100 multifamily dwelling units. This analysis considers the effect that the addition of these dwelling units would have on existing roadway segment operations. Table 10-10 presents the Transportation Impact Study forecasts for the seven study roadway segments under existing plus Multifamily Residential Project conditions, along with the roadway classification and resulting volume-to-capacity ratio and LOS.

Table 10-10
Roadway Segment Operations
Existing Plus Multifamily Residential Project

Segment	Classification[1]	Existing Conditions			Existing + MFR		
		ADT[2]	V/C[3]	LOS	ADT[2]	V/C[3]	LOS
Atwood Road: west of SR 49	2-lane Arterial	9,750	0.54	A	9,800	0.54	A
Bell Road: west of SR 49	4-lane Arterial	15,300	0.42	A	15,700	0.44	A
SR 49: Luther Rd. to New Airport Rd.	6-lane Arterial	42,000	0.78	C	42,300	0.78	C
SR 49: New Airport Rd. to Atwood Rd.	6-lane Arterial	40,000	0.74	C	40,300	0.75	C
SR 49: Atwood Rd. to Willow Creek Dr.	6-lane Arterial	40,500	0.75	C	40,800	0.76	C
SR 49: Willow Creek Dr. to Bell Rd.	6-lane Arterial	37,700	0.70	B	37,800	0.70	B
SR 49: north of Bell Rd.	4-lane Arterial	34,700	**0.96**39	**E**	34,900	~~**0.97**~~0.96 94	**E**

Notes:
1. All study roadway segments are moderate access controlled arterials, based on the definition contained in the *Placer County Countywide General Plan EIR*.
2. ADT = average daily traffic volume; ADT values are rounded to the nearest 100 vehicles.
3. V/C = volume-to-capacity ratio

Bold text indicates unacceptable operations. **Bold and highlighted** text indicates significant impacts.
Source: Appendix E

As shown in Table 10-10, the roadway segments within the County would continue to operate at an acceptable LOS C or better. The SR 49 segments would operate at an acceptable LOS D or better, except for SR 49 between Bell Road and Education Street, which would operate at LOS E. The proposed Multifamily Residential project is expected to add 200 daily vehicles to this segment,

which would increase the volume to capacity ratio by 0.~~01~~0055. This is considered a **less than significant** impact under the Caltrans significance criteria, which defines a significant impact as occurring when the volume to capacity ratio increases by at least 0.01. ~~The Transportation Impact Study states that the addition of a third northbound lane on SR 49 from Bell Road to north of Education Street would improve LOS on this segment and would reduce the impacts to a less than significant level. As discussed previously, this improvement is planned as part of the proposed Auburn Creekside Center and the Auburn/Bowman Benefit District includes funding for widening SR 49 to six lanes from Bell Road to Dry Creek Road. If the Auburn Creekside Center does not proceed, the improvement would not be constructed. Mitigation Measure 10d requires the project applicant for the first project undertaken in implementation of the PCGC Master Plan to either construct the improvement or post a security bond if County staff determine that the Auburn Creekside Center is reasonably expected to construct the improvement. This would reduce the impact to a less than significant level. However, as discussed previously, improvements to SR 49 are not within the County's purview to implement and would require action by Caltrans, which Placer County cannot guarantee. Thus, the proposed Multifamily Residential project is considered to result in a **significant and unavoidable** impact. Additionally, if the Auburn Creekside Center is constructed after the Multifamily Residential project, there may be a temporary period in which the delay on this segment is increased as a result of the traffic generated by this project. This is permissible under Placer County General Plan policy 3.A.7 and Auburn/Bowman Community Plan policy V.C.6, which recognize that as land development occurs temporary violations of the LOS standards may occur until adequate funding has been collected for the construction of program improvements.~~

Impact 10-3	**Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy related to roadway and intersections operations and safety during construction?**		
	PCGC Master Plan Update	*Health and Human Services Building*	*Multifamily Residential Project*
Level of Significance:	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant
Mitigation Measures:	Mitigation Measure 10e	Mitigation Measure 10e	Mitigation Measure 10e
Significance after Mitigation:	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant

PCGC Master Plan Update

Construction of individual projects undertaken in implementation of the PCGC Master Plan Update would occur in four phases based on funding and department needs for the County as well as available funding for the private development. Construction activity would include employee trips and delivery trips for materials and equipment. These construction activities could cause temporary impacts on transportation facilities, including degrading roadway pavement conditions,

Impact 10-8	Would the project result in intersection operations that conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance or the circulation system in a cumulative scenario?		
	PCGC Master Plan Update	*Health and Human Services Building*	*Multifamily Residential Project*
Level of Significance:	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant
Mitigation Measures:	Mitigation Measures 10g through 10p~~n~~	Mitigation Measures 10g, 10i, 10j, 10l, 10n, and 10o	Mitigation Measures 10i, 10n, and 10p
Significance after Mitigation:	Significant and Unavoidable	Significant and Unavoidable	Significant and Unavoidable

No Project Cumulative Conditions

Table 10-11, Figure 10-15a and Figure 10-15b show the average delay and LOS at the study intersections under cumulative no project conditions during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. Most of the study intersections would operate at an acceptable LOS under cumulative no project conditions; the following four intersections are projected to operate at unacceptable LOS:

- SR 49/Bell Road would operate at LOS F in the PM peak hour,
- SR 49/Atwood Road would operate at LOS E in the PM peak hour,
- SR 49/Kemper Road/New Airport Road would operate at LOS E in the PM peak hour,
- Bell Road/Quartz Drive would operate at LOS E in the PM peak hour,
- Bell Road/New Airport Road would operate at LOS E in the PM peak hour, and
- SR 49/Luther Road would operate at LOS F in the PM peak hour.

Table 10-12
Peak Hour Intersection Operations
Cumulative Plus PCGC Master Plan Update

Intersection	Traffic Control[1]	Peak Hour	Cumulative NP		Cumulative + MPU	
			Delay[2]	LOS[3]	Delay[2]	LOS[3]
SR 49/Luther Rd.	Signal	A.M.	**102.0**	**F**	**123.3**	**F**
		P.M.	79.8	E	**98.8**	**F**

Notes:
1. Signal = traffic signal-controlled intersection; AWSC = all-way stop controlled intersection; SSSC = side-street stop controlled intersection
2. Average control delay (rounded to nearest second) for signalized, AWSC, and roundabout intersections is the weighted average for all movements. Average control delay at side-street stop-controlled intersections is calculated as the "overall weighted average delay for movements yielding the right-of-way."
3. LOS = level of service; calculated based on methodologies contained in the *Highway Capacity Manual* (HCM) *6th Edition*.
4. 1st Street is realigned to the east with the proposed PCGC Master Plan Update, resulting in a new intersection approximately 150 feet east of the existing 1st Street/Blue Oaks Drive / Bell Road intersection. Intersection 4 presents the results at the existing Blue Oaks Drive / Bell Road intersection. Intersection 17 presents the results for the new realigned 1st Street / Bell Road intersection.
5. The DeWitt Avenue approaches to this intersection are driveways. Therefore, they are not subject to the County's LOS standards. This intersection would not meet the peak hour signal warrant.
6. 1st Street / Willow Creek Dr. is a four-leg roundabout under Cumulative No Project Conditions with F Ave. serving as the fourth leg; and a three-leg roundabout with the proposed PCGC Master Plan Update.

Bold indicates unacceptable operations. **Bold and highlighted** indicates significant impacts.
All intersections are analyzed in Synchro 10.
Source: Appendix E

As shown in Table 10-12, under cumulative plus the PCGC Master Plan Update conditions, the following significant impacts would occur:

- Richardson Drive/Bell Road – This intersection would operate acceptably in the AM peak hour with or without the project. In the PM peak hour, the project generated traffic would cause the intersection operations to degrade from LOS C to LOS D, with an increase in delay of 7.8 seconds. This **significant** impact could be mitigated by widening the intersection to provide a northbound right-turn pocket. This would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level by restoring operations to LOS C in the PM peak hour. Mitigation Measure 10g requires the ~~County Board of Supervisors to consider adding this improvement to the CIP and require the~~ County and each individual applicant for development under the PCGC Master Plan Update to contribute a fair share of funding to this improvement consistent with the Auburn/Bowman CIP. ~~However, it cannot be~~

~~guaranteed that the Board of Supervisors will amend the CIP, thus t~~This would reduce this impact ~~is considered~~ to **less than significant** ~~**and unavoidable**~~**.**

- County Center Drive/Bell Road – Project-generated traffic would cause the LOS in the PM peak hour to drop from LOS C to LOS F, with an increase in delay of 69.6 seconds. This intersection would also meet the peak hour signal warrant. This is considered a **significant** impact. The impact to County Center Drive/Bell Road could be reduced through the implementation of Mitigation Measure 10h which requires the County to either widen the intersection to provide a separate northbound left-turn lane and right-turn lane and to modify Bell Road to provide a westbound receiving lane in the center two-way, left-turn lane for the northbound left-turn movements, or to prohibit northbound left-turn movements at this intersection.

  The first option would allow northbound right-turning traffic to exit the PCGC property by providing separate right-turn and left-turn lanes. Left-turning traffic would experiences greater delays than right-turning traffic. The westbound receiving lane would also facilitate northbound left-turning traffic by allowing vehicles to conduct a "two-stage gap-acceptance" maneuver. These changes would improve operations to LOS B during the PM peak hour and reduce the impact to a **less-than-significant** level. It would also improve operations to LOS B during the AM peak hour.

  The second option would eliminate the northbound left-turn from this intersection, which would greatly reduce the average delay experienced at the intersection and reduce the impact to a **less-than-significant** level. These trips would re-route to alternative access points where left-turns are possible, such as Richardson Drive at Bell Road, or turn right onto Bell Road and make a U-turn at a downstream intersection. While this would marginally increase the delay at these adjacent intersections, the effect of this re-routing of trips would not cause a significant secondary effect (Appendix E).

- SR 49/Bell Road – this intersection would operate at LOS D in the AM peak hour and LOS F in the PM peak hour in both no project and plus project conditions. Project-generated traffic would cause the PM peak hour delay to increase by 13.3 seconds. This **significant** impact could be mitigated by widening the intersection to provide a third southbound through lane, a third southbound receiving lane and a northbound right-turn lane. This improvement is included in the Auburn/Bowman Benefit District. Mitigation Measure 10i requires the County and all applicants for individual development projects within the PCGC Master Plan Update to pay a fair share contribution to this improvement. This widening would improve operations at this intersection to LOS E in the PM peak hour, which is better than the LOS projected for the cumulative no project conditions. It would also reduce delay to 50 seconds in the AM peak hour. Even though the improvement is

under the jurisdiction of Caltrans, it is reasonable to assume that it will be implemented because it is included in the Auburn/Bowman Benefit District. With implementation of Mitigation measure 10i, the project's contribution to the cumulative impact at SR 49/Bell Road would be less than significant. With the improved LOS, this impact would be reduced to a **less-than-significant** level.

- SR 49/Atwood Road – this intersection would operate at LOS E in the PM peak hour under no-project conditions and LOS F in the PM peak hour under plus project conditions. Project-generated traffic would cause the ~~p.m.~~PM peak hour delay to increase by 32.5 seconds. This **significant** impact could be reduced to a less than significant level with widening of SR 49 and Atwood Road in order to provide a second northbound left-turn lane and a second westbound receiving lane. Caltrans identified the potential need for the second northbound left-turn lane in its comment letter on the Notice of Preparation (NOP). Adding this lane and a second westbound receiving lane would restore operations to LOS E during the PM peak hour and would reduce delay to 35 seconds during the AM peak hour. However, Caltrans acknowledged several constraints for this improvement, including:

    - Widening SR 49 to provide the additional tum lane would be difficult and costly;
    - There are existing safety and operational concerns at the Atwood Road/Drive-In Way intersection, which is very close to the SR 49/Atwood Road intersection. Providing two westbound lane through this intersection might exacerbate the condition; and
    - Atwood Road has only one westbound lane west of Drive-In Way, and widening would be costly and disruptive to existing development.

  Since these improvements are not included any known fee program, there is no assurance that funds necessary for construction will be collected. This combined with the constraints identified by Caltrans would make this improvement infeasible. No other feasible mitigation measures or improvements would mitigate the significant cumulative traffic impact at this intersection. Mitigation Measure 10j requires the County to incorporate Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies within the PCGC Master Plan Update, consistent with the Placer County Trip Reduction ~~Program~~Ordinance. TDM strategies are intended to improve travel options and reduce vehicle travel and can include alternative work schedules and telecommuting, vanpool/shuttle, ride share programs, and bike share programs. Effectiveness of TDM measures at reducing VMT depends on many factors like whether strategies are required or voluntary and the availability and cost of parking. Due to the variability in the effectiveness of TDM measures and the extent of the

delay at this intersection, it is not expected that TDM measures would be sufficient to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Optimization of the signal timing to provide additional green time to the northbound through movement would also alleviate some of the congestion at this intersection. Mitigation Measure 10p requires the County to coordinate with Caltrans regarding this optimization. However, as discussed previously, this would require action by Caltrans, which Placer County cannot guarantee. Thus the impact at this intersection is considered **significant and unavoidable.**

- SR 49/Kemper Road/New Airport Road – the AM peak hour LOS would decrease from an acceptable LOS D to an unacceptable LOS E and delay would increase by 5.2 seconds. The PM peak hour LOS would remain at an unacceptable LOS E and delay would increase by 15.6 seconds. This **significant** impact could be mitigated by widening the intersection to provide a northbound right-turn pocket and an eastbound left-turn lane, which would improve operations to LOS D in both the AM and PM peak hours. However, implementing the eastbound left-turn lane may not be feasible given the tight angle of the intersection, space necessary to accommodate the northbound left-turning vehicles, and the steep grade of Kemper Road as it approaches SR 49. Providing only the northbound right-turn pocket would restore operations in the AM peak hour to LOS D and reduce delay in the PM peak hour, but a significant impact would remain because the project would still result in 6 seconds of additional delay in the PM peak hour. Mitigation Measure 10k requires that the County ~~Board of Supervisors consider adding these improvements to the Auburn/Bowman Benefit District within the County's CIP. However, it is uncertain if the Board of Supervisors would amend the CIP, and it is possible that sufficient funding to construct these improvements may not be collected~~and applicants for private development within the PCGC Master Plan Update to pay a fair share of funding towards this improvement consistent with the Auburn/Bowman CIP. This would reduce the impact to a **less-than-**significant level. ~~Further~~However, construction would require action by Caltrans, which Placer County cannot guarantee~~. Finally,~~ and the full improvement may not be feasible to construct and the partial improvement would not fully mitigate this impact. Additionally, Mitigation Measure 10o requires the County to coordinate with Caltrans regarding signal timing optimization to provide additional green time to the northbound left-turn and southbound through movements. However, as discussed previously, implementing the signal optimization would require action by Caltrans, which Placer County cannot guarantee. Thus the project would have a cumulatively considerable contribution to this impact that would remain **significant and unavoidable.**~~Thus, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable.~~

- Bell Road/Quartz Drive – This intersection would operate at acceptable LOS D in the AM peak hour in both no project and plus project conditions. The project-generated traffic would cause the intersection LOS to decrease in the PM peak hour from LOS E to LOS F,

- Richardson Drive/Bell Road – The Health and Human Services building would increase delay in the PM peak hour by 5.8 seconds. This **significant** impact could be reduced with implementation of Mitigation Measure 10g which requires the ~~County Board of Supervisors to consider amending the CIP to add funding for widening this intersection to provide a northbound right-turn pocket to the Auburn/Bowman Benefit District and require the~~ County and applicants for private development within the PCGC Master Plan Update to pay a fair share of funding towards this improvement consistent with the Auburn/Bowman CIP. This would reduce the impact to a **less-than-**significant level by restoring operations to LOS C in the PM peak hour. ~~However, because it is uncertain that the Board of Supervisors would amend the CIP, this impact is considered **significant and unavoidable.**~~

- SR 49/Bell Road – The project would increase delay in the PM peak hour by 1.7 seconds. This **significant** impact could be reduced by widening the intersection to provide a third southbound through lane, a third southbound receiving lane and a northbound right-turn lane. This improvement is included in the Auburn/Bowman Benefit District. Mitigation Measure 10i requires the County to pay a fair share contribution to this improvement prior to construction of the Health and Human Services building. As discussed previously, this widening would improve operations at this intersection compared to the projected cumulative no project conditions. Even though the improvement is under the jurisdiction of Caltrans, it is reasonable to assume that it will be implemented because it is included in the Auburn/Bowman Benefit District. With implementation of Mitigation M~~m~~easure 10i, the contribution of the Health and Human Services building to the cumulative impact at SR 49/Bell Road would be **less than significant**.

- SR 49/Atwood Road – The project would increase delay by 6 seconds in the PM peak hour. This **significant** impact could be reduced with widening of SR 49 and Atwood Road in order to provide a second northbound left-turn lane and a second westbound receiving lane. However, as discussed previously, Caltrans has identified several constraints that make this widening infeasible. Mitigation Measure 10j requires the County to incorporate TDM strategies within the PCGC Master Plan Update to improve travel options and reduce vehicle travel However, due to the variability in the effectiveness of TDM measures and the extent of the delay at this intersection, it is not expected that TDM measures would be sufficient to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Thus the Health and Human Services building would have a cumulatively considerable contribution to this impact that would remain **significant and unavoidable.**

- SR 49/Kemper Road/New Airport Road – The Health and Human Services building would add 2.9 seconds of delay in the PM peak hour. This **significant** impact could be reduced by optimizing the signal operations to provide additional green time to the northbound left-

Measure 10i requires the Multifamily Residential project applicant to pay a fair share contribution to this improvement prior to construction. As discussed previously, this widening would improve operations at this intersection compared to the projected cumulative no project conditions. Even though the improvement is under the jurisdiction of Caltrans, it is reasonable to assume that it will be implemented because it is included in the Auburn/Bowman Benefit District. With implementation of Mitigation ~~m~~Measure 10i, the contribution of the Multifamily Residential project to the cumulative impact at SR 49/Bell Road would be **less than significant**.

- SR 49/Atwood Road – The project would increase delay by 1.1 seconds in the PM peak hour. This **significant** impact could be reduced with optimization of the signal timing to provide additional green time to the northbound through movement. This modification to the signal timing would restore delay to cumulative no project conditions. Mitigation Measure 10p requires the County to coordinate with Caltrans regarding this optimization. However, as discussed previously, this would require action by Caltrans, which Placer County cannot guarantee. In addition, Mitigation Measure 10j~~k~~ requires Placer County to implement TDM strategies as part of the PCGC Master Plan Update. This would provide some reduction in delay at this location but the impact is expected to remain significant. Thus the Multifamily Residential project would have a cumulatively considerable contribution to this impact that would remain **significant and unavoidable.**

- SR 49/Luther Road – The project would increase delay by 2.1 seconds during the PM peak hour, which would degrade operations to LOS F. This **significant** impact could be reduced with optimization of the signal timing to provide additional green time to the northbound and southbound through, southbound left-turn, and westbound right-turn movements. This would improve operations to LOS C during the AM peak hour and LOS D during the PM peak hour. Mitigation Measure 10n requires the County to coordinate with Caltrans regarding this signal optimization. However, this intersection is not within Placer County's jurisdiction and signal optimization would require action by Caltrans, which the County cannot guarantee. Thus the Multifamily Residential project would have a cumulatively considerable contribution to this impact that would remain **significant and unavoidable.**

Table 10-18
Roadway Segment Operations
Cumulative Plus Multifamily Residential Project

Segment	Classification[1]	Cumulative No Project			Cumulative + MFR		
		ADT[2]	V/C[3]	LOS	ADT[2]	V/C[3]	LOS
Atwood Road: west of SR 49	2-lane Arterial	11,900	0.66	B	12,000	0.67	B
Bell Road: west of SR 49	4-lane Arterial	19,400	0.54	A	19,800	0.55	A
SR 49: Luther Rd. to New Airport Rd.	6-lane Arterial	47,700	0.88	D	48,000	0.89	D
SR 49: New Airport Rd. to Atwood Rd.	6-lane Arterial	45,200	0.84	D	45,500	0.84	D
SR 49: Atwood Rd. to Willow Creek Dr.	6-lane Arterial	45,100	0.84	D	45,400	0.84	D
SR 49: Willow Creek Dr. to Bell Rd.	6-lane Arterial	44,900	0.83	D	45,000	0.83	D
SR 49: north of Bell Rd.	5-lane Arterial	35,000	0.78	C	35,200	0.78	C

Notes:
1. All study roadway segments are moderate access controlled arterials, based on the definition contained in the *Placer County Countywide General Plan EIR*.
2. ADT = average daily traffic volume; ADT values are rounded to the nearest 100 vehicles.
3. V/C = volume-to-capacity ratio

Bold text indicates unacceptable operations.

Source: Appendix E

As shown in Table 10-18, all study roadway segments would continue to operate at an acceptable LOS. Placer County segments would operate at an acceptable C or better and Caltrans segments would operate an acceptable LOS D or better. Therefore, the Multifamily Residential project would have a **less than significant** contribution to the cumulative impact.

10.4 MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure 10a Prior to issuance of a building permit~~s~~ for the Health and Human Services building, Placer County shall work with Caltrans to optimize the signal timings at the SR 49/Bell Road intersection to provide additional green time to the northbound and southbound through, southbound left-turn, and westbound through movements sufficient to improve operations to LOS D during the AM peak hour.

Mitigation Measure 10b Prior to issuance of the first building permits for implementation of the PCGC Master Plan Update, Placer County shall work with Caltrans to optimize the signal timings at the SR 49/Kemper Road/New Airport Road intersection to provide additional green time to the northbound and southbound through movements sufficient to improve operations to LOS D.

Mitigation Measure 10c Prior to issuance of a building permit~~s~~ for the Health and Human Services building, Placer County shall work with Caltrans to optimize the signal

timings at the SR 49/Luther Road intersection to provide additional green time to the northbound and southbound through movements sufficient to improve operations to LOS C during the AM and PM peak hours.

Mitigation Measure 10d Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans for any individual project other than the Multifamily Residential project undertaken in implementation of the PCGC Master Plan Update, Placer County shall either require the project proponent (including the County for a County-sponsored project) to construct a third northbound lane on SR 49 from Bell Road to north of Education Street or to post a security for the improvements if at the time of Improvement Plan approval, the Auburn Creekside Center project is determined to be active and progressing with their frontage improvements. ~~If the County requires a project proponent for development within the PCGC Master Plan Update area to ultimately construct this improvement, the County should consider incorporation of this funding into the traffic mitigation fee program; allowing for fee credits associate with the applicable countywide traffic impact fees, as applicable.~~

Mitigation Measure 10e Prior to the approval of Improvement Plans or issuance of any grading or building permits, whichever comes first, the project applicant for each future construction project undertaken in implementation of the PCGC Master Plan Update shall prepare a Construction Traffic Management Plan (TMP) to the satisfaction of the Placer County Department of Public Works and Facilities and CDRA Engineering and Surveying Division.

The Construction TMP shall include, but not be limited to, items such as:

- approved truck circulation routes/patterns;
- monitoring for roadbed damage and timing for completing repairs;
- preservation of safe and convenient passage for bicyclists and pedestrians through/around construction areas;
- methods for partial (i.e., single lane)/complete street closures (e.g., timing, signage, location and duration restrictions), if necessary;
- identification of detour routes for roadways subject to partial/complete street closures
- criteria for use of flaggers and other traffic controls;

Alternate routes shall be sufficient to accommodate emergency response vehicles. Some potential route options include:

- 1st Street to Professional Drive to Bell Road
- 1st Street to A Avenue to County Center Drive to Bell Road
- Atwood Road to Richardson Drive to Bell Road

These routes provide similar travel times from the Fire Station 180 to Bell Road northwest of the PCGC campus as well as Blue Oaks Drive north of the PCGC campus.

Mitigation Measure 10g Prior to issuance of building permits for any individual project undertaken in implementation of the PCGC Master Plan Update, Placer County and applicants for private development within the PCGC Master Plan Update shall contribute a fair share amount towards ~~Prior to issuance of building permits for any individual project undertaken in implementation of the PCGC Master Plan Update, the County Board of Supervisors shall consider amending the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) to add funding for~~ widening the Richardson Drive/Bell Road intersection to provide a northbound right-turn pocket consistent with the Auburn/Bowman CIP~~to the Auburn/Bowman Benefit District of the Placer County Countywide CIP and require the County and applicants for private development within the PCGC Master Plan Update to pay a fair share of funding towards this improvement at the time that building permits are issued~~.

Mitigation Measure 10h Upon further project level review for any individual projects other than the Health and Human Services building and the Multifamily Residential project, the County shall require a traffic analysis to determine if the need to modify the County Center Drive/Bell Road intersection is warranted with the project. If it is determined to be warranted with development of the project, the County shall require either of the following modifications as a condition of approval:

1. Provide a separate northbound left-turn lane and right-turn lane while modifying Bell Road to include a westbound receiving lane in the center two-way left-turn lane for northbound left-turn movements; or
2. Prohibit northbound left-turn movements from County Center Drive

Mitigation Measure 10i Prior to issuance of building permits for any individual project undertaken in implementation of the PCGC Master Plan Update, Placer County and applicants for private development within the PCGC Master Plan Update shall

contribute a fair share amount towards widening of the SR 49/Bell Road intersection, consistent with the Auburn/Bowman CIP, to accommodate a third southbound through lane, a third southbound receiving lane, and a northbound right-turn lane. This includes extending the existing third southbound lane that begins just south of Bell Road north to Bell Road. ~~Placer County and applicants for private development within the PGCC Master Plan Update shall pay the applicable countywide traffic impact fees at the time that building permits are issued, which will provide funding for this improvement.~~

Mitigation Measure 10j Placer County shall incorporate Transportation Demand Management strategies in the PCGC Master Plan Update, consistent with the Placer County Trip Reduction ~~Program~~Ordinance. These may include alternative work schedules and telecommuting, vanpool/shuttle, ride share programs, and bike share programs.

Mitigation Measure 10k Prior to issuance of building permits for any individual project undertaken in implementation of the PCGC Master Plan Update, ~~the Placer County Board of Supervisors shall consider amending the Capital Improvement Program to add funding to the Auburn/Bowman Benefit District for widening of the SR 49/Kemper Road/New Airport Road intersection to provide a northbound right-turn pocket and an eastbound left-turn lane. If the CIP is amended,~~ the County and developers of individual projects within the PCGC Master Plan Update shall contribute a fair share amount to construction widening of the SR 49/Kemper Road/New Airport Road intersection ~~of these improvements~~ at the time that building permits are issued, consistent with the Auburn/Bowman CIP.

Mitigation Measure 10l Placer County shall implement signal timing optimization at the Bell Road/Quartz Drive intersection to provide additional green time to the eastbound through, westbound through, and southbound movements sufficient to improve operations to LOS D during the PM peak hour.

Mitigation Measure 10m Prior to issuance of building permits for any individual project undertaken in implementation of the PCGC Master Plan Update, Placer County and applicants for private development within the PCGC Master Plan Update shall contribute a fair share amount towards improvements at the Bell Road/New Airport Drive intersection, consistent with the Auburn/Bowman CIP, to reconfigure~~ing~~ the southbound approach lane to the Bell Road/New Airport Drive intersection to provide one left-turn lane and one shared through/right-turn lane and optimize the existing signal operations to efficiently allocate green time among different

movements sufficient to reduce the average control delay to less than cumulative no project conditions.

Mitigation Measure 10n Placer County shall coordinate with Caltrans to optimize the signal timing at the SR 49/Luther Road intersection to provide additional green time to the northbound and southbound through, southbound left-turn, and westbound right-turn movements sufficient to improve operations to LOS C during the AM peak hour and LOS D during the PM peak hour.

Mitigation Measure 10o Placer County shall coordinate with Caltrans to explore options to optimize the signal timings at the SR 49/Kemper Road/New Airport Road intersection to provide additional green time to the northbound left-turn and southbound through movements sufficient to restore delay to cumulative no project conditions.

Mitigation Measure 10p Placer County shall coordinate with Caltrans to explore options to optimize the signal ~~optimize the signal~~ operations at the SR 49/Atwood Road intersection to provide additional green time to the northbound through movement sufficient to restore delay to cumulative no project conditions.

10.5 REFERENCES CITED

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2002. *Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies.* 2002.

Caltrans 2017. Transportation Concept Report, State Route 49. 2017.

County of Placer. 1994. Placer County Countywide General Plan EIR, Transportation and Circulation. 1994

County of Placer. 2015. Department of Public Works Impact Analysis Methodology of Assessment memorandum. 2015

Impact 11~~9~~-4	Would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels associated with the proximity of the site to a public or private airport or airstrip?		
	PCGC Master Plan Update	*Health and Human Services Building*	*Multifamily Residential Project*
Level of Significance:	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant
Mitigation Measures:	None required	None required	None required
Significance after Mitigation:	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant

PCGC Master Plan Update

The project site is located approximately 1.25 miles from the Auburn Municipal Airport, outside the 55 dB CNEL contour, but within the "Airport Influence Area" as designated on Exhibit 7D in the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (Placer County Airport Land Use Commission 2014). There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the project site.

The State of California (California Code of Regulations Title 21) and the FAA (Part 150 Regulation) consider sound levels less than 65 dB CNEL to be compatible with all land uses. Therefore, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project site to excessive noise levels from Auburn Municipal Airport and the impact is considered **less than significant**.

Health and Human Services Building

The proposed Health and Human Services building would be located in Zone D of the Auburn Municipal Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. This site is outside of the 55 dB CNEL contour. The State of California (California Code of Regulations Title 21) and the FAA (Part 150 Regulation) consider sound levels less than 65 dB CNEL to be compatible with all land uses. Therefore, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project site to excessive noise levels from Auburn Municipal Airport and the impact is considered less than significant.

Multifamily Residential Project

The proposed Multifamily Residential project would be located in Zone C2 of the Auburn Municipal Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. This site is outside of the 55 dB CNEL contour. The State of California (California Code of Regulations Title 21) and the FAA (Part 150 Regulation) consider sound levels less than 65 dB CNEL to be compatible with all land uses. Therefore, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project site to excessive noise levels from Auburn Municipal Airport and the impact is considered less than significant.

12 AIR QUALITY

This section describes the project's impacts on air quality and contribution to regional air quality conditions, identifies associated regulatory requirements, evaluates potential impacts, and identifies mitigation measures related to implementation of the proposed Placer County Government Center Master Plan Update Project (PCGC Master Plan Update or proposed project), including the Health and Human Services building and the Multifamily Residential project at 1st Street and B Avenue, as described in Chapter 3, Project Description. The analysis in this chapter is taken from the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) (Version 2016.3.2) modeling prepared for the project, provided in Appendix G.

One comment was received in response to the Notice of Preparation for this EIR that addresses air quality. The Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) provided information related to the details of the project description relevant to the air quality analysis, the thresholds of significance the PCAPCD has adopted, recommended methodology for the air pollutant emissions modeling, and mitigation measure recommendations. The Notice of Preparation and comments received in response to it are provided in Appendix A.

12.1 EXISTING CONDITIONS

Air quality is affected by the rate, amount, and location of pollutant emissions and the associated meteorological conditions that influence pollutant movement and dispersal. Atmospheric conditions (for example, wind speed, wind direction, and air temperature) in combination with local surface topography (for example, geographic features such as mountains and valleys), determine how air pollutant emissions affect local air quality.

The proposed project is located in central Placer County, which lies within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB) and is within the jurisdictional boundaries of the PCAPCD. Air quality in the vicinity is influenced by both local and distant emission sources. Local sources include the emissions from vehicle traffic on nearby roadways, area sources such as landscaping maintenance, and stationary sources such as residential woodstoves and barbeques as well as local industry. Distant emission sources include the vehicle traffic and various industries in the Sacramento metropolitan area and beyond. Carried to the foothills region by the prevailing southwesterly winds found in the valley, pollutants emitted in Sacramento and the San Francisco Bay area affect local ambient pollutant concentrations. Inversion layers occur when a layer of warm air traps a layer of cold air beneath it, preventing vertical dispersion of air contaminants. These layers are created by seasonal temperatures and contribute to seasonal concentrations of airborne contaminants, elevating air pollution levels.

Climate

Mild, wet winters and hot, dry summers characterize the climate of central and western Placer County. Precipitation generally occurs between November and April. Prevailing winds are from

the south and southwest, and local air quality is influenced by the transportation of emissions from upwind mobile and stationary pollution sources in south Placer County, the Sacramento metropolitan area, and the San Francisco Bay area. Additionally, in the late fall and early spring the SVAB frequently experiences calm atmospheric conditions, contributing to the creation of inversion layers, which results in higher concentrations of pollutants near ground level.

Pollutants and Effects

Criteria Air Pollutants

Criteria air pollutants are defined as pollutants for which the federal and state governments have established ambient air quality standards, or criteria, for outdoor concentrations to protect public health. The federal and state standards have been set, with an adequate margin of safety, at levels above which concentrations could be harmful to human health and welfare. Criteria air pollutants include ozone (O_3), nitrogen dioxide (NO_2), carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide (SO_2), particles less than 10 microns in diameter (PM_{10}), particles less than 2.5 microns in diameter ($PM_{2.5}$), and lead. In California, sulfates, vinyl chloride, hydrogen sulfide, and visibility-reducing particles are also regulated as criteria air pollutants. O_3, NO_2, CO, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$, as well as toxic air contaminants (TACs), are discussed in the following paragraphs.[1]

Ozone (O_3), carbon monoxide (CO), and particulate matter (PM_{10}) are pollutants of particular concern in the area. Under the air quality standards mandated by the California Clean Air Act, the SVAB is currently in non-attainment for particulate matter and is designated as serious non-attainment for O_3. This air basin is also in non-attainment for federal O_3 standards under the Federal Clean Air Act. South Placer County is a federal maintenance area for carbon monoxide standards. This region was in non-attainment for federal CO standards until 1998. As shown in the tables included in this discussion, violations of O_3 and particulate matter standards have occurred and continue to occur within the region.

Ozone

O_3 is a strong-smelling, pale blue, reactive, toxic chemical gas consisting of three oxygen atoms. It is a secondary pollutant formed in the atmosphere by a photochemical process involving the sun's energy and O_3 precursors. These precursors are mainly oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) and reactive organic gases (ROG, also termed volatile organic compounds [VOCs]). The maximum effects of precursor emissions on O_3 concentrations usually occur several hours after they are emitted and many miles from the source. Meteorology and terrain play major roles in O_3 formation, and ideal

[1] The descriptions of the criteria air pollutants and associated health effects are based on the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) Criteria Air Pollutants (EPA 2016a) and the California Air Resources Board's (CARB's) Glossary of Air Pollutant Terms (CARB 2016a).

conditions occur during summer and early autumn on days with low wind speeds or stagnant air, warm temperatures, and cloudless skies. O_3 exists in the upper atmosphere O_3 layer (stratospheric ozone) and at the Earth's surface in the troposphere (ozone).[2] The O_3 that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the California Air Resources Board (CARB) regulate as a criteria air pollutant is produced close to the ground level, where people live, exercise, and breathe. Ground-level O_3 is a harmful air pollutant that causes numerous adverse health effects and is thus considered "bad" O_3. Stratospheric, or "good," O_3 occurs naturally in the upper atmosphere, where it reduces the amount of ultraviolet light (i.e., solar radiation) entering the Earth's atmosphere. Without the protection of the beneficial stratospheric O_3 layer, plant and animal life would be seriously harmed.

O_3 in the troposphere causes numerous adverse health effects; short-term exposures (lasting for a few hours) can result in breathing pattern changes, reduction of breathing capacity, increased susceptibility to infections, inflammation of the lung tissue, and some immunological changes (EPA 2013, CARB 2019a). These health problems are particularly acute in sensitive receptors such as the sick, the elderly, and young children.

Nitrogen Dioxide

NO_2[3] is a brownish, highly reactive gas that is present in all urban atmospheres. The major mechanism for the formation of NO_2 in the atmosphere is the oxidation of the primary air pollutant nitric oxide, which is a colorless, odorless gas. NO_x plays a major role, together with ROG, in the atmospheric reactions that produce O_3. NO_x is formed from fuel combustion under high temperature or pressure. In addition, NO_x is an important precursor to acid rain and may affect both terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems. The two major emissions sources are transportation and stationary fuel combustion sources such as electric utility and industrial boilers. NO_2 can irritate the lungs and may potentially lower resistance to respiratory infections (EPA 2016a).

Carbon Monoxide

CO is a colorless, odorless gas formed by the incomplete combustion of hydrocarbon, or fossil fuels. CO is emitted almost exclusively from motor vehicles, power plants, refineries, industrial boilers, ships, aircraft, and trains. In urban areas, automobile exhaust accounts for the majority of CO emissions. CO is a nonreactive air pollutant that dissipates relatively quickly; therefore, ambient CO concentrations generally follow the spatial and temporal distributions of vehicular traffic. CO concentrations are influenced by local meteorological conditions—primarily wind speed,

[2] The troposphere is the layer of the Earth's atmosphere nearest to the surface of the Earth. The troposphere extends outward about 5 miles at the poles and about 10 miles at the equator.

[3] In this section, the term NO_2 will be used with respect to the presence of nitrogen dioxide in the atmosphere. The term NO_x will be used to refer to the *emissions* of oxides of nitrogen from stationary and mobile sources, which are primarily in the form of nitric oxide (NO) and, to a lesser extent, NO_2.

with bronchitis can expect aggravated symptoms from breathing in particulate matter. Children may experience a decline in lung function due to breathing in PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ (EPA 2009).

Non-Criteria Air Pollutants

Toxic Air Contaminants. A substance is considered toxic if it has the potential to cause adverse health effects in humans, including increasing the risk of cancer upon exposure, or acute and/or chronic noncancer health effects. A toxic substance released into the air is considered a TAC. TACs are identified by federal and state agencies based on a review of available scientific evidence. In the State of California, TACs are identified through a two-step process that was established in 1983 under the Toxic Air Contaminant Identification and Control Act. This two-step process of risk identification and risk management and reduction was designed to protect residents from the health effects of toxic substances in the air. In addition, the California Air Toxics "Hot Spots" Information and Assessment Act, Assembly Bill (AB) 2588, was enacted by the Legislature in 1987 to address public concern over the release of TACs into the atmosphere. The law requires facilities emitting toxic substances to provide local air pollution control districts with information that will allow an assessment of the air toxics problem, identification of air toxics emissions sources, location of resulting hotspots, notification of the public exposed to significant risk, and development of effective strategies to reduce potential risks to the public over 5 years.

Examples include certain aromatic and chlorinated hydrocarbons, certain metals, and asbestos. TACs are generated by a number of sources, including stationary sources, such as dry cleaners, gas stations, combustion sources, and laboratories; mobile sources, such as automobiles; and area sources, such as landfills. Adverse health effects associated with exposure to TACs may include carcinogenic (i.e., cancer-causing) and noncarcinogenic effects. Noncarcinogenic effects typically affect one or more target organ systems and may be experienced on either short-term (acute) or long-term (chronic) exposure to a given TAC.

Diesel Particulate Matter. Diesel particulate matter (DPM) is part of a complex mixture that makes up diesel exhaust. Diesel exhaust is composed of two phases, gas and particle, both of which contribute to health risks. More than 90% of DPM is less than 1 micrometer in diameter (about 1/70 the diameter of a human hair) and, thus, is a subset of $PM_{2.5}$ (CARB ~~2016a~~2016c). DPM is typically composed of carbon particles ("soot," also called black carbon) and numerous organic compounds, including over 40 known cancer-causing organic substances. Examples of these chemicals include polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, benzene, formaldehyde, acetaldehyde, acrolein, and 1,3-butadiene (CARB ~~2016a~~2016c). CARB classified "particulate emissions from diesel-fueled engines" (i.e., DPM; 17 CCR 93000) as a TAC in August 1998. DPM is emitted from a broad range of diesel engines: on-road diesel engines of trucks, buses, and cars and off-road diesel engines, including locomotives, marine vessels, and heavy-duty construction equipment, among others. Approximately 70% of all airborne cancer risk in California is associated with DPM

(CARB 2000). To reduce the cancer risk associated with DPM, CARB adopted a diesel risk reduction plan in 2000 (CARB 2000).

Because it is part of $PM_{2.5}$, DPM also contributes to the same noncancer health effects as $PM_{2.5}$ exposure. These effects include premature death; hospitalizations and emergency department visits for exacerbated chronic heart and lung disease, including asthma; increased respiratory symptoms; and decreased lung function in children. Several studies suggest that exposure to DPM may also facilitate development of new allergies (CARB ~~2016a~~2016c). Those most vulnerable to noncancer health effects are children whose lungs are still developing and the elderly who often have chronic health problems.

Odorous Compounds. Odors are generally regarded as an annoyance rather than a health hazard. Manifestations of a person's reaction to odors can range from psychological (e.g., irritation, anger, or anxiety) to physiological (e.g., circulatory and respiratory effects, nausea, vomiting, and headache). The ability to detect odors varies considerably among the population and overall is quite subjective. People may have different reactions to the same odor. An odor that is offensive to one person may be perfectly acceptable to another (e.g., coffee roaster). An unfamiliar odor is more easily detected and is more likely to cause complaints than a familiar one. Known as odor fatigue, a person can become desensitized to almost any odor, and recognition may only occur with an alteration in the intensity. The occurrence and severity of odor impacts depend on the nature, frequency, and intensity of the source; wind speed and direction; and the sensitivity of receptors.

The nearest existing source of odors is the Placer County Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP), which is located on Joeger Road about 1.5 miles north of the proposed project and Recology Auburn Placer disposal facility, which is located on Shale Ridge Road about 1.0 miles north-northeast of the proposed project.

Sensitive Receptors

Some land uses are considered more sensitive to changes in air quality than others, depending on the population groups and the activities involved. People most likely to be affected by air pollution include children, the elderly, athletes, and people with cardiovascular and chronic respiratory diseases. Facilities and structures where these air-pollution-sensitive people live or spend considerable amounts of time are known as sensitive receptors. Land uses where air-pollution-sensitive individuals are most likely to spend time include schools and schoolyards, parks and playgrounds, daycare centers, nursing homes, hospitals, and residential communities (sensitive sites or sensitive land uses) (CARB 2005).

The County contains numerous sensitive receptors within the project area including residences, several schools, medical care facilities, and senior living facilities. In addition, the proposed project would

result in the development of multifamily residences, which would be considered sensitive receptors. Table 12-1 below describes the sensitive receptors nearest to the proposed project.

Table 12-1
Sensitive Receptors located near the Project Area

Type	Name	Distance from Project Site (Miles)	Direction From Project Site
Residential	Ian Lane	0.01	North
	Atwood Road	0.01	South
	Harness Court/Birdie Court	0.01	South
	Cottage Drive	0.01	East
Schools	Saint Joseph Catholic School	0.09	South
	Rock Creek Elementary School	0.15	Northeast
	Auburn Elementary School	0.17	South
Medical	UC Davis Medical Group (Bell Road)	0.02	North
	UC Davis Medical Group (Professional Drive)	0.02	East
	Sutter Medical Group	0.04	East
	Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation	0.06	North
	Auburn Oaks Care Center	0.07	Northwest
	DaVita Auburn Dialysis	0.10	East
Senior Living	Oakwood Village Retirement Community	0.04	North
	Brookdale Auburn	0.07	North
	Solstice Senior Living	0.07	North
	Sierra Ridge Memory Care	0.07	North

Sources: Sensitive receptors identified from Google Earth.

Local Ambient Air Quality

CARB, air districts, and other agencies monitor ambient air quality at approximately 250 air quality monitoring stations across the state. The ~~SMAQMD~~ PCAPCD monitors local ambient air quality at the project site. Air quality monitoring stations usually measure pollutant concentrations 10 feet above ground level; therefore, air quality is often referred to in terms of ground-level concentrations. The most recent background ambient air quality data from 2015 to 2017 are presented in Table 12-2. The Auburn monitoring station, located at 11645 Atwood Road, California 95603, is the nearest air quality monitoring station to the project site, which is located in the southeast corner of the project site. Air quality data for O_3 and $PM_{2.5}$ from the Auburn monitoring station monitoring station are provided in Table 12-2. Because CO, SO_2, and NO_2~~, and $PM_{2.5}$~~ are not monitored at the Auburn monitoring station, NO_2 and PM_{10} measurements were taken from the Roseville monitoring station (51 North Sunrise

Table 12-2
Local Ambient Air Quality Data

Monitoring Station	Unit	Averaging Time	Agency/ Method	Ambient Air Quality Standard	Measured Concentration by Year			Exceedances by Year		
					2015	*2016*	*2017*	*2015*	*2016*	*2017*
Fine Particulate Matter ($PM_{2.5}$)[b]										
Auburn	µg/m³	Maximum 24-hour concentration	Federal	35	109.8	28.6	29.7	1.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
	µg/m³	Annual concentration	State	12	ND	5.9	5.7	–	–	–
			Federal	12.0	7.0	6.8	6.5	–	–	–

Sources: CARB 2018; EPA 2017.
Notes: — = data not available; µg/m3 = micrograms per cubic meter; ND = insufficient data available to determine the value; ppm = parts per million
Data taken from CARB iADAM (http://www.arb.ca.gov/adam) and EPA AirData (http://www.epa.gov/airdata/) represent the highest concentrations experienced over a given year.
Exceedances of federal and state standards are only shown for O_3 and particulate matter. Daily exceedances for particulate matter are estimated days because PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ are not monitored daily. All other criteria pollutants did not exceed federal or state standards during the years shown. There is no federal standard for 1-hour ozone, annual PM_{10}, or 24-hour SO_2, nor is there a state 24-hour standard for $PM_{2.5}$.
Auburn Monitoring Station is located at 11645 Atwood Road, Auburn, California 95603.
Roseville Monitoring Station is located at 51 North Sunrise Avenue, Roseville, California 95661.
Antelope Monitoring Station is located at 7823 Blackfoot Way, Antelope, California 95843.
[a] Mean does not satisfy minimum data completeness criteria.
[b] Measurements of PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ are usually collected every 6 days and every 1 to 3 days, respectively. Number of days exceeding the standards is a mathematical estimate of the number of days concentrations would have been greater than the level of the standard had each day been monitored. The numbers in parentheses are the measured number of samples that exceeded the standard.

Health Effects

Air pollution affects everyone to some degree, however pregnant women, children, the elderly, and people with respiratory or cardiovascular disease are more susceptible to experiencing health effects from air pollution. As discussed in Section 12.2, the EPA and CARB have set ambient air quality standards (AAQS) for criteria air pollutants at levels that are intended to protect public health, as shown in Table 12-3. Thus concentrations of criteria air pollutants that are below the AAQS would not result in significant adverse health effects.

Even at low concentrations, ground-level O_3 can adversely affect everyone (EPA 2000a). In relatively low concentrations, O_3 can damage vegetation, crack rubber, and irritate the lungs and respiratory system when inhaled. At higher concentrations, O_3 can impact public health by directly affecting the lungs, causing respiratory irritation and reduction in lung function. Lung flow and air passage through lung tissues can be seriously decreased, resulting in symptoms such as coughs, chest discomfort, headaches, and eye irritation. "Repeated exposure to ozone pollution for several months may cause permanent lung damage" (EPA 2000a). Persons suffering from asthma, bronchitis, other respiratory ailments, and cardiovascular disease are particularly susceptible to O_3, as well as children and persons engaged in heavy exercise, but "even healthy people that are active

outdoors can be affected when ozone levels are high" (EPA 2000a). At high concentrations, this pollutant can cause severe damage to the lungs.

A large body of health science literature indicates that exposure to NO_2 can induce adverse health effects. The strongest health evidence, and the health basis for the ambient air quality standards for NO_2, is results from controlled human exposure studies that show that NO_2 exposure can intensify responses to allergens in allergic asthmatics. In addition, a number of epidemiological studies have demonstrated associations between NO_2 exposure and premature death, cardiopulmonary effects, decreased lung function growth in children, respiratory symptoms, emergency room visits for asthma, and intensified allergic responses. Infants and children are particularly at risk because they have disproportionately higher exposure to NO_2 than adults due to their greater breathing rate for their body weight and their typically greater outdoor exposure duration. Several studies have shown that long-term NO_2 exposure during childhood, the period of rapid lung growth, can lead to smaller lungs at maturity in children with higher compared to lower levels of exposure. In addition, children with asthma have a greater degree of airway responsiveness compared with adult asthmatics. In adults, the greatest risk is to people who have chronic respiratory diseases, such as asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (CARB 2019b).

Inhaled CO passes through the lungs to enter the blood stream, interfering with the transfer of oxygen to the blood. This reduces the amount of oxygen that reaches the muscles, including the heart, brain, and other body tissues – resulting in adverse cardiovascular and central nervous system effects. Even in healthy adults, CO inhalation can result in drowsiness, fatigue, inability to concentrate, nausea, headache, changes in heart function, impairment of vision, and slowed reflexes. At very high concentrations, CO inhalation can be fatal (EPA 2000b).

Particulate matter causes harm when inhaled particulates lodge deep within the lungs, causing health problems as the human immune system reacts to the presence of these foreign particles. Fine particles can lodge deeper within the lungs than coarse particles, posing a more serious health threat. Scientific studies have linked inhaled PM to several significant health problems, including "aggravated asthma, increases in respiratory symptoms like coughing and difficult or painful breathing, chronic bronchitis, decreased lung function, and premature death" (EPA 2000c). Very small particulates of certain substances can cause direct lung damage or can contain absorbed gasses that may be harmful. Populations that are especially sensitive to the health effects of exposure to particulate matter include children, the elderly, exercising adults, individuals with influenza, asthmatics, and those who suffer from chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. "Health problems for sensitive people can get worse if they are exposed to high levels of PM for several days in a row" (EPA 2000c), and "both short- and long-term exposures to PM have been shown to lead to harmful health effects" (CARB 2003b). Recent studies suggest that prolonged exposure to PM may affect the growth and functioning of children's lungs; other studies have found an

association between fine particle air pollution and premature death related to decreases in cardiopulmonary functions. "In addition, scientists have observed higher rates of hospitalizations, emergency room visits and doctor's visits for respiratory illnesses or heart disease during times of high PM concentrations" (CARB 2003b).

12.2 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

The proposed project is in the SVAB, one of 14 air basins in the state; Placer County is one of 11 counties within this air basin. PCAPCD has the primary responsibility for attainment and maintenance of air quality standards within their jurisdiction. The project area is also subject to the regulations of the Sacramento Air Quality Maintenance Area, CARB, and EPA. Both the State of California and the EPA have established and published air quality standards as shown in Table 12-2. The *Sacramento Regional 8-Hour Ozone Attainment and Reasonable Further Progress Plan (2017 Draft SIP Revisions)* (PCAPCD et al 2017b), which addresses attainment of the federal 8-hour O_3 standard, as well as the *2015 Triennial Progress Report* (SMAQMD 2016), which addresses attainment of the state O_3 standard, are the latest plans issued by the PCAPCD. Additionally, the Lead Agency will use the policies contained in the Placer County General Plan and the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan related to air quality to evaluate the proposed project. This section provides a list of those policies, ordinances, and regulations that will be used to evaluate and implement this project.

Federal Regulations

Criteria Air Pollutants

The federal Clean Air Act, passed in 1970 and last amended in 1990, forms the basis for the national air pollution control effort. The EPA is responsible for implementing most aspects of the Clean Air Act, including setting NAAQS for major air pollutants; setting hazardous air pollutant (HAP) standards; approving state attainment plans; setting motor vehicle emission standards; issuing stationary source emission standards and permits; and establishing acid rain control measures, stratospheric O_3 protection measures, and enforcement provisions. Under the Clean Air Act, NAAQS are established for the following criteria pollutants: O_3, CO, NO_2, SO_2, PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$, and lead.

The NAAQS describe acceptable air quality conditions designed to protect the health and welfare of the citizens of the nation ~~.~~ by defining the maximum amount of a pollutant averaged over a specified period of time that can be present in outdoor air without harm to the public's health. The NAAQS (other than for O_3, NO_2, SO_2, PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$, and those based on annual averages or arithmetic mean) are not to be exceeded more than once per year. NAAQS for O_3, NO_2, SO_2, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ are based on statistical calculations over 1- to 3-year periods, depending on the pollutant. The Clean Air Act requires the EPA to reassess the NAAQS at least every 5 years to determine

whether adopted standards are adequate to protect public health based on current scientific evidence. States with areas that exceed the NAAQS must prepare a state implementation plan that demonstrates how those areas will attain the standards within mandated time frames.

State Regulations

Criteria Air Pollutants

The federal Clean Air Act delegates the regulation of air pollution control and the enforcement of the NAAQS to the states. In California, the task of air quality management and regulation has been legislatively granted to CARB, with subsidiary responsibilities assigned to air quality management districts and air pollution control districts at the regional and county levels. CARB, which became part of the California Environmental Protection Agency in 1991, is responsible for ensuring implementation of the California Clean Air Act of 1988, responding to the federal Clean Air Act, and regulating emissions from motor vehicles and consumer products.

CARB has established CAAQS, which are generally more restrictive than the NAAQS. As stated previously, an AAQS defines the maximum amount of a pollutant averaged over a specified period of time that can be present in outdoor air without harm to public health. The CAAQS describe adverse conditions; that is, pollution levels must be below these standards before a basin can attain the standard. Air quality is considered "in attainment" if pollutant levels are continuously below the CAAQS and violate the standards no more than once each year. The CAAQS for O_3, CO, SO_2 (1-hour and 24-hour), NO_2, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ and visibility-reducing particles are values that are not to be exceeded. All others are not to be equaled or exceeded. The NAAQS and CAAQS are presented in Table 12-3. In air basins where the NAAQS and CAAQS are attained, regional air quality is not expected to lead to adverse public health effects, although localized health effects could occur if conditions and activities result in pockets of high air pollutant concentrations.

Table 12-3
Ambient Air Quality Standards

Pollutant	Averaging Time	California Standards[a]	National Standards[b]	
		Concentration[c]	*Primary*[c,d]	*Secondary*[c,e]
O_3	1 hour	0.09 ppm (180 µg/m³)	—	Same as Primary Standard[f]
	8 hours	0.070 ppm (137 µg/m³)	0.070 ppm (137 µg/m³)[f]	
NO_2[g]	1 hour	0.18 ppm (339 µg/m³)	0.100 ppm (188 µg/m³)	Same as Primary Standard
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	0.030 ppm (57 µg/m³)	0.053 ppm (100 µg/m³)	

health risk in 2020 compared with the diesel risk in 2000. Additional regulations apply to new trucks and diesel fuel, including the On-Road Heavy Duty Diesel Vehicle (In-Use) Regulation, the On-Road Heavy Duty (New) Vehicle Program, the In-Use Off-Road Diesel Vehicle Regulation, and the New Off-Road Compression-Ignition (Diesel) Engines and Equipment program. All of these regulations and programs have timetables by which manufacturers must comply and existing operators must upgrade their diesel powered equipment. Several Airborne Toxic Control Measures (ATCMs) that reduce diesel emissions include In-Use Off-Road Diesel-Fueled Fleets (13 CCR 2449 et seq.) and In-Use On-Road Diesel-Fueled Vehicles (13 CCR 2025).

Local Regulations

Placer County Air Pollution Control District

The PCAPCD regulates many sources of air pollutants and is responsible for implementing certain programs and regulations for controlling air pollutant emissions to improve air quality and attain NAAQS and CAAQS. Various development projects have the potential to generate air pollutants that would result in adverse environmental impacts. In order to evaluate air pollutant emissions from development projects, the PCAPCD recommends significance thresholds for emissions of ROG, NO_x, ~~CO,~~ and PM_{10}. The emissions-based thresholds for O_3 precursors are intended to serve as a surrogate for an "O_3 significance threshold" (i.e., the potential for adverse O_3 impacts to occur). This approach is used because O_3 is not emitted directly (see the discussion of O_3 and its sources in Section 12.1, Pollutants and Effects) and the effects of an individual project's emissions of O_3 precursors (VOC and NO_x) on O_3 levels in ambient air cannot be determined through air quality models or other quantitative methods. The PCAPCD recommends significance thresholds as listed in Table 12-5, expressed in pounds per day, which serve as air quality standards that may be used in the evaluation of air quality impacts associated with development projects. These thresholds were included in the 2017 update to their CEQA Air Quality Handbook.

Table 12-5
PCAPCD Significance Thresholds for Criteria Pollutants

Pollutant	Construction Threshold	Operational Threshold	Operational Cumulative-Level Threshold
	Pounds per Day		
ROG	82	55	55
NO_X	82	55	55
PM_{10}	82	82	82

Source: PCAPCD 2017a

The PCAPCD recommends that a project would not result in significant project-level criteria pollutant emissions of ROG, NO_x, and $PM_{10,}$ for which the region is designated non-attainment if it does not exceed the construction and operational significance thresholds. In addition, a project would not be considered to be cumulatively considerable and would result in a less-than-significant cumulative impact if it does not exceed the PCAPCD cumulative-level significance thresholds.

PCAPCD established their thresholds of significance for CEQA purposes based on the regional goal to attain the NAAQS and CAAQS (PCAPCD 2017a). Since an AAQS is based on maximum pollutant levels in outdoor air that would not harm the public's health, and air district thresholds pertain to attainment of the AAQS, this means that a project that complies with the thresholds established by a local air district, such as the PCAPCD, would not result in adverse effects to human health.

Ozone Attainment Plan

For air quality planning purposes, western Placer County is classified as a severe non-attainment area for O_3. The "severe" classification triggers various plan submittal requirements and transportation performance standards. One such requirement is that the PCAPCD update the Clean Air Plan every three years to reflect progress in meeting the air quality standards and to incorporate new information regarding the feasibility of control measures and new emission inventory data. The PCAPCD's record of progress in implementing previous measures must also be reviewed. The *Sacramento Regional 8-Hour Ozone Attainment and Reasonable Further Progress Plan (Draft 2017 SIP Revisions)* (PCAPCD et al 2017b), demonstrates how existing and new control strategies would provide the necessary future emission reductions to meet the federal 8-hour O_3 standard. The Ozone Attainment Plan is the currently adopted and applicable air quality plan for the region. Therefore, the PCAPCD, along with other local air districts in the Sacramento region, is required to comply with and implement the Ozone Attainment Plan.

Triennial Progress Report

To comply with the planning requirements of the California Clean Air Act, the PCAPCD has prepared several triennial progress reports that build upon the Air Quality Attainment Plan adopted in 1991. The *2015 Triennial Progress Report* (SMAQMD 2016) is the most recent report. The triennial progress report, like the Ozone Attainment Plan, includes a current emission inventory and projected future inventories of ROG and NO_x emissions in Placer County. The future inventories reflect future growth rates of population, travel, employment, industrial/commercial activities, and energy use, as well as controls imposed through local, state, and federal emission reduction measures. The Triennial Report discusses rules that the PCAPCD has amended or adopted during the previous 3 years, incentive programs that have been implemented, and other

measures that would supplement those in the Ozone Attainment Plan to achieve annual emission reductions required by the Clean Air Act.

The Triennial Report indicates that a majority of ROG and NO_x emission in the County come from mobile sources. Additionally, emission trends within the County show a 47% decrease in ROG emissions from 39 tons per day to 21 tons per day and a 43% decrease in NO_x emissions from 36 tons per day to 21 tons per day between 1990 and 2015.

PCAPCD Rules and Regulations

Appendices B and D of the PCAPCD CEQA Air Quality Handbook include an all-inclusive list of rules and regulations required and recommended for all projects.[4] Project proponents are responsible for compliance with the adopted PCAPCD rules. To facilitate rule compliance, the City includes applicable rules as standard notes on improvement plans, grading plans, or design review permits.

A general summary of the key PCAPCD rules and regulations is presented below.

Rule 202 – Visible Emissions: Rule 202 limits the amount of time during which air pollutant emissions of a certain shade of darkness or degree of opacity may be discharged, specifically to no more than 3 minutes in any 1 hour.

Rule 205 – Nuisance: Rule 205 prohibits a discharge from any source whatsoever such quantities of air contaminants or other material which cause injury, detriment, nuisance or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, or which endanger the comfort, repose, health or safety of any such persons or the public.

Rule 217 – Cutback and Emulsified Asphalt Paving Materials: Rule 217 limits the VOC (ROG) content of asphalt paving materials used in the district.

Rule 218 – Architectural Coatings: Rule 218 requires that architectural coatings supplied, sold, offered for sale, applied, solicited for application, or manufactured for use within the PCAPCD area meet specified maximum VOC (ROG) content levels.

Rule 225 – Wood Burning Appliances: Rule 225 is intended to limit emissions of particulate matter entering the atmosphere from the operation of a wood burning appliance.

Rule 228 – Fugitive Dust: Rule 228 is intended to reduce the amount of particulate matter entrained in the ambient air, or discharged into the ambient air, as a result of anthropogenic (man-made)

[4] In addition, a complete listing of all PCAPCD rules can be found at http://www.placer.ca.gov/Departments/Air/Rules.aspx.

fugitive dust sources by requiring actions to prevent, reduce, or mitigate fugitive dust emissions. The provisions of Rule 228 apply to any activity or man-made condition capable of generating fugitive dust within Placer County.

Rule 246 – Natural Gas-Fired Water Heaters: Rule 246 is intended to limit the emission of NO_x from natural-gas-fired water heaters.

Rule 247 – Natural Gas-Fired Water Heaters, Small Boilers and Process Heaters: Rule 247 is intended to limit emissions of oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) from the use of natural gas-fired water heaters, small boilers and process heaters.

Rule 501 – General Permit Requirements: Rule 501 provides an orderly procedure for the review of new sources of air pollution, and modification and operation of existing sources, through the issuance of permits.

Auburn/Bowman Community Plan

The *Auburn/Bowman Community Plan's* Air Quality section of the Environmental Resources Management Element provides guidance in land use and development policies for implementation by the PCAPCD. The following *Auburn/Bowman Community Plan* policies are applicable to the proposed project:

Goals IV.B.6.a

2. Protect and improve air quality in the Auburn area.
3. Assure Placer County's compliance with state and federal air quality standards.

Policy 6.B.5 Use Indirect Source Control Program strategies for all subsequent, new or revised land uses within the Plan area to reduce emissions. These are to be developed in the EIR for the Plan area and applied through individual land use performance standards.

Policy 6.B.6 Use Direct Source Review as outlined in the EIR for the Plan to reduce emissions from existing land uses.

Policy 6.B.7 Produce mitigations for air quality impacts associated with adoption of the Community Plan and include them in the monitoring plan.

Policy 6.B.9 Projects which result in 200 or more trip-ends may require an air quality analysis to be submitted for review and approval.

Policy 6.F.9 In reviewing project applications, the County shall consider alternatives or amendments that reduce emissions of air pollutants.

Policy 6.F.10 The County may require new development projects to submit an air quality analysis for review and approval. Based on this analysis, the County shall require appropriate mitigation measures consistent with the PCAPCD's 1991 Air Quality Attainment Plan (or updated edition).

Policy 6.F.11 The County shall apply the buffer standards described on page 20 in Part I of this Policy Document and meteorological analysis to provide separation between possible emission/nuisance sources (such as industrial and commercial uses) and residential uses.

Goal 6.G To integrate air quality planning with the land use and transportation planning process.

Policy 6.G.1 The County shall require new development to be planned to result in smooth flowing traffic conditions for major roadways. This includes traffic signals and traffic signal coordination, parallel roadways, and intra- and inter-neighborhood connections where significant reductions in overall emissions can be achieved.

Policy 6.G.3 The County shall encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation by incorporating public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian modes in County transportation planning and by requiring new development to provide adequate pedestrian and bikeway facilities.

12.3 PROJECT IMPACTS

Significance Criteria

The significance criteria used to evaluate the project impacts to air quality are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a significant impact related to air quality would occur if the project would:

1. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.
2. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.
3. Result in a cumulatively considerable new increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality

Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) (SACOG 2016a) based on general plans for cities and counties in the SVAB. The air quality management plans rely on the land use and population projections provided in the MTP/SCS, which is generally consistent with the local plans; therefore, the air quality management plans are generally consistent with local government plans.

As discussed in Chapter 5, Land Use, the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan anticipates that the PCGC property would be developed with a range of uses, including continued county services and offices, private offices, retail, and residential. To accomplish this under the proposed PCGC Master Plan, the County proposes to amend the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan to increase the maximum allowable residential density within the project site. Under the existing Community Plan and zoning requirements, the maximum residential density within the site would be 15 dwelling units per acre. The proposed PCGC Master Plan Update Development Standards would allow a density of 30 dwelling units per acre within the Multifamily Residential Thematic Area and the Mixed Use Thematic Area, as shown on Figure 3-8 in Chapter 3, Project Description. These areas cover approximately 41 acres of the project site; both are currently zoned CPD. The proposed project would alter the zoning designation for these areas by applying a TC combining zone district ~~zoning overlay~~ to the eastern portion of the campus, as shown in Figure 3-6 in Chapter 3, Project Description. To allow development within the TC combining zone district ~~zoning overlay~~ area to exceed the densities of the underlying Commercial Planned Development zoning district and to exceed the 15 units per acre limit currently set by the Community Plan, the County proposes to amend the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan to recognize that the proposed PCGC Master Plan Update defines the allowable land use types and densities within the PCGC campus. This amendment would affect only the PCGC campus and would bring the proposed PCGC Master Plan Update into consistency with the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan and with the Placer County Zoning Ordinance.

As discussed in Chapter 5, Land Use and Planning, the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan anticipates development of a mixed-use community within the PCGC property. The proposed PCGC Master Plan Update is expected to accommodate approximately 485 dwelling units. Based on the County's average population per household of 2.68, at build-out of the PCGC Master Plan Update, the PCGC could accommodate 1,300 residents. The community plan projected a population of 31,200 and 37,186 people for the planning area in 2010 (based on an assumption of either a 2.1% or 3.0% annual growth rate). This correlates to a need of approximately 3,930 to 6,147 new housing units (County of Placer 1999). The housing constructed under the proposed project would increase the supply of multifamily housing in the area consistent with the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan and the Placer County General Plan. Additionally as discussed in Chapter 6, Population and Housing, the number of housing units within the unincorporated areas of the County increased by 19.1% between 2000 and 2018 while the number of housing units in

the City of Auburn increased by 15.6% and the number of housing units in other incorporated jurisdictions within the County increased by 88.7%

As previously discussed, the proposed project is requesting a General Plan Amendment to re-designate the site to increase the maximum allowable density for multifamily residential land uses. Although the proposed project would result in more intense development (15 dwelling units per acre versus 30 dwelling units per acre) compared to how the site could be developed under the existing land use and zoning designations, the proposed project would not generate more population growth than has been anticipated for the project region. SACOG's population estimate for the project area in 2020 is 28,360 and the forecasted population in 2030 (the closest year SACOG has available data to a project build-out of 2035) is 32,463. Therefore, ~~SANDAG's~~ SACOG's projections anticipated approximately 4,103 new residents in the project area over a 10-year period (SACOG 2016b). In comparison the proposed PCGC Master Plan Update is expected to build-out over a 20-year period, with most of the residential development anticipated to occur in years 5 through 15. Further, as discussed in Chapter 6, Population and Housing, in determining the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) for Placer County, SACOG found there would be a need for 5,031 new housing units within unincorporated Placer County, minus the Tahoe region, for the 2013 to 2021 planning period. As shown in the County's Annual Housing Element Progress Report for 2017 (County of Placer 2018), the County added 39 affordable housing units in 2017 and would need to an additional 3,366 new housing units to attain the County's 2021 RHNA target. In order to meet the RHNA within the 2013 to 2021 planning period, the County would need to create approximately 1,122 new housing units per year (County of Placer 2017).

While the proposed project was not included in the underlying growth estimates for the County used as the basis for the MTP/SCS, it would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the MTP/SCS because the SACOG population projections for County would accommodate more growth (4,103 new residents) than that associated with the proposed project (1,300 residents). Further, a portion of the residential units within the proposed project would help the County in achieving the level of affordable housing needs as established by SACOG. Finally, by developing a wide mix of uses within close proximity to each other as well as existing government services and commercial land uses, the project would support non-motorized transportation which could help reduce air pollutant emissions. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant population growth that would substantially exceed any established growth projections. As such, population resulting due to the proposed project would be more or less consistent with the population projections of SACOG and impacts relating to the project's potential to conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality management plan would be **less than significant**.

Impact 12-2	Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?		
	Master Plan Update	*Health and Human Services Building*	*Multifamily Residential*
Level of Significance:	~~Less than~~Potentially S~~s~~ignificant	Less than significant	Less than significant
Mitigation Measures:	~~None required~~Mitigation Measures 12a and 12b	None required	None required
Significance after Mitigation:	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant

Construction and operation of the proposed project would result in the emissions of criteria air pollutants that may cause exceedances of federal and state ambient air quality standards or contribute to existing nonattainment of ambient air quality standards. The following discussion identifies potential short- and long-term impacts that would result from implementation of the proposed project.

PCGC Master Plan Update

Construction

Emissions from construction activities were estimated using CalEEMod. As stated in Chapter 3, implementation of the PCGC Master Plan Update is expected to occur incrementally. Phasing for development is planned in four segments, resulting in an estimated build-out of the proposed project by 2035. Accordingly, construction emissions were modeled by each project component in four separate phases, which are referred to as tiers in the PCGC Master Plan Update: Phase 1 (2019–2021), Phase 2 (2024–2025), Phase 3 (2029–2031), and Phase 4 (2034-2035). Phase 1 includes construction of the new Health and Human Services building and the Multifamily Residential project (buildings R1, R1.1, R2, and R2.1), which are assessed in detail within this chapter as separate projects. Specific construction schedule sequencing and subphases for the remaining phases have not yet been determined; therefore, a conceptual construction schedule was developed for the purpose of air quality modeling as shown in Table 12-6.

Subsequent to preparation of the air quality modeling, a second multifamily residential project was moved into Phase 1, as shown in Figure 3-9, Tiering Plan. This project site includes approximately four acres located in the southwestern corner of the PCGC property and is estimated to support approximately 45 dwelling units. However the County has not identified any specific developers for this project and no detailed site planning has begun. Thus it is not expected that construction of this project would occur in the same year that construction of the other Phase 1 projects occurs, and thus there would not be an emissions increase on the worst-case day in any of the construction years. The analysis in this section and in the following Health and Human Services and

for each model scenario, including quantity of equipment, are provided in Appendix G. These assumptions are summarized Table 12-7.

Table 12-7
PCGC Master Plan Update Construction Scenario Assumptions (Phases 2 – 4)

Construction Phase	One-Way Vehicle Trips			Equipment	Quantity	Usage Hours
	Maximum Daily Worker Trips	*Maximum Daily Vendor Truck Trips*	*Total Haul Truck Trips*			
Phase 2						
Demolition	16	0	764	Concrete/Industrial Saw	1	8
				Excavators	3	8
				Rubber Tired Dozers	2	8
Site Preparation	18	0	0	Rubber Tired Dozers	3	8
				Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	4	8
Grading	20	0	0	Excavators	2	8
				Grader	1	8
				Rubber Tired Dozer	1	8
				Scrapers	2	8
				Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	2	8
Paving	16	0	0	Pavers	2	8
				Paving Equipment	2	8
				Rollers	2	8
Building Construction	186	84	0	Crane	1	7
				Forklifts	3	8
				Generator Sets	1	8
				Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	3	7
				Trencher	1	8
				Welder	1	8
Architectural Coatings	38	0	0	Air Compressor	1	6
Phase 3						
Demolition	16	0	124	Concrete/Industrial Saw	1	8
				Excavators	3	8
				Rubber Tired Dozers	2	8
Site Preparation	18	0	0	Rubber Tired Dozers	3	8
				Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	4	8
Grading	20	0	0	Excavators	2	8
				Grader	1	8
				Rubber Tired Dozer	1	8
				Scrapers	2	8

Construction of the proposed project would generate construction-related air pollutant emissions from entrained dust, equipment and vehicle exhaust emissions, asphalt pavement, and architectural coatings. Exhaust from internal combustion engines used by construction equipment, vendor trucks (delivery trucks), haul trucks, and worker vehicles would result in emissions of ROG, NO_x, and PM_{10}. Construction of the proposed project would also generate CO, SO_x and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions; however, only the criteria air pollutants that the PCAPCD have adopted thresholds for are presented in Table 12-5, though all criteria air pollutant emissions are included in Appendix G. Entrained dust results from the exposure of earth surfaces to wind from the direct disturbance and movement of soil, resulting in PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions. To account for compliance with PCAPCD Rule 228 (fugitive dust), it was assumed that the active sites would be watered at least twice daily, or as necessary depending on weather conditions. The application of architectural coatings, such as exterior/interior paint and other finishes, would also produce VOC (ROG) emissions. The proposed project would comply with the requirements of PCAPCD Rule 218 (Architectural Coatings), which sets a cap for the VOC content in paint of 100 grams of VOC per liter of coating for non-flat coatings.

Predicted construction emissions for the worst-case day for each of the construction years are presented in Table 12-8 and are compared to the PCAPCD significance thresholds. As shown in Table 12-8, daily unmitigated construction emissions associated with Phases 2 through 4 would not exceed the PCAPCD thresholds for ROG, NO_x, or PM_{10}. As such, construction of the proposed project would result in a **less than significant** impact associated with violating the NAAQS or CAAQS or contributing substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Further, because maximum daily emissions during construction would not violate the NAAQS or CAAQS, these emissions would not result in any adverse health effects within the SVAB.

Table 12-8
Maximum Daily Construction Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions
Proposed PCGC Master Plan Build-Out (Phases 2 – 4)

Year	ROG	NO_x	PM_{10}
	Pounds per Day		
2024	3.30	32.43	9.59
2025	20.03	23.79	4.59
2029	2.97	27.98	9.45
2030	19.32	16.13	4.71
2031	19.25	16.06	4.71
2034	6.05	14.22	8.80
2035	5.88	12.97	2.47
Maximum Daily	**20.03**	**32.43**	**9.59**
PCAPCD threshold	*55*	*55*	*82*
Threshold exceeded?	No	No	No

Notes: ROG = reactive organic gas; NO_x = oxides of nitrogen; PM_{10} = coarse particulate matter; PCAPCD = Placer County Air Pollution Control District.
The values shown are the maximum summer or winter daily emissions results from CalEEMod.
These estimates reflect implementation of PCAPCD Rule 228, which assumes watering of the site two times per and Rule 218 that limits the VOC content of architectural coatings to 100 g/L.
Emissions presented in the above table are provided in the "mitigated" CalEEMod output because the estimates include emission reductions associated with required compliance with regulations, but are not actual mitigation measures.
See Appendix G for estimated maximum daily emissions of CO, SO_x, and $PM_{2.5}$.
Source: Appendix G

Operations

Operation of the proposed project would produce ROG, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions from area sources, including natural gas combustion, use of consumer products, and motor vehicle trips to project land uses. The proposed project would primarily impact air quality through vehicular traffic generated by residents, employees, and visitors. The estimation of proposed operational emissions was based on proposed land use defaults and total area (i.e., square footage) of buildings and residential dwelling units that would be in operation by 2036 (first year of full operation after build-out).

Area Sources

CalEEMod was used to estimate operational emissions from area sources, which includes emissions from consumer product use, architectural coatings, and landscape maintenance equipment. Emissions associated with natural gas usage are calculated in the building energy use, which is described in the following "Energy Source" section below.

Vehicular Traffic

As provided in the Transportation Impact Study (TIS) completed for the proposed project (Appendix E), the project is estimated to generate a total average daily vehicle miles traveled (VMT) of 16,234 miles. Emissions associated with project-generated daily traffic were modeled with CalEEMod using the trip-generation provided in the TIS. CalEEMod default data, including temperature, trip characteristics, variable start information, emissions factors, and trip distances were conservatively used for the model inputs. Project-related traffic was assumed to include a mixture of vehicles in accordance with the model outputs for traffic. Emission factors representing the vehicle mix and emissions for 2036 (the first full year of operation after build-out) were used to estimate emissions associated with the proposed project.

Table 12-9 presents the maximum daily emissions associated with operation of the proposed project. The values shown are the maximum summer or winter daily emissions results from CalEEMod. Details of the emission calculations are provided in Appendix G. The estimated existing PCGC facilities emissions in 2015 were subtracted from the proposed project emissions, and the net change in emissions is compared with PCAPCD significance thresholds.

Table 12-9
Maximum Daily Operational Criteria Air Pollutant Emission
Proposed PCGC Master Plan Update Build-out[1]

Year	ROG	NO_x	PM_{10}
	Pounds per Day		
Project Build-out			
Area Sources	22.33	6.14	0.67
Energy	0.39	3.47	0.27
Motor Vehicles	17.96	133.00	97.54
Total Project Build-out Emissions	*39.98*	*138.57*	*95.01*
Existing Facilities			
Total Existing Facilities Emissions	*16.87*	*72.34*	*52.14*
Net Increase (Project Build-out minus Existing Facilities)	**23.81**	**70.27**	**46.34**
PCAPCD threshold	*55*	*55*	*82*
Threshold exceeded?	No	**Yes**	No

Notes: ROG = reactive organic gas; NO_x = oxides of nitrogen; PM_{10} = coarse particulate matter; PCAPCD = Placer County Air Pollution Control District.
The values shown are the maximum summer or winter daily emissions results from CalEEMod.
These estimates reflect implementation of Rule 218 which limits the VOC content of architectural coatings to 100 g/L.
1 PCGC Master Plan build-out scenario includes operational emissions associated with Phases 2 through 4.
See Appendix G for estimated maximum daily emissions of CO, SO_x, and $PM_{2.5}$.
Source: Appendix G

As shown in Table 12-9, ROG and PM_{10} emissions would be less than the applied thresholds on a daily basis, whereas NO_x emissions would exceed the PCAPCD daily thresholds of significance. Build-out of the proposed project would have a **potentially significant impact** on regional air quality without mitigation. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 12a and 12b would ensure that the net maximum daily operational levels of NO_x emissions do not exceed PCAPCD's thresholds of 55 lbs/day. Mitigation Measure 12a would require project features to be included into the proposed project's design such as the development of a system of pedestrian and bicycle facilities throughout the project site and providing alternatives to driving. Furthermore, Mitigation Measure 12b requires that the County and each individual project applicant implement a program to offset operational NO_x emissions such that the project's net emissions are below the PCAPCD significance threshold. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measures 12a and 12b would reduce this impact to **less than significant** level by ensuring that the project's operational emissions are offset and thus, the project would not violate the NAAQS or CAAQS or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Further, because maximum daily emissions during operation would not violate the NAAQS or CAAQS, these emissions would not result in any adverse health effects within the SVAB.

Health and Human Services Building

Construction

Emissions from construction activities associated with development of the Health and Human Services Building were estimated using CalEEMod. Specific construction schedule sequencing and subphases for the this building have not yet been determined; therefore, a conceptual construction schedule was developed for the purpose of air quality modeling as shown in Table 12-10.

Table 12-10
Health and Human Services Building Construction Schedule

Phase Type	Start Date	End Date	Number of Days/Week	Total Days
Demolition	07/01/2019	08/09/2019	5	30
Site Preparation	08/10/2019	09/06/2019	5	20
Grading	09/07/2019	11/08/2019	5	45
Paving	11/09/2019	12/06/2019	5	20
Building Construction	12/07/2019	10/16/2020	5	225
Architectural Coating	08/08/2020	10/16/2020	5	50

Source: Appendix G

Specific CalEEMod assumptions for each construction phase, including quantity of equipment, are provided in Appendix G. These assumptions are summarized Table 12-11.

Table 12-11
Health and Human Services Building Construction Scenario Assumptions

Construction Phase	One-Way Vehicle Trips			Equipment	Quantity	Usage Hours
	Maximum Daily Worker Trips	*Maximum Daily Vendor Truck Trips*	*Total Haul Truck Trips*			
Demolition	16	0	144	Concrete/Industrial Saw	1	8
				Excavators	3	8
				Rubber Tired Dozers	2	8
Site Preparation	18	0	0	Rubber Tired Dozers	3	8
				Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	4	8
Grading	20	0	0	Excavators	2	8
				Graders	1	8
				Rubber Tired Dozers	1	8
				Scrapers	2	8
				Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	2	8
Paving	16	0	0	Pavers	2	8
				Paving Equipment	2	8
				Rollers	2	8
Building Construction	236	96	0	Crane	1	7
				Forklifts	3	8
				Generator Set	1	8
				Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	3	7
				Trencher	1	8
				Welder	1	8
Architectural Coating	48	0	0	Air Compressors	1	6

Source: Appendix G

Construction of the Health and Human Services building would generate construction-related air pollutant emissions from entrained dust, equipment and vehicle exhaust emissions, asphalt pavement, and architectural coatings.

Predicted construction emissions for the worst-case day for each of the construction years are presented in Table 12-12 and are compared to the PCAPCD significance thresholds.

As shown in Table 12-12, daily unmitigated construction emissions would not exceed the PCAPCD thresholds for ROG, NO_x, or PM_{10}. As such, construction of the Health and Human Services building would result in a **less than significant** impact associated with violating the NAAQS or CAAQS or contributing substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

Further, because maximum daily emissions during construction would not violate the NAAQS or CAAQS, these emissions would not result in any adverse health effects within the SVAB.

Table 12-12
Maximum Daily Construction Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions – Health and Human Services Building

Year	ROG	NO_x	PM_{10}
	Pounds per Day		
2019	4.86	54.61	10.75
2020	35.49	36.60	5.79
Maximum Daily	**35.49**	**54.61**	**10.75**
PCAPCD threshold	*82*	*82*	*82*
Threshold exceeded?	No	No	No

Notes: ROG = reactive organic gas; NO_x = oxides of nitrogen; PM_{10} = coarse particulate matter; PCAPCD = Placer County Air Pollution Control District.
The values shown are the maximum summer or winter daily emissions results from CalEEMod.
These estimates reflect implementation of PCAPCD Rule 228, which assumes watering of the site two times per and Rule 218 that limits the VOC content of architectural coatings to 100 g/L.
Emissions presented in the above table are provided in the "mitigated" CalEEMod output because the estimates include emission reductions associated with required compliance with regulations, but are not actual mitigation measures.
See Appendix G for estimated maximum daily emissions of CO, SO_x, and $PM_{2.5}$.
Source: Appendix G

Operations

Operation of the Health and Human Services building would produce ROG, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions from area sources, including natural gas combustion, use of consumer products, and motor vehicle trips to project land uses. The general descriptions of these sources is provided in the PCGC Master Plan discussion above. The Health and Human Services building would primarily impact air quality through vehicular traffic. The estimation of proposed operational emissions was based on proposed land use defaults and total area (i.e., square footage) of buildings that would be in operation by 2021.

As provided in the TIS, the Health and Human Services building is estimated to generate 4,582 weekday trips (Fehr and Peers 2018). Emissions associated with project-generated daily traffic were modeled with CalEEMod using the weekday trip-generation estimates. CalEEMod default data was utilized for other parameters, including temperature, trip characteristics, variable start information, trip distances, and emissions factors were conservatively used for the model inputs. Project-related traffic was assumed to include a mixture of vehicles in accordance with the model outputs for traffic. Emission factors representing the vehicle mix and emissions for 2021 (the first full year of operation) were used to estimate emissions associated with the Health and Human Services building.

Table 12-13 presents the maximum daily emissions associated with the operation of the Health and Human Services building. The values shown are the maximum summer or winter daily emissions results from CalEEMod. Complete details of the emissions calculations are provided in Appendix G.

Table 12-13
Maximum Daily Operational Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions
Health and Human Services Building

Year	ROG	NO_x	PM_{10}
	Pounds per Day		
Proposed Health and Human Services Building			
Area Sources	4.03	<0.01	<0.01
Energy	0.07	0.60	0.05
Motor Vehicles	7.61	43.83	18.38
Total Health and Human Services Building Emissions	11.71	44.43	18.43
Existing Health and Human Services Building			
Total Existing Health and Human Services Building Emissions	*11.87*	*45.91*	*14.71*
Net increase (Health and Human Services Building minus Existing)	**(0.16)**	**(1.48)**	**3.72**
PCAPCD threshold	*55*	*55*	*82*
Threshold exceeded?	No	No	No

Notes: ROG = reactive organic gas; NO_x = oxides of nitrogen; PM_{10} = coarse particulate matter; PCAPCD = Placer County Air Pollution Control District.
The values shown are the maximum summer or winter daily emissions results from CalEEMod.
These estimates reflect implementation of Rule 218 which limits the VOC content of architectural coatings to 100 g/L.
See Appendix G for estimated maximum daily emissions of CO, SO_x, and $PM_{2.5}$.
Source: Appendix G

As shown in Table 12-13, daily net operational emissions would not exceed the PCAPCD thresholds for ROG, NO_x, and PM_{10}. As such, the Health and Human Services building would result in a **less than significant** impact in regards to operational ~~impacts~~emissions having the potential to cause or contribute to a violation of the NAAQS or CAAQS. Further, because maximum daily emissions during operation would not violate the NAAQS or CAAQS, these emissions would not result in any adverse health effects within the SVAB.

Vertical construction of the Multifamily Residential project would generate construction-related air pollutant emissions from equipment and vehicle exhaust emissions and architectural coatings.

Predicted construction emissions for the worst-case day for each of the construction years for the Multifamily Residential development are presented in Table 12-16 and are compared to the PCAPCD significance thresholds.

Table 12-16
Maximum Daily Construction Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions – Multifamily Residential project

Year	ROG	NO_x	PM_{10}
	Pounds per Day		
2020	2.97	24.63	2.41
2021	34.26	24.03	2.49
Maximum Daily	**34.26**	**24.63**	**2.49**
PCAPCD threshold	*82*	*82*	*82*
Threshold exceeded?	No	No	No

Notes: ROG = reactive organic gas; NO_x = oxides of nitrogen; PM_{10} = coarse particulate matter; PCAPCD = Placer County Air Pollution Control District.
The values shown are the maximum summer or winter daily emissions results from CalEEMod.
These estimates reflect implementation of PCAPCD Rule 228, which assumes watering of the site two times per and Rule 218 that limits the VOC content of architectural coatings to 100 g/L.
Emissions presented in the above table are provided in the "mitigated" CalEEMod output because the estimates include emission reductions associated with required compliance with regulations, but are not actual mitigation measures.
See Appendix G for estimated maximum daily emissions of CO, SO_x, and $PM_{2.5}$.
Source: Appendix G

As shown in Table 12-16, daily unmitigated construction emissions would not exceed the PCAPCD thresholds for ROG, NO_x, or PM_{10}. As such, construction of the Multifamily Residential project would result in a **less than significant** impact associated with violating the NAAQS or CAAQS or contributing substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Further, because maximum daily emissions during construction would not violate the NAAQS or CAAQS, these emissions would not result in any adverse health effects within the SVAB.

Operations

Operation of the Multifamily Residential project would produce ROG, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions from area sources, including natural gas combustion, use of consumer products, and motor vehicle trips to project land uses. The general descriptions of these sources is provided in the PCGC Master Plan Update discussion above. The Multifamily Residential project would primarily impact air quality through vehicular traffic. The estimation of proposed operational

emissions was based on proposed land use defaults, number of dwelling units, and total area (i.e., square footage) that would be in operation by 2022.

As provided in the TIS, the Multifamily Residential project is estimated to generate 730 weekday trips (Appendix E). CalEEMod default Saturday and Sunday trip-generation rates were adjusted based on weekday trip-generation rates per land use type, because weekend trip-generation rates were not provided in the TIS. Furthermore, CalEEMod default trip distances were adjusted to match the total average daily VMT (2,016 miles). Other CalEEMod default data, including temperature, trip characteristics, variable start information, and emissions factors were conservatively used for the model inputs. Project-related traffic was assumed to include a mixture of vehicles in accordance with the model outputs for traffic. Emission factors representing the vehicle mix and emissions for 2022 (the first full year of operation) were used to estimate emissions associated with the Multifamily Residential project.

Table 12-16 presents the maximum daily emissions associated with the operation of the Multifamily Residential project. The values shown are the maximum summer or winter daily emissions results from CalEEMod. Complete details of the emissions calculations are provided in Appendix G.

Table 12-17
Maximum Daily Operational Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions – Multifamily Residential project

Year	ROG	NO_x	PM_{10}
	Pounds per Day		
Area Sources	2.91	1.59	0.17
Energy	0.03	0.25	0.02
Motor Vehicles	1.13	6.01	1.64
Total	**4.07**	**7.85**	**1.83**
PCAPCD threshold	*55*	*55*	*82*
Threshold exceeded?	No	No	No

Notes: ROG = reactive organic gas; NO_x = oxides of nitrogen; PM_{10} = coarse particulate matter; PCAPCD = Placer County Air Pollution Control District.
The values shown are the maximum summer or winter daily emissions results from CalEEMod.
These estimates reflect implementation of Rule 218 which limits the VOC content of architectural coatings to 100 g/L.
See Appendix G for estimated maximum daily emissions of CO, SO_x, and $PM_{2.5}$.
Source: Appendix G

As shown in Table 12-17, daily operational emissions would not exceed the PCAPCD thresholds for ROG, NO_x, and PM_{10} at full build-out. As such, the Multifamily Residential project would result in a **less than significant** impact in regards to operational ~~impacts~~ emissions having the potential to cause or contribute to a violation of the NAAQS or CAAQS. Further, because

maximum daily emissions during operation would not violate the NAAQS or CAAQS, these emissions would not result in any adverse health effects within the SVAB.

Impact 12-3	Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable new increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative threshold emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?		
	Master Plan Update	*Health and Human Services Building*	*Multifamily Residential*
Level of Significance:	~~Less than~~ Potentially ~~s~~Significant	Less than significant	Less than significant
Mitigation Measures:	~~None required~~Mitigation Measures 12a and 12b	None required	None required
Significance after Mitigation:	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant

PCGC Master Plan Update

The cumulative context of an air pollutant is dependent on the specific pollutant being considered. O_3 precursors are a regional pollutant; this means that O_3 precursors generated in one location do not necessarily have O_3 impacts in that area. Instead, precursors from across the region can combine in the upper atmosphere and be transported by winds to various portions of the air basin. Consequently, all O_3 precursors generated throughout the air basin are part of the cumulative context and the geographic region in which cumulative O_3 impacts are considered is the entire Sacramento Federal Nonattainment Area (SFNA) for O_3. The SFNA includes the counties of Sacramento, Yolo, Solano (partial), Sutter (partial), Placer (except Lake Tahoe Air Basin), and El Dorado (except Lake Tahoe Air Basin). The PCAPCD establishes emissions thresholds for regional emissions.

For operational cumulative impacts associated with nonattainment pollutants, a project whose operational emissions would not exceed the PCAPCD cumulative significance thresholds (depicted in Table 12-5) would not be considered cumulatively considerable and would be less than significant. As presented in Table 12-9, the proposed project's net operational emissions (proposed project minus existing facilities emissions) would exceed the PCAPCD cumulative thresholds of significance without mitigation. Therefore, the proposed project's operational activities would be cumulatively considerable and the contribution to cumulative impacts would be **potentially significant**. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 12a and 12b would ensure that NO_x emissions would be reduced to a **less than significant** level~~.~~ by ensuring that the project's operational emissions are offset and thus, the project would not ~~make~~result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to the existing and projected exceedances of the NAAQS or CAAQS

within the SVAB. Further, because maximum daily emissions during operation would not be cumulatively considerable and would not exceed the PCAPCD thresholds, which are set at levels that ensure a project would not cause a violation of the NAAQS or CAAQS, these emissions would not result in any adverse health effects within the SVAB.

Health and Human Services Building

As presented in Table 12-13, the proposed Health and Human Services building's operational emissions would not exceed the PCAPCD cumulative-level thresholds of significance and thus would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, the Health and Human Services building's contribution to cumulative impacts during would be **less than significant** because the emissions associated with this building would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to the existing and projected exceedances of the NAAQS or CAAQS within the SVAB and would not result in any adverse health effects within the SVAB.

Multifamily Residential Project

As presented in Table 12-17, the Multifamily Residential project operational emissions would not exceed the PCAPCD cumulative-level thresholds of significance and thus would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, the Multifamily Residential project contribution to cumulative impacts would be **less than significant** because the emissions associated with this project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to the existing and projected exceedances of the NAAQS or CAAQS within the SVAB and would not result in any adverse health effects within the SVAB.

Impact 12-4	**Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?**		
	PCGC Master Plan Update	*Health and Human Services Building*	*Multifamily Residential Project*
Level of Significance:	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant
Mitigation Measures:	None required	None required	None required
Significance after Mitigation:	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant

PCGC Master Plan Update

Health ~~Impacts~~ Effects of Toxic Air Contaminants

Construction of the proposed project would involve the use of diesel-fueled vehicles used during site preparation, grading, building construction, paving, and application of architectural coatings. DPM is the primary TAC of concern during these construction activities. Notably, on-road diesel trucks traveling to and from the proposed project would be less of a concern because they would

project and within the proposed project itself. If such traffic occurs during periods of poor atmospheric ventilation, is composed of a large number of vehicles "cold-started" and operating at pollution-inefficient speeds, and is operating on roadways already crowded with non-project traffic, there is a potential for the formation of microscale CO hotspots in the area immediately around points of congested traffic. Because of continued improvement in vehicular emissions at a rate faster than the rate of vehicle growth and/or congestion, the potential for CO hotspots in the SVAB is steadily decreasing.

CO transport is extremely limited and disperses rapidly with distance from the source. Under certain extreme meteorological conditions, however, CO concentrations near a congested roadway or intersection may reach unhealthy levels, affecting sensitive receptors such as residents, school children, hospital patients, and older adults. Typically, high CO concentrations are associated with roadways or intersections operating at an unacceptable level of service (LOS). Projects contributing to adverse traffic impacts may result in the formation of such CO hotspots.

To verify that the project would not cause or contribute to a violation of the CO standards, a screening evaluation of the potential for CO hotspots was conducted. The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and the U.C. Davis Institute of Transportation Studies *Transportation Project-Level Carbon Monoxide Protocol* (CO Protocol) (Caltrans 1997), and the PCAPCD *CEQA Air Quality Handbook* (PCAPCD 2017a) were followed. PCAPCD outlines the following criteria in order to determine whether a CO hotspots analysis is typically warranted if the project would generate more than 550 pounds per day of CO from vehicle operation **AND** ~~(1)~~ the traffic study for the project indicates that the peak-hour LOS on one or more streets or at one or more intersections (both signalized and non-signalized) in the project vicinity will be degraded from an acceptable LOS (e.g., A, B, C, or D) to an unacceptable LOS (e.g., E or F); ~~and~~ or ~~(2)~~ if the traffic study indicates that the project would substantially worsen an already existing unacceptable peak-hour LOS on one or more streets or at one or more intersections in the project vicinity. "Substantially worsen" includes situations where delay would increase by 10 seconds or more with project-generated traffic included.

The proposed project's TIS evaluated the potential transportation and circulation impacts resulting from the implementation of the proposed project. The TIS evaluated seventeen intersections for four different scenarios which included existing conditions, existing plus build-out of project, cumulative without project, and cumulative plus build-out of project. According to the CO Protocol, there is a cap on the number of intersections that need to be analyzed for any one project. For a single project with multiple intersections, only the three intersections representing the worst LOS ratings of the project, and to the extent they are different intersections, the three intersections representing the highest traffic volumes, need be analyzed. For each intersection failing a screening test as described in this protocol, an additional intersection should be analyzed (Caltrans 1997).

Four receptor locations at each intersection were modeled to determine CO ambient concentrations. Each receptor was assumed to be located on the sidewalk at each corner of the modeled intersections. Receptors represent the possibility of extended outdoor exposure at locations adjacent to the modeled intersections. CO concentrations were modeled at these locations (highest recorded traffic volumes for each scenario) to assess the maximum potential CO exposure that could occur in 2036. A receptor height of 5.9 feet (1.8 meters) was used in accordance with Caltrans recommendations for all receptor locations (Caltrans 1998b).

The highest 1-hour CO concentration of 2.3 parts per million (ppm) from the last three years was used as the ambient CO background concentration. A persistence factor of 0.6, as is recommended for suburban locations, was applied to the output values of predicted concentrations in parts per million at each of the receptor locations.

The results of the model are shown in Table 12-18. Model input and output data are provided in Appendix G.

Table 12-18
CALINE4 Predicted Carbon Monoxide Concentrations

Intersection	Maximum Modeled Impact Long-Term 2036 (ppm)	
	1-hour	*8-hour*
(Cumulative Plus Master Plan SR 49 and Bell Rd (PM peak hour)	2.4	1.44
(Cumulative Plus Master Plan SR 49 and Atwood Rd (PM peak hour)	2.4	1.44
(Cumulative Plus Master Plan SR 49 and Kemper Rd/New Airport Road (PM peak hour)	2.4	1.44

Notes: CO = carbon monoxide; ppm = parts per million.
Modeled concentrations reflect background 1-hour concentration of 2.3 ppm.
8-hour concentrations were obtained by multiplying the 1-hour concentration by a factor of 0.6, as referenced in Caltrans 1997, Table B.15.
Source: Caltrans 1998a (CALINE4).

As shown in Table 12-~~17~~18, maximum CO concentration predicted for the 1-hour averaging period would be 2.~~8~~ 4 ppm, which is below the state 1-hour CO standard of 20 ppm. Maximum predicted 8-hour CO concentrations at each of the impacted intersections would be below the state CO standard of 9 ppm. Neither the 1-hour nor 8-hour state standard would be equaled or exceeded at any of the intersections studied. Accordingly, CO hotspot impacts would be **less than significant**.

Health Effects of Criteria Air Pollutants

Construction and operation of the proposed project would result in emissions that would not exceed the PCAPCD thresholds for ROG or PM_{10}. NO_x emissions during project operation would exceed the PCAPCD thresholds, but these emissions would be offset with implementation of

Mitigation Measure 12b. ROG emissions would be generated by motor vehicles, construction equipment, and architectural coatings; however, project-generated ROG emissions would not result in the exceedances of the PCAPCD thresholds as shown in Tables 12-8 and 12-9. Generally, the VOCs in architectural coatings are of relatively low toxicity. Additionally, PCAPCD Rule 218 governs the application and VOC content of coatings for both construction and operational applications.

ROG and NO_x are precursors to O_3, for which the SVAB is designated as nonattainment with respect to the NAAQS and CAAQS. As discussed previously, the health effects associated with O_3 are generally associated with reduced lung function. The contribution of ROG and NO_x to regional ambient O_3 concentrations is the result of complex photochemistry. The increases in O_3 concentrations in the SVAB due to O_3 precursor emissions tend to be found downwind from the source location to allow time for the photochemical reactions to occur. However, the potential for exacerbating excessive O_3 concentrations would also depend on the time of year that the ROG emissions would occur because exceedances of the O_3 NAAQS and CAAQS tend to occur between April and October when solar radiation is highest. The holistic effect of a single project's emissions of O_3 precursors is speculative due to the lack of quantitative methods to assess this impact. Thus, a project's ROG and NO_x emissions are evaluated in the context of the PCAPCD maximum daily thresholds, which define the levels of emissions that can occur without causing or contributing to violations of the NAAQS and CAAQS. In turn, the NAAQS and CAAQS define the pollutant concentrations above which adverse health effects are expected to occur. Thus, because the ROG and NO_x emissions associated with proposed project construction and/or operation would not exceed the PCAPCD maximum daily thresholds, it is not anticipated the proposed project would contribute to regional O_3 concentrations and the associated health effects.

Construction and operation of the project would not contribute to exceedances of the NAAQS and CAAQS for NO_2. Health effects that result from NO_2 and NO_x include respiratory irritation, which could be experienced by nearby receptors during the periods of heaviest use of off-road construction equipment. However, off-road construction equipment would be operating at various portions of the project site and would not be concentrated in one portion of the site at any one time. Construction and operation of the proposed project would not require use of any stationary sources (e.g., diesel generators, boilers) that would create substantial, localized NO_x impacts. The proposed project is not anticipated to result in potential health effects associated with NO_2 and NO_x because project-generated emissions would not exceed the PCAPCD thresholds after mitigation and therefore, the project would not create or contribute to a violation of the NAAQS or CAAQS, which define the concentration of NO_2 above which adverse health effects could occur.

CO tends to be a localized impact associated with congested intersections. The potential for the proposed project to create CO hotspots was discussed previously and determined to be a **less-than-significant** impact. Thus, the project's CO emissions would not contribute to significant health

effects associated with this pollutant because the project would not generate localized mobile-source concentrations of CO that exceed the NAAQS or CAAQS (see Table 12-18).

Construction and operation of the proposed project would also not exceed thresholds for PM_{10} and would not contribute to exceedances of the NAAQS and CAAQS for particulate matter or obstruct the SVAB from coming into attainment for these pollutants. The proposed project would also not result in substantial DPM emissions during construction and operation, and therefore, would not result in significant health effects related to DPM exposure. Additionally, the proposed project would implement dust control strategies and be required to comply with PCAPCD Rule 228, which limits the amount of fugitive dust generated during construction. It is not anticipated that the proposed project would result in potential health effects related to PM_{10} because the project would not generate emissions of PM_{10} that would exceed the PCAPCD thresholds, and therefore, would not create or contribute to a violation of the NAAQS or CAAQS, which define the concentration of PM_{10} above which adverse health effects could occur.

Health and Human Services Building

The Health and Human Services building would not generate a substantial amount of traffic that would contribute to potential adverse traffic impacts that may result in the formation of CO hotspots. In addition, due to continued improvement in vehicular emissions at a rate faster than the rate of vehicle growth and/or congestion, the potential for CO hotspots in SVAB is steadily decreasing. Similar to the PCGC Master Plan Update analysis, because construction and operation of the Health and Human Services building would not exceed the PCAPCD thresholds for ROG, NO_x, and PM_{10} emissions, it is not anticipated to result in adverse health effects associated with these pollutants because it would not cause a violation of the NAAQS or CAAQS. Therefore, further analysis is not required and impacts would be **less than significant**.

Multifamily Residential Project

The Multifamily Residential project would not generate a substantial amount of traffic that would contribute to potential adverse traffic impacts that may result in the formation of CO hotspots. In addition, due to continued improvement in vehicular emissions at a rate faster than the rate of vehicle growth and/or congestion, the potential for CO hotspots in SVAB is steadily decreasing. As discussed previously, because construction and operation of the Multifamily Residential project would not exceed the PCAPCD thresholds for ROG, NO_x, and PM_{10} emissions, it is not anticipated to result in adverse health effects associated with these pollutants because it would not cause a violation of the NAAQS or CAAQS. Therefore, further analysis is not required and impacts would be **less than significant**.

- Include pedestrian-friendly paths and cross walks in all parking lots.
- Install two 110/208 volt power outlets for every two loading docks.

Mitigation Measure 12b The County and future project applicants for individual projects shall implement one of the following off-site mitigation measures prior to issuance of ~~certificates of occupancy~~ a building permit for each building constructed on-site:

- Establish mitigation off-site within the portion of Placer County that is within the SVAB by participating in an off-site mitigation program, coordinated through PCAPCD. Examples include, but are not limited to retrofitting, repowering, or replacing heavy duty engines from mobile sources (e.g., busses, construction equipment, on-road haulers); or other programs that the project proponent may propose to reduce emissions.
- Participate in PCAPCD's Off-site Mitigation Program by paying the equivalent amount of fees for the project's contribution of NO_x that exceeds the operational threshold of 55 lbs/day. The applicable fee rates changes over time. At the time of writing this EIR, the fee rate is $18,260 per ton emitted during the ozone season. The actual amount to be paid shall be determined, and satisfied per current CARB guidelines, at the time of recordation of the Final Map (residential projects), or issuance of a Building Permit (non-residential projects).

12.6 REFERENCES CITED

13 CCR 2025. Regulation to Reduce Emissions of Diesel Particulate Matter, Oxides of Nitrogen and Other Criteria Pollutants, from In-Use Heavy-Duty Diesel-Fueled Vehicles.

13 CCR 2449–2449.3 and Appendix A. General Requirements for In-Use Off-Road Diesel-Fueled Fleets.

17 CCR 93000. Substances Identified as Toxic Air Contaminants. In Subchapter 7, Toxic Air Contaminants.

CARB (California Air Resources Board). 2000. *Risk Reduction Plan to Reduce Particulate Matter Emissions from Diesel-Fueled Engines and Vehicles*. October 2000. Accessed August 2016. http://www.arb.ca.gov/diesel/documents/rrpfinal.pdf.

CARB. 2005. *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective*. April 2005.

CARB. 2016a. "Glossary of Air Pollution Terms." CARB website. Accessed June 2016. https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/about/glossary.

CARB. ~~2016a~~2016b. "Ambient Air Quality Standards." May 4, 2016. Accessed December 2016. http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/aaqs/aaqs2.pdf.

CARB. ~~2016b~~2016c. "Overview: Diesel Exhaust and Health." April 12, 2016. Accessed December 2016. https://www.arb.ca.gov/research/diesel/diesel-health.htm.

CARB. 2017. "Area Designation Maps/State and National." Last updated October 18, 2017. Accessed July 2018. http://www.arb.ca.gov/desig/adm/adm.htm.

CARB. 2018. "iADAM: Air Quality Data Statistics." Accessed July 31, 2018. http://www.arb.ca.gov/adam/topfour/topfour1.php.

CARB. 2019a. "Ozone & Health." https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/ozone-and-health

CARB. 2019b. "Nitrogen Dioxide & Health." https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/nitrogen-dioxide-and-health

Caltrans (California Department of Transportation). 1997. *Transportation Project-Level Carbon Monoxide Protocol*. Appendix B, Table B.2. Prepared by the Institute of Transportation Studies, University of California, Davis. Revised December 1997.

CAPCOA. 2017. *California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) User's Guide Version 2016.3.2*. Prepared by BREEZE Software, A Division of Trinity Consultants in collaboration with South Coast Air Quality Management District and the California Air Districts. November 2017. Accessed November 2017. http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/caleemod/01_user-39-s-guide2016-3-2_15november2017.pdf?sfvrsn=4.

Caltrans. 1998a. CALINE4 - A Dispersion Model for Predicting Air Pollutant Concentrations Near Roadways. Version 1.32. Written by Sonoma Technology, Inc. Petaluma, CA. Sponsored by the University of California, Davis Institute of Transportation Studies and Caltrans. http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/InfoSvcs/EngApps/.

Caltrans. 1998b. *User's Guide for CL4: A User-Friendly Interface for the Caline4 Model for Transportation Project Impact Assessments*. User's Guide STI-997480-1814-UG. June 1998. http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/env/air/documents/CL4Guide.pdf.

County of Placer. 1999. Auburn/Bowman Community Plan. Approved 1994; updated 1999. Accessed July 2018. https://www.placer.ca.gov/departments/communitydevelopment/planning/documentlibrary/commplans/auburn-bowman-cp.

County of Placer. 2017. Placer Supervisors approve new work plan on affordable, workforce housing. August 9, 2017. https://placer.ca.gov/news/2017/august/housing-affordability

County of Placer. 2018. Annual Housing Element Progress Report for 2017. March 8, 2018.

EPA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency). 2000a. Air Quality Criteria for Ozone and Related Photochemical Oxidants. EPA 600-R-05-004bF. National Center for Environmental Assessment, Office Research and Development, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, NC. https://www3.epa.gov/ttn/naaqs/aqmguide/collection/cp2/20060228_ord_epa-600_r-05-004bf_ozone_criteria_document_vol-2.pdf

EPA. 2000b. Air Quality Criteria for Carbon Monoxide. EPA 600-P-99-001F. National Center for Environmental Assessment, Office Research and Development, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, NC. http://www.epa.gov/ncea/pdfs/coaqcd.pdf

EPA. 2000c. Air Quality Criteria for Particulate Matter. EPA 600-P-99-002aB. National Center for Environmental Assessment, Office Research and Development, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, NC. http://ofmpub.epa.gov/eims/eimscomm.getfile?p_download_id=435945

EPA ~~(U.S. Environmental Protection Agency)~~. 2009. "Integrated Science Assessment for Particulate Matter." U.S. EPA, EPA/600/R-08/139F, 2009.

EPA. 2016a. "Criteria Air Pollutants." July 21, 2016. Accessed August 2016. https://www.epa.gov/criteria-air-pollutants.

EPA. 2016b. "EPA Region 9 Air Quality Maps and Geographic Information." Last updated April 27, 2016. Accessed August 2016. http://www.epa.gov/region9/air/maps/.

EPA. 2013. "Integrated Science Assessment of Ozone and Related Photochemical Oxidants." U.S. EPA, EPA/600R-10/076F, 2013.

EPA. 2017. "AirData: Access to Air Pollution Data." Last updated December 5, 2017. http://www.epa.gov/airdata/ad_rep_mon.html.

EPA. 2018. "EPA Region 9 Air Quality Maps and Geographic Information." Last updated June 11, 2018. Accessed July 2018. http://www.epa.gov/region9/air/maps/.

Fehr and Peers. 2018. Transportation Impact Study for Placer County Government Center Master Plan Update.

PCAPCD (Placer County Air Pollution Control District). 2008. *Sacramento Regional 8-Hour Ozone Attainment and Reasonable Further Progress Plan.*

~~PCAPCD. 2012. *CEQA Air Quality Handbook.* Accessed September 22, 2016. http://www.placer.ca.gov/departments/air/landuseceqa.~~

PCAPCD. 2017a. *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*. August 2017.

PCAPCD. 2017b. *Sacramento Regional 8-Hour Ozone Attainment and Reasonable Further Progress Plan (Draft 2017 SIP Revisions)*. July 24, 2017.

PCAPCD. 2018. Placer County Public Records Request. August 17, 2018.

SACOG (Sacramento Area Council of Governments). 2016a. *Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) for 2036*. Adopted February 18, 2016.

SACOG (Sacramento Area Council of Governments). 2016b. SACOG 2016 MTP/SCS Modeling Projections for 2012, 2020, and 2036.

Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD). 2016. *2015 Triennial Progress Report*. Accessed September 22, 2016. http://www.airquality.org/ProgramCoordination/Documents/11)%20%202015TriennialReportandProgressRevision.pdf.

Western Regional Climate Center (WRCC). 2017. Auburn, California (040383).

Environmental Checklist Form, which is often used as a basis for lead agencies' selection of significance thresholds, do not prescribe specific thresholds. Rather, the CEQA Guidelines establish two new CEQA thresholds related to GHGs, and these will therefore be used to discuss the significance of project impacts:

- Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?
- Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

The PCAPCD recommends the following approach to determine if a project's GHG emissions would result in a significant impact:

- Tier 1 would consist of evaluating whether or not a project qualifies for any applicable exemption under CEQA.
- Tier 2 consists of determining whether the project is consistent with a qualified climate action plan. If a project is consistent with a qualifying local climate action plan, it does not have significant GHG emissions.
- Tier 3 consists of comparing the project's GHG emissions to the de minimis level of 1,100 MT CO_2e per year. If a project does not exceed this threshold, it does not have significant GHG emissions.
- Tier 4 is a bright line threshold level to determine significance using an 82% emission capture rate approach and is 10,000 MT CO_2e per year, for both construction and operational phases. If a project exceeds this cap, impacts are found to be significant. If a project does not exceed this threshold, the project is compared with the efficiency thresholds.
- Tier 5 compares the project emissions to efficiency thresholds. These thresholds are 4.5 MT CO_2e per capita for residential projects in an urban area and 5.5 MT CO_2e per capita for residential projects in a rural area. For nonresidential development, the thresholds are 26.5 MT CO_2e per 1,000 ~~sf~~ square feet for projects in urban areas and 27.3 MT CO_2e per 1,000 ~~sf~~ square feet for projects in rural areas. If a project does not exceed the applicable efficiency threshold, it does not have significant GHG emissions.

Table 13-3
Estimated Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions
Proposed PCGC Master Plan Build-out

Emission Source	CO_2	CH_4	N_2O	CO_2e
	Metric Tons per Year			
Project Build-out				
Area	276.91	<0.01	<0.01	278.65
Energy (natural gas and electricity)	1,604.99	0.10	0.03	1,616.75
Mobile	13,122.30	0.33	0.00	13,130.78
Solid waste	115.56	6.83	0.00	286.30
Water supply and wastewater	107.78	2.65	0.06	192.97
Total Project Build-out Emissions	*15,227.54*	*9.91*	*0.09*	*15,505.45*
Existing Facilities				
Total Existing Facilities Emissions	*7,136.33*	*7.24*	*0.06*	*7,335.96*
Net Increase (Project Build-out minus Existing Facilities)				**8,169.49**
PCAPCD GHG Threshold				1,100
Threshold exceeded?				**Yes**

Source: Appendix G
Notes: CO_2 = carbon dioxide; CH_4 = methane; N_2O = nitrogen dioxide; CO_2e = carbon dioxide equivalent.
Project GHG emissions are based on the "mitigated" CalEEMod outputs which includes incorporation of water reduction consistent with CALGreen and a 75% diversion of solid waste per Assembly Bill 341 the latter of which was assumed for the estimated emissions for the existing facilities.

As shown in Table 13-3, the proposed project would result in an increase of 8,169 MT CO_2e per year relative to existing conditions. Approximately 82% of the proposed project's annual GHG emissions are from mobile sources; consequently, to reduce GHG emissions any further project vehicle trips would need to be reduced by more than half. Measures have already been included in the proposed project that reduce the project's GHG emissions from energy consumption, waste, and water use when compared to a typical project.

As previously discussed, the PCAPCD proposes several tiers in determining if a project's contribution to GHG emissions is significant. Under this approach, the proposed project's operational GHG emissions would exceed the 1,100 MT CO_2e "de minimis" threshold but would be below the bright-line cap of 10,000 MT CO_2e. For a mixed-used type project, the PCACPD recommends that significance is determined based upon a comparison meeting either the efficiency threshold of 27.3 MT CO_2e per 1,000 square feet for nonresidential uses or 5.5 MT CO_2e per capita for residential uses (PCAPCD 2017). Based on the net operational GHG emissions attributable to the proposed project of 8,169 CO_2e per year and the total square footage of nonresidential land uses to be developed of 454,600 square feet, the proposed project would result in 18.0 MT CO_2e per ~~capita~~1,000 square feet, which is below the efficiency threshold of 27.3 MT CO_2e per ~~capita~~

1,000 square feet recommended by the PCAPCD. Therefore, GHG emissions would result in a **less than significant** impact.

Health and Human Services Building

Construction Impacts

Construction of the Health and Human Services building would result in GHG emissions that would primarily be associated with use of off-road construction equipment, on-road hauling and vendor trucks, and worker vehicles. CalEEMod was used to calculate the annual GHG emissions based on the construction scenario described in Chapter 12 of this EIR. Construction of the Health and Human Services building is anticipated to commence in July 2019 and would be completed by October 2020, for a total duration of approximately 16 months. On-site sources of GHG emissions include off-road equipment and off-site sources including haul trucks, vendor trucks, and worker vehicles.

Table 13-4 presents construction emissions for the proposed Health and Human Services building for 2019 and 2020.

Table 13-4
Estimated Annual Construction Greenhouse Gas Emissions
Health and Human Services Building

Year	CO_2	CH_4	N_2O	CO_2e
	Metric Tons per Year			
2019	313.93	0.08	0.00	315.91
2020	802.58	0.09	0.00	804.81
Total	**1,116.51**	**0.17**	**0.00**	**1,120.72**
			PCAPCD GHG Threshold	10,000
			Threshold exceeded?	No

Source: Appendix G
Notes: CO_2 = carbon dioxide; CH_4 = methane; N_2O = nitrous oxide; CO_2e = carbon dioxide equivalent

As shown in Table 13-4, total construction GHG emissions would be approximately 1,121 MT CO_2e as a result of construction-related activities. As previously discussed, the PCAPCD identifies a GHG emission threshold for construction-related emissions of 10,000 MT CO_2e per year. Table 13-4 indicates that the Health and Human Services building would not exceed the PCAPCD GHG threshold for any construction year. Additionally, as presented in the following Multifamily Residential project section and Table 13-6, construction of the Multifamily Residential project would generate 411 MT CO_2e over two years. Combined with emissions from construction of the Health and Human Services building, the total emissions would be 1,532 MT CO_2e, which is well-

below the PCAPCD GHG emission threshold. Therefore, the Health and Human Services building construction-related GHG emissions would represent a **less than significant** impact individually and in combination with the Multifamily Residential project.

Operational Impacts

Long-term operations of the Health and Human Services building would result in GHG emissions through area sources (landscape maintenance equipment); energy use (natural gas and generation of electricity consumed by the project); generation of electricity associated with wastewater treatment and with water supply, treatment, and distribution; and solid waste disposal. Annual GHG emissions from these sources were estimated using CalEEMod.

CalEEMod default mobile source data, including temperature, trip characteristics, variable start information, emission factors, and trip distances, were used for the model inputs. Default trip generation rates included in CalEEMod for the Health and Human Services building were adjusted to match the overall daily trips (4,299 trips). Project-related traffic was assumed to be comprised of a mixture of vehicles in accordance with the model defaults for government office building land use traffic. It is assumed that the first full year of project operation would be in the year 2021.

CalEEMod was also used to estimate emissions from the Health and Human Services building's area sources, which includes operation of gasoline-powered landscape maintenance equipment, which produces minimal GHG emissions.

Estimation of operational energy emissions was based on CalEEMod land use defaults and total area (i.e., square footage) of the Health and Human Services building. Annual natural gas and electricity emissions were estimated in CalEEMod using the emissions factors for Pacific Gas and Electric (the site's energy provider) and adjusted to account for 33% of electricity as a result of the RPS by 2020. The Health and Human Services building would also be required to comply with the 2016 Title 24 standards. CalEEMod 2016.3.2 uses the 2016 version of Title 24 as a basis for energy modeling.

Water supplied to the Health and Human Services building requires the use of electricity. Accordingly, the supply, conveyance, treatment, and distribution of water would indirectly result in GHG emissions through use of electricity. A 20% reduction in water consumption was incorporated into the CalEEMod model to account for compliance with CALGreen standards.

The Health and Human Services building would generate solid waste, and, therefore, result in CO_2e emissions associated with landfill off-gassing. CalEEMod default values for solid waste generation were used to estimate GHG emissions associated with solid waste. A diversion rate of 75% was assumed for the Health and Human Services building per requirements of AB 341.

The estimated operational GHG emissions from mobile sources, area sources, energy consumption, solid waste, water consumption, and wastewater treatment associated with the existing Health and Human Services facilities and operations projected for the year 2021 and the estimated operational GHG emissions for the proposed Health and Human Services building in 2021 are shown in Table 13-5. Details of the emission calculations are provided in Appendix G.

Table 13-5
Estimated Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions
Health and Human Services Building

Emission Source	CO_2	CH_4	N_2O	CO_2e
	Metric Tons per Year			
Health and Human Services Building Project				
Area	<0.01	<0.01	0.00	<0.01
Energy (natural gas and electricity)	449.24	0.02	0.01	451.61
Mobile	2,874.52	0.12	0.00	2,877.63
Solid waste	6.40	0.38	0.00	15.87
Water supply and wastewater	43.78	0.70	0.02	66.47
Total Health and Human Services Building Emissions	*3,373.94*	*1.22*	*0.03*	*3,411.58*
Existing Health and Human Services Building				
Total Existing Health and Human Services Building Emissions	~~*3,000.86*~~*2,784.70*	~~*2.05*~~*2.01*	*0.02*	~~*3,058.67*~~*2,841.69*
Net increase (Health and Human Services Building minus Existing)				~~**352.91**~~**569.89**
PCAPCD GHG Threshold				1,100
Threshold exceeded?				No

Source: Appendix G
Notes: CO_2 = carbon dioxide; CH_4 = methane; N_2O = nitrogen dioxide; CO_2e = carbon dioxide equivalent.
Project GHG emissions are based on the "mitigated" CalEEMod outputs which includes incorporation of water reduction consistent with CALGreen and and a 75% diversion of solid waste per Assembly Bill 341; these measures were not included in the estimated emissions for the existing Health and Human Services building.

As shown in Table 13-5, the Health and Human Services building would result in an increase of 353 MT CO_2e per year relative to existing conditions and would be below the PCAPCD GHG threshold of 1,100 MT CO_2e per year. Therefore, the Health and Human Services building's GHG emissions would result in a **less than significant** impact.

Additionally, as presented in the following Multifamily Residential project section and Table 13-7, operation of the Multifamily Residential project would generate 639.09 MT CO2e annually. Combined with emissions from operation of the Health and Human Services building, the total emissions would be 1,208.92 MT CO_2e. While this exceeds the PCAPCD de minimus GHG emission threshold, it remains well-below the bright line cap of 10,000 MT CO_2e. Therefore, the

GHG emissions from operation of both the Health and Human Services building and the Multifamily Residential project would represent a **less than significant** impact.

Multifamily Residential Project

Construction Impacts

Construction of the Multifamily Residential project would result in GHG emissions that would primarily be associated with use of off-road construction equipment, on-road hauling and vendor trucks, and worker vehicles. CalEEMod was used to calculate the annual GHG emissions based on the construction scenario described in Chapter 12 of this EIR. It was assumed that site preparation, grading, and paving activities would occur concurrently with the Health and Human Services building, with the generated GHGs assessed for that project above. Vertical construction of the Multifamily Residential project was assumed to occur immediately following completion of the Health and Human Services building. It is anticipated to commence in October 2020 and would be completed by August 2021, for a total duration of approximately 11 months. On-site sources of GHG emissions include off-road equipment and off-site sources including vendor trucks and worker vehicles.

Table 13-6 presents construction emissions of the Multifamily Residential project for 2020 and 2021.

Table 13-6
Estimated Annual Construction Greenhouse Gas Emissions
Multifamily Residential project

Year	CO_2	CH_4	N_2O	CO_2e
	Metric Tons per Year			
2020	99.12	0.02	0.00	99.59
2021	310.27	0.06	0.00	311.71
Total	**409.39**	**0.06**	**0.00**	**411.30**

Source: Appendix G
Notes: CO_2 = carbon dioxide; CH_4 = methane; N_2O = nitrous oxide; CO_2e = carbon dioxide equivalent

As shown in Table 13-6, total construction GHG emissions would be approximately 411 MT CO_2e as a result of construction-related activities. As previously discussed, the PCAPCD identifies a GHG emission threshold for construction-related emissions of 10,000 MT CO_2e per year. Table 13-6 indicates that the Multifamily Residential project would not exceed the PCAPCD GHG threshold for any construction year. Additionally, as presented in the previous Health and Human Services building section and Table 13-4, construction of the Health and Human Services building would generate 1,120.72 MT CO_2e over two years. The combined construction emissions from

the two projects would be 1,532 MT CO_2e, which is well-below the PCAPCD GHG emission threshold. Therefore, the Multifamily Residential project's construction-related GHG emissions would represent a **less than significant** impact individually and in combination with the Health and Human Services building.

Operational Impacts

Long-term operations of the Multifamily Residential project would result in GHG emissions through area sources (landscape maintenance equipment); energy use (natural gas and generation of electricity consumed by the project); generation of electricity associated with wastewater treatment and with water supply, treatment, and distribution; and solid waste disposal. Annual GHG emissions from these sources were estimated using CalEEMod.

CalEEMod default mobile source data, including temperature, trip characteristics, variable start information, and emission factors, were used for the model inputs. Default trip generation rates and trip distances included in CalEEMod for the Multifamily Residential project were adjusted to match the overall daily trips (730 trips) and total average daily VMT (2,016 miles) included in the TIS. Project-related traffic was assumed to be comprised of a mixture of vehicles in accordance with the model defaults for a residential land use traffic. It is assumed that the first full year of project operation would be in the year 2022.

CalEEMod was also used to estimate emissions from the Multifamily Residential project area sources, which includes operation of gasoline-powered landscape maintenance equipment, which produces minimal GHG emissions.

Estimation of operational energy emissions was based on CalEEMod land use defaults and total area (i.e., square footage) of the Multifamily Residential project. Annual natural gas and electricity emissions were estimated in CalEEMod using the emissions factors for Pacific Gas and Electric (the site's energy provider) and adjusted to account for 33% of electricity as a result of the RPS by 2020. The Multifamily Residential project would also comply with the 2016 Title 24 standards as incorporated in CalEEMod.

Water supplied to the Multifamily Residential project requires the use of electricity. Accordingly, the supply, conveyance, treatment, and distribution of water would indirectly result in GHG emissions through use of electricity. A 20% reduction in water consumption was incorporated into the CalEEMod model to account for compliance with CALGreen standards. The Multifamily Residential project would generate solid waste, and, therefore, result in CO_2e emissions associated with landfill off-gassing. CalEEMod default values for solid waste generation were used to estimate GHG emissions associated with solid waste. A diversion rate of 75% was assumed for the Multifamily Residential project per requirements of AB 341.

The estimated operational GHG emissions from mobile sources, area sources, energy consumption, solid waste, water consumption, and wastewater treatment associated with the Multifamily Residential project in 2022 are shown in Table 13-7. Details of the emission calculations are provided in Appendix G. As shown in Table 13-7, the Multifamily Residential project would result in of 639 MT CO_2e per year and would be below the PCAPCD GHG threshold of 1,100 MT CO_2e per year. Additionally, as presented in the previous Health and Human Services building section and Table 13-5, operation of the Health and Human Services building would generate 369.89 MT CO2e annually. The combined operational emissions from both the Multifamily Residential project and the Health and Human Services building would be 1,208.92 MT CO2e. While this exceeds the PCAPCD de minimus GHG emission threshold, it remains well-below the bright line cap of 10,000 MT CO_2e. Therefore, the Multifamily Residential project's GHG emissions would result in a **less than significant** impact individually and in combination with the Health and Human Services building**.**

Table 13-7
Estimated Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions
Multifamily Residential project

Emission Source	CO_2	CH_4	N_2O	CO_2e
	Metric Tons per Year			
Area	72.10	<0.01	<0.01	72.55
Energy (natural gas and electricity)	148.49	0.01	<0.01	149.28
Mobile	394.77	0.02	0.00	395.34
Solid waste	2.33	0.14	0.00	5.78
Water supply and wastewater	10.65	0.17	<0.01	16.14
			Total Emissions	**639.09**
			PCAPCD GHG Threshold	1,100
			Threshold exceeded?	No

Source: Appendix G
Notes: CO_2 = carbon dioxide; CH_4 = methane; N_2O = nitrogen dioxide; CO_2e = carbon dioxide equivalent.
Project GHG emissions are based on the "mitigated" CalEEMod outputs which includes incorporation of water reduction consistent with CALGreen and and a 75% diversion of solid waste per Assembly Bill 341.

Commercial/Office

The project would create approximately 540,000 square feet of commercial/office/community space on the PCGC property. Based on a review of statewide annual solid waste disposal, CalRecycle determined that in 2016, the average solid waste disposal rate was 5 pounds per 1,000 square feet per day. Using this rate, the project would generate approximately 2,700 tons of solid waste annually or 52 tons per week. With a diversion rate of 50%, the effective solid waste generation rate of the proposed commercial/office space is 1,350 tons per year or 26 tons per week.

Residential

Implementation of the PCGC Master Plan Update is expected to include development of approximately 485 new residences on the project site. Project build-out would result in a population increase of approximately 1,300 residents. Based on a review of statewide annual solid waste disposal, CalRecycle determined that in 2016, the average solid waste disposal rate was 6 pounds per person per day (CalRecycle 2018). Using this rate, the project would generate approximately 1,423.5 tons of solid waste annually. With a diversion rate of 50%, the effective solid waste generation rate of the proposed commercial/office space is 712 tons per year or 13.7 tons per week.

Total

With all proposed site uses considered, the Master Plan Update would generate approximately 2136.8 tons of solid waste per year or 41 tons per week. The WRSL has a permitted throughput of 1,900 tons per day and typically receives less than 700 tons per day. The project would not cause the WRSL to exceed capacity and this impact would remain **less than significant**.

Health and Human Services Building

The proposed Health and Human Services building would accommodate ~~141~~ 142 new employees by 2035. This would generate approximately 83.19 tons per year of solid waste, with 41.6 tons anticipated to be disposed of within the WRSL. As discussed above, the WRSL has sufficient capacity to receive this additional solid waste and this impact would remain **less than significant.**

Multifamily Residential Project

The proposed Multifamily Residential building would accommodate up to 100 dwelling units and 268 residents. This would generate approximately 293.46 tons of solid waste annually, with 146.7 tons anticipated to be disposed of within the WRSL. As discussed above, the WRSL has sufficient capacity to receive this additional solid waste and this impact would remain **less than significant.**

Table 5-2 of the North Auburn DeWitt Trunk Sewer Capacity Evaluation Report. The off-site mitigation program shall be coordinated, reviewed, and approved by the ~~Facility Services~~ Department of Public Works, Environmental Engineering Division prior to or concurrent with the Improvement Plan approval for the Health and Human Services building. The on-site development project sewer improvements shall not be accepted as complete by the County until the County accepts the off-site sewer mitigation program improvements, which may be constructed by others, as complete.

18.5 REFERENCES CITED

County of Placer. 2003. DeWitt Government Center Facility Plan EIR. Prepared for Placer County Department of Facility Services. Prepared by North Fork Associates. December 2003.

County of Placer. 2018a. Placer County Government Center Master Plan, Draft Strategic Vision. Prepared by Williams + Paddon. November 16, 2018. http://www.placer.ca.gov/pcgc.

County of Placer. 2018b. Placer County Government Center Master Plan, Draft Strategic Vision, Appendix E Wet Utility Plan. Prepared by Cartwright Engineers. November 16, 2018.

Nevada Irrigation District (NID). 2015. Urban Water Management Plan. Prepared by Brown and Caldwell. June 2016.

Placer County Water Agency (PCWA). 2016. 2015 Urban Water Management Plan. Prepared by Tully and Young. June 2, 2016.

Stantec. 2016. North Auburn DeWitt Trunk Sewer Capacity Evaluation Report. March 6, 2016.

increases in traffic. It also reflects consideration of the project objectives as described throughout the proposed PCGC Master Plan Update and in this EIR. As discussed in Section 3 of the proposed PCGC Master Plan Update, development of the proposed land use plan and the project alternatives reflects the goal of "creating a balance of different land uses throughout the campus and utilizes proposed site and building improvements to create or reinforce open spaces at a pedestrian-oriented scale."

Impacts 8-1 and 8-5 were determined to be significant and unavoidable because build-out of the proposed PCGC Master Plan Update would require demolition of structures that are identified as contributing features within the DeWitt General Hospital Historic District. Thus, in developing project alternatives, the design team explored options for retaining more of the existing buildings that are contributing features to the historic district. This included reviewing comments received on the Notice of Preparation for this EIR to identify specific buildings that were suggested to be retained, such as the theater, building 315, and auditorium, building 208. This also included consideration of the degree to which individual buildings have been modified over time. As a result, the design team identified two areas within the historic district where greater retention of existing buildings, with the limitations of repurposing the long narrow barracks/hospital ward building footprints, might potentially reduce the project's effects – retention of the buildings within the block of buildings numbered in the 100 series, which is referred to as the 100 ramp and is located between B Avenue and C Avenue, and retention of some of the buildings on the 300 ramp which is located between D Avenue and F Avenue, including the theater building. The 300 ramp buildings were identified as those that have been subject to relatively few modifications and therefore the area that retains a greater degree of the original construction of the historic district during its period of significance. However, as indicated in Chapter 3, Project Description, the 300 ramp buildings are vacant and the majority of these buildings have been vacant for many years. Due to the long period of their vacancy, these buildings have not been maintained for use and would require a substantial degree of rehabilitation to be usable. Due to the nature of 75 year-old unreinforced brick wall and wood-framed roof structure that is associated with the original semi-permanent construction type of the DeWitt General Hospital, most of the buildings within the historic district would require extensive structural and building-wide systems upgrades, hazardous materials abatement, and ADA improvements to meet new functional and programmatic needs, requirements of the California Historic Building Code, in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Historic Buildings. Modifications would be required for each of the structures to provide for the health, safety and welfare of the building occupants. The specific extent of the modifications necessary for each structure would be based on the proposed use and the existing conditions of the building.

Impacts 10-1, 10-2, 10-8, and 10-9 were determined to be significant and unavoidable because build-out of the proposed PCGC Master Plan Update would generate traffic that would increase delays at several intersections during the PM peak hour. While feasible mitigation is available to

conceptual land use plan), adding structured parking south of the 4-story buildings, and increasing the height of the buildings south of the structure parking to 5 stories (compared to 3 stories under the conceptual land use plan). The buildings around the roundabout would include retail and commercial uses on the ground floor to maintain a portion of the mixed use town center concept. This alternative would require modifying the proposed Development Standards to increase the maximum allowable building height so that the5-story buildings would be permitted.

Development of this alternative included consideration of increasing residential uses on the western portions of the project site, such as west of Richardson Drive between B Avenue and Bell Road, and increasing the density of the residential uses proposed for the southwest corner of the project site. These concepts were rejected from further consideration because of their potential to increase environmental impacts, including creating land use conflicts between the residential and government office land uses, increased visual impacts and change in visual character, and additional loss of biological resources in the southwest corner of the site.

Alternative 2 would result in the following land uses: 97,156 square feet of retained buildings that are contributing features to the historic district, approximately half of which would be used for residential space and half of which would be used for private commercial and government offices, 242,100 square feet of new government office buildings, 652,900 square feet of new residential space (in combination with the retained buildings in the historic district, this alternative would accommodate 699 dwelling units), 64,900 square feet of new mixed use buildings, 60,600 square feet of hotel space, and 30,000 square feet of Community/Events Center.

3. **Alternative 3: Greater Historic District Retention through Increased Non-Residential Intensity Alternative.** This alternative seeks to reduce impacts to the DeWitt General Hospital Historic District by retaining more of the existing buildings, which is accomplished by increasing the intensity of the new non-residential uses within the project site. The increased intensity is expressed through increased building height and introducing structured parking. This increases the land coverage and floor-area-ratios through some of the non-residential portions of the site. A sketch representing this alternative is shown in Figure 20-3. This alternative would retain most of the 100 ramp buildings (buildings 107 through 118), and a portion of the 300 ramp buildings, including the theater (building 315) and the 6 buildings to the west and southwest of the theater (buildings 311 through 314, 321, and 322). The retained buildings would be modified as necessary to ensure compliance with current building codes in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior standards to allow for adaptive reuse of the buildings, with office uses anticipated for the 100 ramp buildings and a potential for office, commercial, and/or residential in the 300

ramp buildings. To accommodate retention of these buildings, this alternative would increase building intensity in the government offices portion of the PCGC property and reorienting the community green. This includes shifting the proposed Health and Human Services building to the west, allowing retention of buildings 107, 108, and 109, incorporating the Agricultural Commissioner's office within the same structure, and introducing structured parking to the land north of the Richardson Drive/D Avenue intersection. The Community/Events Center would be constructed north of the retained 100 ramp buildings, and the community green would be separated from the Community/Events Center and reoriented to extend from west to east between County Center Drive and 1st Street. The County Administration building would have a smaller footprint but would be 3 stories tall rather than 2 stories as proposed. The proposed annex to the Finance Administration Building would be reduced in footprint and building height; much of the uses proposed for the annex would be located within the 100 ramp buildings instead. The mixed use town center area proposed to the south of the roundabout at Willow Creek Drive and 1st Street would remain largely the same as proposed, with the addition of a parking structure to the southwest of the roundabout.

Alternative 3 would result in the following land uses: 145,562 square feet of retained buildings that are contributing features to the historic district, all of which would be used for private commercial and government offices, 220,200 square feet of new government office buildings, 318,800 square feet of new residential space (providing 319 dwelling units), 79,800 square feet of new mixed use buildings, 60,600 square feet of hotel space, and 30,000 square feet of Community/Events Center.

Table 20-1

Summary of Land Uses in Each Alternative

Land Use	Proposed PCGC Master Plan Update	Alternative 2: Greater Historic District Retention through Increased Residential Intensity Alternative	Alternative 3: Greater Historic District Retention through Increased Non-Residential Intensity Alternative
New County Office Buildings	242,100 square feet	242,100 square feet	220,200 square feet
Residential			
Adaptive Reuse	0 square feet	45,948 square feet (46 dwelling units)	0 square feet
New Construction	446,300 square feet (446 dwelling units)	652,900 square feet (653 dwelling units)	318,800 square feet (319 dwelling units)
Mixed-Use, Commercial, Governmental			

Land Use	Proposed PCGC Master Plan Update	Alternative 2: Greater Historic District Retention through Increased Residential Intensity Alternative	Alternative 3: Greater Historic District Retention through Increased Non-Residential Intensity Alternative
Adaptive Reuse	41,077 square feet	46,077 square feet	145,562 square feet
New Construction	122,600 square feet (39 dwelling units)	64,900 square feet (0 dwelling units)	79,800 square feet (0 dwelling units)
Hotel	60,600 square feet (101 rooms)	60,600 square feet (101 rooms)	60,600 square feet (101 rooms)
Community/Events Center	30,000 square feet	30,000 square feet	30,000 square feet
Total Building Space	**820,077 square feet**	**1,082,756 square feet**	**775,162 square feet**
Total Dwelling Units	**485 dwelling units**	**699 dwelling units**	**319 dwelling units**

Alternatives Considered but Rejected:

In addition to the alternatives selected for additional analysis, the following alternatives were initially considered but rejected from further consideration. The CEQA Guidelines provide that reasons to eliminate potential alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR can include (1) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, (2) infeasibility, and (3) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts. Factors that may be considered to determine if an alternative is feasible include site suitability, economic viability, and general plan consistency. The following alternatives were preliminarily considered but rejected from further evaluation for the reasons described below.

4. **Site Alternative – Option 1.** This alternative would develop the Site Alternative Option 1 identified in the proposed PCGC Master Plan Update. Under this option, modifications to existing street patterns, building sites and utility infrastructure would be minimized. Access to the site would be provided by the existing County Center Drive, which would enter the site and end at the Central Green Space. C Avenue would bisect the Central Green, and this street could be used during events and for vendors and food trucks. County buildings would be located along Richardson Drive, and extend to the west of the site along B Avenue. The west edge of the site along 1st Street and F Avenue would support residential, retail and mixed use projects. Housing would also be provided at the southwestern corner of the site off of Atwood Road. This alternative was rejected from further consideration because it would develop largely the same amount of office, commercial, and residential uses as the proposed project and would not retain any more of the contributing features to the historic district than proposed. Thus, this alternative was rejected from further consideration because it would not reduce impacts associated with loss of contributing

features to the historic district, and would not reduce traffic impacts compared to the proposed project.

5. **Site Alternative – Option 2.** This alternative would develop the Site Alternative Option 2 identified in the proposed PCGC Master Plan Update. Under this option, County Center Drive would extend to F Avenue, terminating in a roundabout at the intersection of the two streets. County buildings would be arranged around this roundabout to create a plaza space. This point would also mark the western end of F Avenue, and allow for the separation of Corporation Yard functions from other campus uses. In order to accommodate the ~~Central~~ Community Green, a portion of C Avenue would be removed. The Central Green and Community/~~-~~Events Center would be located between 1st Street and County Center Drive. D Avenue would be used during events and for vendors and food trucks. Non-county uses would be consolidated in the southeastern corner of the site. Site Alternative Option 2 provides for more retail uses than Site Alternative Option 1. This alternative was rejected from further consideration because it would develop largely the same amount of office and residential uses as the proposed project but would increase retail uses. It would not retain any more of the contributing features to the historic district than proposed. Thus, this alternative was rejected from further consideration because it would not meet the project objectives related to land use planning and the desired mixture of land uses, would not reduce impacts associated with loss of contributing features to the historic district, and would not reduce traffic impacts compared to the proposed project.

6. **Site Alternative – Option 3.** This alternative would develop the Site Alternative Option 3 identified in the proposed PCGC Master Plan Update. Under this option, County Center Drive would be extended to F Avenue and the County Administrative Center would be located along Bell Road. The Central Green would be located along County Center Drive, and the Community/~~-~~Events Center would be placed at the intersection of D Avenue and County Center Drive. The Community Development Resource Center and County Administrative Center would surround County Center Drive to provide a primary gateway to the Government Center. F Avenue would support mixed use and retail uses, with residential uses located along the southeast end of the site. F Avenue would be extended through the Corporation Yard to Atwood Road. This alternative provides a large percentage of non-County residential uses that would be located along 1st Street. This alternative was rejected from further consideration because it would develop largely the same amount of office and residential uses as the proposed project. It would not retain any more of the contributing features to the historic district than proposed. Thus, this alternative was rejected from further consideration because it would not meet the project objectives related to land use planning and the desired mixture of land uses, would not reduce impacts associated with loss of contributing features to the historic district, and would not reduce traffic impacts compared to the proposed project.

alternative, none of the contributing features to the historic district would be demolished. County buildings planned within this area under the proposed project include the Health and Human Services building and the Agricultural Commissioner and Farm Advisor building. The Community/Events Center, community green, hotel, residential uses, and parking lots are also planned within the historic district boundaries.

As discussed under Alternatives 2 and 3, the retained buildings within the historic district would be modified according to the California Historic Building Code and Secretary of the Interior Standards for Historic Buildings to accommodate a wide range of adaptive reuses. Under this alternative all new construction would occur outside of the historic district. To accommodate construction of the approximately 950,000 square feet of new uses included in the proposed project, this alternative would involve intensification of both the office and residential/mixed use portions of the proposed project. This would involve the modifications to the proposed land use plan shown under both Alternative 2 and Alternative 3. It would also require retention of the 200 ramp buildings, which would substantially reduce the amount of space available to develop the community green. It would also require retention of buildings 208, 209, and 210, which would require modifications to the road network, specifically the proposed southward extension of County Center Drive and the proposed alignment of D Avenue. This would require relocation, reduction in size, or elimination of the proposed hotel use. This alternative was determined to be incapable of meeting most of the basic project objectives because it would require substantial increases in the land use intensity on other portions of the project site, which would not allow the project design to meet the land use planning concepts advanced in the proposed PCGC Master Plan Update, specifically the objectives related to creating a pedestrian-orientated scale of development, it would increase the degree of change in the existing visual conditions of the project site by substantially increasing building heights and requiring construction of several parking structures, and it would not decrease other environmental effects.

20.3.1 Alternative 1: No Project/No Build Alternative

Under the No Project/No Build Alternative, the project site would remain in its current condition. No building demolition, grading or new construction would occur. The site would remain vacant, and the existing non-native grassland, riparian habitat, and woodlands would not be removed. No changes to land use designations under the Auburn Bowman Community Plan would occur. It is expected that modifications to building interiors would occur to allow for more efficient office and government service operations.

Land Use

Both construction and operation of the PCGC Master Plan Update would result in less-than-significant impacts associated with energy consumption. The No Project/No Build Alternative would result in no changes in existing levels of energy consumption on the project site. Further, no energy consumption associated with construction, vehicle trips, or on-site operation would occur. However, this alternative would not accommodate the increase in government space necessary to serve the anticipated increases in County population, thus it is likely some amount of new government office construction would be needed offsite, which could result in additional energy consumption. Additionally, the existing buildings within the PCGC property that are proposed to be demolished and replaced with new construction are not energy-efficient. The proposed project would construct buildings that meet or are designed to meet Zero Net Energy concepts, which would improve the overall energy-efficiency of the built environment within the PCGC property.

Impacts related to energy consumption would be less than significant under the PCGC Master Plan Update. Because the proposed project would improve the overall energy-efficiency within the property, and this benefit would not be achieved under the No Project/No Build Alternative, impacts related to energy conservation would be increased under this alternative compared to the proposed PCGC Master Plan Update.

20.3.2 Alternative 2: Greater Historic District Retention through Residential Uses.

The Greater Historic District Retention through Increased Residential Intensity Alternative, considers retaining a larger portion of the DeWitt General Hospital Historic District by increasing the intensity of the proposed residential land uses while providing for development of a similar mix of land uses as the proposed PCGC Master Plan Update. This alternative would retain buildings 114, 115, 116, 117 and 118 (the chapel), 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 403, 419, 420, 423, and 430 consistent with the proposed project. In addition, this alternative would also retain buildings 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, and 315 (the theater), 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, and 323. These buildings would be modified consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's standards for treatment of historic resources to attain compatibility with current building code standards and accommodate adaptive reuse of the buildings for office, commercial, and residential land uses, similar to the uses anticipated under the proposed PCGC Master Plan Update.

In comparison to the proposed PCGC Master Plan Update, Alternative 2 would retain 56,079 more square feet of buildings that are contributing features to the historic district, which would be adapted for residential use. Including the adaptive reuse areas, this alternative would increase the amount of residential space within the PCGC property by 206,600 square feet, allowing a total of 699 dwelling units, compared to the 485 units under the proposed project. Residential land uses would remain within the maximum allowable ~~desnity~~density of 30 dwelling units per acre. This

alternative would also decrease the amount of mixed use building space to 64,900 square feet, compared to the 122,600 square feet under the proposed project. This alternative would introduce three parking structures to the project site and would increase the height of several of the buildings shown on the conceptual land use plan, including constructing four 5-story residential buildings. This alternative would develop the same amount of government office space in the same building heights and configurations as identified on the proposed conceptual land use plan, and the same amount of hotel space, at 60,600 square feet, and Community/Events Center space, at 30,000 square feet, as the proposed project.

Under Alternative 2, the PCGC property would support a total of 1,082,756 square feet of land uses, which is an increase of 262,749 square feet compared to the proposed project. The same changes to land use designations under the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan and similar impacts to existing non-native grassland, riparian habitat, and woodlands would occur. Those buildings that are retained would be subject to internal and external building modifications to ensure appropriate upgrades for life and safety are made commensurate with the adaptive reuse intent of the building, and in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior standards for historic structures.

Land Use

The proposed PCGC Master Plan Update would result in no impact to land uses within the PCGC campus. The Greater Historic District Retention through Increased Residential Intensity Alternative would result in similar changes to land uses in the project vicinity. This alternative would have similar land use impacts as the PCGC Master Plan Update because it would develop a similar mixed-use project, with government office land uses concentrated in the central portion of the project site, and a mixed-use town center area in the southeast portion of the site. By increasing the building intensity in the southeast corner of the project site, which includes increasing residential building height to 5 stories and introducing structured parking, this alternative could create land use conflicts with the neighboring single-family residential neighborhood to the southeast due to greater changes in the visual character of the area and increased noise from project operation. This project would increase the number of dwelling units within the project site, providing greater support for attainment of the County's housing goals than the proposed project. Because this alternative could increase land use conflicts with existing adjacent land uses, this alternative would have greater impacts to land use and planning than the proposed project.

Population and Housing

The proposed PCGC Master Plan Update would not result in any significant impacts associated with the provision of housing nor would the project induce substantial growth elsewhere in the County. Under the Greater Historic District Retention through Residential Intensity Alternative, the PCGC property would support 214 more dwelling units than the proposed project. This would

efficiency would be completed as part of the overall modifications needed to accommodate adaptive reuse of these buildings, it is unlikely that the existing buildings could be retrofitted to achieve a similar energy efficiency as new construction. Thus this alternative would result in an increase in the total energy consumption within the PCGC property. However, all new construction would be subject to the same energy-efficiency requirements of the proposed project, and thus Alternative 2 would result in similar changes in energy consumption within the project site as the proposed project.

20.3.3 Alternative 3: Greater Historic District Retention through Increased Non-Residential Intensity

The Greater Historic District Retention through Increased Non-Residential Intensity Alternative considers retaining a larger portion of the DeWitt General Hospital Historic District by increasing the intensity of the proposed office land uses while providing for development of a similar mix of land uses as the proposed PCGC Master Plan Update. This alternative would retain buildings 114, 115, 116, 117 and 118 (the chapel), 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 403, 419, 420, 423, and 430 consistent with the proposed project. This alternative would also retain buildings 311, 312, 313, 314, 315 (the theater), 322, and 323. These buildings would be modified consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's standards for treatment of historic resources to attain compatibility with current building code standards and accommodate adaptive reuse of the buildings for office and commercial land uses, similar to the uses anticipated under the proposed PCGC Master Plan Update.

In comparison to the proposed PCGC Master Plan Update, Alternative 3 would retain 104,485 more square feet of buildings that are contributing features to the historic district. It would also reduce the amount of residential space within the PCGC property by 127,500 square feet, allowing a total of 319 dwelling units, compared to the 485 units under the proposed project, and decrease the amount of mixed use building space to 79,800 square feet, compared to the 122,600 square feet under the proposed project. As shown in Figure 20-3, the retained buildings would be used for office and commercial space. This alternative would also introduce two parking structures to the project site. This alternative would develop the same amount of hotel space, at 60,600 square feet, and Community/Events Center space, at 30,000 square feet, as under the proposed project.

Under Alternative 3, the PCGC property would support a total of 775,162 square feet of land uses, which is a decrease of 44,915 square feet compared to the proposed project. The same changes to land use designations under the Auburn Bowman Community Plan and similar impacts to existing non-native grassland, riparian habitat, and woodlands would occur. Those buildings that are retained would be subject to internal and external building modifications to ensure appropriate upgrades for life and safety are made commensurate with the adaptive reuse intent of the building, and in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior standards for historic structures.