

PLACER COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT RESOURCE AGENCY

CERTIFIED COPY

PLACER COUNTY SUNSET AREA
PLAN/PLACER RANCH SPECIFIC
PLAN DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT REPORT (PLN15-00283/
PLN16-00341), PUBLIC REVIEW
AND COMMENT SUPERVISORIAL
DISTRICT 2

Public comments begin on page 81 - sih

Reporter's Transcript of Proceedings

LOCATION: Planning Commission Hearing Room
3091 County Center Drive
Auburn, California

DATE AND TIME: Thursday, February 14, 2019

| | |
|----|--------------------------------|
| 1 | |
| 2 | |
| 3 | APPEARANCES |
| 4 | |
| 5 | PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS: |
| 6 | |
| 7 | JEFFREY MOSS, CHAIRMAN |
| 8 | |
| 9 | SAMUEL CANNON |
| 10 | |
| 11 | RICHARD JOHNSON |
| 12 | |
| 13 | ANDERS HAUGE |
| 14 | |
| 15 | WAYNE NADER |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | ALSO PRESENT: |
| 22 | |
| 23 | E.J. IVALDI, Planning Director |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |

---o0o---

P R O C E E D I N G S

---o0o---

CHAIRMAN MOSS: Good morning everybody. Welcome to this February 14th meeting of the planning commission. If you'd all stand and please join me in the flag salute.

(Flag salute.)

CHAIRMAN MOSS: Thank you. Roll call, please.

COMMISSION SECRETARY: All right. Mr. Cannon.

COMMISSIONER CANNON: Here.

COMMISSION SECRETARY: Mr. Johnson.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Here.

COMMISSION SECRETARY: Mr. Nader.

COMMISSIONER NADER: Here.

COMMISSION SECRETARY: Mr. Hauge.

COMMISSIONER HAUGE: Here.

COMMISSION SECRETARY: And Mr. Moss.

CHAIRMAN MOSS: Here.

Report from the planning director. Morning,
E.J.

MR. IVALDI: Good morning. E.J. Ivaldi, planning services division. I think Mr. Sevison, Commissioner Sevison was gonna also try to make it down

1 today, but given the weather over the Summit, I'm not
2 sure that's going to happen, especially given my drive
3 up here this morning.

4 So anyway, glad you're all here to make it.
5 Just a few quick items this morning, update on a board
6 meeting that happened last Tuesday or actually on
7 February 5th, as you recall, the third-party appeal of
8 the Habad of Roseville was scheduled at that hearing.
9 The board did not hear that item that day. There was an
10 issue with public noticing and the 300-foot surrounding
11 property notice. So what they did, they continued that
12 to an open date and a new date has not been set yet for
13 that.

14 The next board meeting is going to be
15 February 26th. The board will consider the Placer --
16 the hearing's properly (unintelligible) specific plan
17 amendment at that hearing. That is scheduled for 10:10
18 that morning. And then the other item is the first of
19 several zoning text amendments, which our commission
20 recommended approval of last year. As you recall, the
21 board, when we got to the board late last year, they
22 decided they wanted me to break that up into increments
23 just so it's more digestible to the public and to the
24 board itself. So at that hearing, we're going to be
25 taking the ground-mounted solar and cellular facilities,

1 those zone text amendments. And that is scheduled for
2 10:30, February 26th.

3 So our upcoming planning commission meetings,
4 you might be happy to hear that we will not be going to
5 Tahoe on February 28th. We're going to be canceling
6 that meeting. So the next planning commission meeting
7 that is scheduled will be here in Auburn. That's going
8 to be on March 14th. A couple projects that might be of
9 interest that will be on that agenda, the Placer County
10 Government Center master plan, and then also one of the
11 White Hawk projects down in Granite Bay.

12 So for today's meeting, we have two draft EIR
13 items that were scheduled. I know the chairman will go
14 over the protocol prior to each of those items today,
15 but for those in attendance that would like to provide
16 public comment, we have sign-in sheets over here to my
17 left. I've already seen a number of people utilize
18 those. So anybody else who wants to get on those lists,
19 please now would be a good time to do that.

20 And also, you will notice we have a court
21 reporter here who is here to -- for the first item. She
22 says that she can go quite long, an hour and a half, but
23 at some point, if she needs a break, we may need to take
24 a short intermission.

25 So that's all I have. Do you have any

1 questions?

2 CHAIRMAN MOSS: Questions? No.

3 MR. IVALDI: All right. We can get started.

4 Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN MOSS: All right. Now is the time in
6 the meeting for public comment. Anybody who would like
7 to make a comment that is regarding anything that is not
8 on today's agenda is welcome to come forward and do so.

9 MR. ROOD: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members
10 of the commission my name is Bart Rood.

11 CHAIRMAN MOSS: One moment, if you would,
12 please. Just a matter of protocol, the hearing is for
13 public comment. As well as most things of this meeting,
14 we will try to limit the time for each speaker to three
15 minutes, please.

16 Go ahead. Thank you.

17 MR. ROOD: Thank you, sir. Good morning,
18 Mr. Chairman and members of the commission. My name is
19 Bart Rood, Kramer Road, Auburn. I am a member of
20 Protect Rural Placer. You have probably heard of us.
21 And our interest, of course, is the proposed parking lot
22 to be located at 5345 Bell Road. That would be a
23 parking lot that would provide additional access to
24 Hidden Falls Regional Park.

25 We are opposed to the parking lot. We're

1 opposed to the extension of the trail system from Hidden
2 Falls Regional Park, because that amounts to
3 urbanization of an agricultural area. As you're aware,
4 that area has been in agriculture since the 1850s. The
5 Rood Family farm is adjacent to that particular area.

6 So I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you.
7 This has not become an issue that has been discussed
8 publicly to a great deal. We are proactive. We do not
9 want to be reactive. The whole idea of the review of
10 the SEIR was to have been in October, and now it's
11 delayed until May, perhaps May of 2019. And so time
12 moves on. Last word, the supervisors meeting,
13 February 5th, the board of supervisors approved an
14 additional \$50,000 of expenditure towards this SEIR
15 project. And I want you to please understand that the
16 ag folks in Placer County are few in number. We are far
17 outnumbered by equestrians, by hikers and by mountain
18 bicyclists. We hope that you will listen carefully and
19 preserve agriculture in Placer County and protect rural
20 Placer County. We appreciate your time and thank you
21 very much.

22 CHAIRMAN MOSS: Thank you.

23 MS. ROOD: Good morning. My name is Delana
24 Rood. I live in North Auburn on Kramer Road. My
25 family's ranch is directly across Bell Road from the

1 entrance to the proposed Hidden Falls Regional Park
2 expansion parking lot for 100 cars, 40 trucks and
3 trailer rigs, a stable, bike concession, restrooms and
4 more. I am also part of the Protect Rural Placer group.

5 According to Cal Fire, almost 85 percent of
6 fires in California are human caused, and of that, 7
7 percent are arson. A wildland fire can travel from
8 about 6 miles an hour up to 14 miles an hour and perhaps
9 more. This proposed trail expansion is in a rural area
10 of Auburn that has limited access. The total of the
11 proposed Hidden Falls Regional Park expansion trail
12 extension is to cover 3700 acres with 60 miles of
13 trails. There is 3600 acres of private property right
14 in the center known as Big Hill.

15 This area covers dry oak woodlands and heavily
16 wooded brushy hills and gorges that are extremely
17 combustible with very little access for firefighters.
18 We believe with 3700 acres and 60 miles of trails, there
19 could easily be over 1,000 people on a single, busy day
20 on these trails. It will be very likely that some
21 hikers will make it a two-day hike and leave the trail
22 to camp out. This will create a high potential for
23 wildland fire from camp fires.

24 Additionally, there is a high potential for
25 homeless camps in such a large trail network. And I

1 might tell you that we've already had homeless people
2 camping on the backside of our ranch on Ore Creek. All
3 of this is to go on with no park ranger, no law
4 enforcement to monitor the activity in the Big Hill
5 area. The proposed expansion is less than four miles
6 from the densely populated Highway 49 business district,
7 the county facilities here at DeWitt, the hospital,
8 several schools and a multitude of convalescent
9 facilities as well as thousands of people who work and
10 live in the area.

11 Remember, a fire -- wildland fire can travel at
12 a rate of 6 to 14 miles an hour. Can you imagine trying
13 to evacuate all of North Auburn in an hour? Perhaps you
14 remember the Forty-Niner fire right across the highway
15 here eight or nine years ago. I watched it from a
16 hilltop, and I can tell you that I and my neighbors were
17 pretty scared about the possibility of that
18 leapfrogging.

19 We have been safe so far, because there is no
20 public access to this remote wildland area.
21 Unsupervised public access will clearly increase the
22 potential for fire. Our other big concerns are the
23 roads and cost. I ask that you recommend to the board
24 of supervisors that they deny this regional park
25 expansion. By doing so, Placer County will show they

1 are taking steps to protect the people --

2 CHAIRMAN MOSS: Thank you.

3 MS. ROOD: -- that live here and prevent a
4 catastrophic fire. Thank you.

5 MS. KIET: This is Valentine's Day, and I've
6 never done anything like this on a Valentine's Day. So
7 this is unusual. My name is Jean Kiet. I've been here
8 before. I live at 5395 Bell Road, which is next door to
9 5345 Bell Road. And I have found that most of the
10 people that listen to us, if they're listening, if
11 you're listening, have never had any questions, have
12 never had any comments. I realize this is a formal
13 meeting, but it's very difficult when you're living in a
14 place where you have all of these fears of what's going
15 to be happening, and you get absolutely nothing.

16 This environmental impact review is -- report is
17 taking forever, and one of the reasons for that is, as
18 you heard, the park's administrator, after listening to
19 all of us who object to this development in our
20 community, has been adding and adding and adding as
21 things come up to the contract. And now, he's gotten
22 approval for a \$50,000 addition in order to complete the
23 environmental impact. That's necessary in order to
24 finally get it, if we get it and if he stops adding once
25 we keep telling him what we object to.

1 Also, you may have gotten a little note from me
2 showing that the survey that came out of their
3 department is totally inapplicable. They're not enough
4 responses in that type of a survey, when you look at the
5 size of our county, to really be significant. So there
6 is an awful lot that has been going on from day one that
7 is inappropriate and is not on behalf of the property
8 owners and the local residents.

9 I've asked people, commissioners and others,
10 "Have you gone out and looked at the property? Do you
11 know what we're talking about? Have you looked around
12 to see all of the other properties surrounding this?"
13 When you turn off of Bell Road onto 5345, there is a
14 small driveway. It's not real wide. It only goes as
15 far as the house on the top ten acres. There has never
16 been a road in this particular area. That's not a road.
17 It's a driveway. And the back part of the property,
18 which is the 40 acres, has never had a road. So this is
19 not an appropriate access. Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN MOSS: Thank you. All right. Is there
21 anybody else who would like to make a public comment
22 that is not on the agenda today?

23 MR. GAVNEY: Good morning. My name is Wally
24 Gavney. I live at 4961 --

25 CHAIRMAN MOSS: Sorry, Wally.

1 MR. GAVNEY: That's okay. I live real close to
2 this proposed parking lot. I can get there in three
3 minutes. What we have here, in my mind, is a couple
4 problems. One is it's zoned residential ag. I don't
5 know where a parking lot comes into play there. The
6 other issue I think we have is on Marysville, the other
7 access and parking lot has a lot of problems still. So
8 I'm not sure why, which is opening up another can of
9 worms when we haven't fixed the first.

10 Anyway, I'm vehemently opposed as much as all my
11 neighbors here. I oppose that twilight parking lot.
12 And thank you for listening.

13 CHAIRMAN MOSS: Thank you. Anyone else?

14 Okay. With that, we will close this portion and
15 move on to the consent agenda then.

16 COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: I'll make a motion.

17 COMMISSIONER HAGUE: Second.

18 CHAIRMAN MOSS: We have a motion and a second.
19 Roll call, please.

20 COMMISSION SECRETARY: I have a motion by
21 Mr. Johnson and a second by Mr. Hague.

22 So Mr. Cannon?

23 COMMISSIONER CANNON: Yes.

24 COMMISSION SECRETARY: Mr. Johnson?

25 COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Yes.

1 COMMISSION SECRETARY: Mr. Nader?

2 COMMISSIONER NADER: Yes.

3 COMMISSION SECRETARY: Mr. Hague?

4 COMMISSIONER HAGUE: Yes.

5 COMMISSION SECRETARY: And Mr. Moss?

6 CHAIRMAN MOSS: Yes.

7 Okay. We're now coming up to our 10:05 item
8 with Placer County Sunset Area Plan and Placer Ranch
9 Specific Plan. When it gets time for public comment, I
10 would like to remind you to keep your comments only on
11 the environmental impact document. We will ask that you
12 sign up prior to and wait until your name is called to
13 speak. Limit these comments to three minutes for an
14 individual. If you represent a group or organization,
15 that time limit will be extended to five minutes.

16 We're not going to yield or share or allocate
17 other people's time towards an individual already
18 speaking, so we'll stick with the three and five minute
19 limits. The yellow light is giving you your last minute
20 warning and telling you it's time to kind of wrap up
21 your thoughts and do it, but we will try to hold very
22 strictly with these time limits.

23 And I think that's kind of got the basic rules
24 covered. It's all yours.

25 MS. JACOBSON: All right. Thank you,

1 Mr. Chairman.

2 Good morning members of the commission. My name
3 is Crystal Jacobson. I am a civil planner with the
4 planning services division here today to present to you
5 on the draft environmental impact report for the Sunset
6 Area Plan and Placer Ranch Specific Plan. As you had
7 just noted, the meeting purpose here today is to receive
8 comment on the draft environmental impact report
9 prepared for this project. The CEQA guidelines do
10 encourage counties and cities to hold public hearings on
11 environmental documents and so that has been our policy
12 for years to do that.

13 And today this hearing is, again, just to focus
14 on the draft environmental impact report. Certainly
15 here to answer questions that you might have on that
16 analysis and then to accept comments, but not to get
17 into the merits of the project.

18 So I am joined today by a number of folks who
19 are part of our planning team. Michelle Kingsbury with
20 the County Sacramento office is here. She'll be
21 assisting with the presentation along with Vance Jones
22 from McCane and Stumps, a consultant that helped with
23 the preparation of the Placer Ranch Specific Plan
24 project, so he will also present. And then we also have
25 our environmental consultant with (unintelligible)

1 Environmental here today. Mike Parker is the lead on
2 that and various technical experts. So if something
3 comes up on an item that I am not able to adequately
4 answer your questions, we can certainly call on someone
5 else to do that. So we have technical experts on staff
6 and also consultants in the room.

7 So this slide just kind of highlights the public
8 notification process for this. It's very standard in
9 our office. Property owners within 300 feet of the
10 project boundaries. All folks who have commented on
11 this process has been underway since late 2016, so we
12 have a number of folks on our e-mail distribution list.
13 Those folks have been providing comment along with some
14 key stakeholders in cities and other agencies. And then
15 I did want to point out, we did provide copies of the
16 DEIR to a number of different libraries that kind of
17 went above what we typically do for the -- providing
18 those documents in the libraries, and we also provided
19 some copies for check-out. So people were able to
20 actually check out the copies and take them home with
21 them.

22 This is a graphic that shows the existing
23 vicinity of the Sunset Industrial Area plan. It's out
24 in West Placer, I think, as you know. So the area in
25 red is the existing boundary of the Sunset -- what we

1 call the Sunset Industrial Area Plan boundary. We have
2 the city of Lincoln to the north, city of Rocklin to the
3 east and city of Roseville to the south here. This area
4 that you see kind of in gray or purple is the Placer
5 Ranch Area, so meshed within the Sunset. This slide
6 here shows the proposed boundary. You can see it has
7 been expanded here, and I'll talk a little bit about
8 that in a minute. But here is the Placer Ranch site.
9 So it's within the south area of Sunset. And you'll see
10 65 and then 80 over here.

11 So by way of background, this area has always
12 been anticipated for development, largely slated for
13 industrial, although there is some agriculturally zoned
14 areas to the west of the site. And so the intent really
15 in the existing Sunset Industrial Area Plan is that this
16 site is to promote economic development providing
17 opportunity for job growth in the region. So there is a
18 lot of policies, existing policies in that plan. I'll
19 speak to that.

20 So the long term really dates back -- actually
21 dates back to over 50 years to create that employment
22 hub in South Placer. The idea is to capitalize on the
23 proximity of Highway 65, the rail lines and the nearby
24 growing communities of West Placer. So the first
25 formally adopted plan was this 1997 plan that we are

1 updating now. In 2002, Placer Ranch partnered with Sac
2 State to bring a university to that site. So Placer
3 Ranch has been kind of in and out of process for a long
4 time, and I think Michelle will touch on that. But then
5 in 2014, our board initiated an update to the Sunset
6 Area Plan -- Industrial Area Plan. Really, the purpose
7 was to re-brand that area and establish a new vision and
8 development plan. The objective is really to reposition
9 the land to attract some new users, achieve economic
10 development and create jobs. And then Placer Ranch was
11 added to the work program in 2016 by a direction from
12 our board or with direction from our board. And really,
13 Placer Ranch project has revisions for our public
14 universities, critical backbone infrastructure, which
15 would really catalyze the job creation and economic
16 growth through the Sunset Area. So that's really the
17 reasoning behind that decision.

18 So just some key visioning factors for this
19 project. Really, the three key components is
20 employment, so job creation, a university on the Placer
21 Ranch site, which I will let Michelle and Vance talk
22 about, and then housing. And then I'll touch on the
23 housing in the Sunset Area Plan. The amendment to the
24 Placer Ranch Specific Plan does include a town center, a
25 university and then housing in addition to that. So

1 again, job creation, kind of trying to create a
2 job/housing balance within the region.

3 This is an overview of the work program. The
4 Sunset Area Plan is a policy document. It includes a
5 set of implementing zoning regulations, corridor design
6 standards. There was an existing condition report
7 prepared, economic market analysis as you see here, a
8 number of different documents and text studies that went
9 into the preparation of the plan.

10 The Placer Ranch Specific Plan has the specific
11 plan documents, design guidelines, development
12 standards. In addition to the tech studies, a utilities
13 master plan, and then at the end, there will be a
14 development agreement prepared for that project.

15 And then still underway is a capital improvement
16 and finance plan, and then of course the environmental
17 document which analyzes both as you see in the document
18 there. So analyzes the Sunset Area Plan and a
19 problematic level, and then Placer Ranch had a project
20 level with the exception to a Sac State piece, which is
21 really analyzed more in a problematic level, because
22 they intend to come in with some future master planning
23 of that site, at which time it would be subject to CEQA.

24 So this just shows both plans combining into one
25 map here. So again, this is the Placer Ranch. You can

1 see it's a lot less specific in terms of the land uses
2 proposed here. This is the university site here, and
3 this is the Sunset, and I will talk a little about those
4 land uses in the Sunset in just a minute here.

5 In terms of the tasks, our documents completed
6 to date, a lot of work has gone into this project to get
7 to where we are now. But the last time we were before
8 your commission was back in February of 2018 when we had
9 the least preliminary drafts of the two plans, and so we
10 presented that to your commission to seek some input,
11 and since that time, we've really now been preparing
12 this document that's before you today.

13 We did prepare a couple of different
14 administrative draft EIRs. I will say that we have
15 worked really closely with our key stakeholders, mainly
16 the cities and the agencies, governmental agencies just
17 to make sure that this document was prepared in
18 coordination with them.

19 I drink a lot of water. Sorry about that. So
20 I'm just now going to talk about the Sunset Area Plan
21 before I turn it over to Michelle to talk about Placer
22 Ranch. So this is really what consists of the Sunset
23 Area Plan as you have before you today. So the area
24 plan is again a policy document, and it covers these
25 different resource chapters that you see there, and then

1 you have that implementing zoning at the end and some
2 appendices, which is the corridor design standards and
3 guidelines, and then again, the two pending documents
4 are still underway.

5 So this is the land use map of Sunset. And
6 really, the big changes that you'll see from the
7 existing plan, you know, most of this is all zoned
8 industrial today. We do have industrial remaining here.
9 This is the existing built environment that's largely
10 industrial. Up in here, this is our preserve and
11 mitigation reserve land. There are existing preserved
12 areas there, and then (inaudible). So that was
13 reflective of that, the landscape.

14 But the two big changes is this area here, which
15 is the entertainment mixed-use district, and then right
16 here is innovation center that you'll see on both sides
17 of this. This actually has a development reserve on it,
18 so any future planning here would be required to go
19 through assistant plan process.

20 This is our zoning map. I intended to implement
21 that larger land plan, so you can see -- excuse me --
22 the zone districts are really consistent with the land
23 use designations that I just described.

24 So real quick, I just want to touch on some
25 notable components. Again, I have presented this before

1 your commission last year. I'm going to -- I'll touch
2 on them really quick. One is the plan includes an
3 expansion of the Sunset Area Plan boundary that I have
4 shown you before. That was with direction from our
5 board. (Unintelligible) there are 25 acres to the west
6 side as being included in the plan area. We are also
7 proposing an increase in density. This would be for
8 Sunset and Placer Ranch, and it would be from 21 units
9 to 30 dwelling units per acre for high-density
10 residential, general commercial and tourist/resort
11 commercial land uses.

12 So it would really allow -- so this would be a
13 general plan amendment that would allow the Sunset Area
14 Plan and the Placer Ranch Specific Plan to set their own
15 development standards to go to that density, and that
16 density is consistent with state housing law for Placer
17 County. We are seeing it as a metropolitan area or
18 organization, and so we are required to show density
19 capacity up to 30 dwelling units to per acre.

20 And then we also have a refinement to a public
21 facility buffer requirement that is in the general plan.
22 So we are proposing a change to that buffer, which I
23 will touch on here in a minute. It would update
24 residential, commercial and recreational uses near the
25 landfill site. So it's really the proximity of those

1 uses to the property that -- the property boundary of
2 the landfill. And then we also have a level-of-service
3 change -- oops. I'll touch on residential use in just a
4 minute -- but a level-of-service change, which would
5 allow for a level-of-service change of E at major
6 intersections and really focuses on reduction of what we
7 call vehicle miles traveled. And then the two other
8 changes are a residential use allowance in the Sunset
9 Area. Under the existing zoning, residential uses are
10 not allowed in the Sunset Area with exception to the --
11 there are some areas that are zoned farm right now to
12 have one single-family home on the site there. But our
13 board saw value in trying to provide some opportunity
14 for work-force housing in the Sunset Area, and so there
15 is a provision that would allow residential uses. They
16 would be subject to landfill buffer standards, and they
17 would -- they are all required to have a use permit and
18 required to be subordinate to an employment-generating
19 use on site. So it's really that kind of work-housing
20 balance is what we're trying to achieve there.

21 And then for the scale and height standards, we
22 have some zoning changes that would allow an increase in
23 height in many of the zones within the Sunset Area and
24 the Placer Ranch Area. This just shows you -- this is a
25 table out of the Sunset Area Plan. I will point out

1 these buffer standards actually live in our general
2 plan, but we have also included them in the Sunset
3 document. So the change right now under our existing
4 general plan, this -- the solid waste disposal site in
5 Placer for residential is one mile, and so we're
6 proposing to reduce that to 2,000 feet. However, there
7 is a note here that it can be considered on a
8 case-by-case basis to be as close to 1,000 with approval
9 of a specific plan, master plan or development
10 agreement. So for Placer Ranch, the -- there is -- the
11 specific plan is the tool to do that. And then for
12 commercial and recreation, these numbers have not
13 changed here, the 1,000 and 500, but what has changed is
14 that we added a footnote here that those uses within the
15 buffer zones may be considered on a case-by-case basis
16 with approval of, again, a specific plan, master plan or
17 development agreement.

18 So this just shows those buffers. This exhibit
19 is actually out of the Sunset Area Plan. You can see
20 the 2,000 feet here, 1,000 and 500. I've also overlaid
21 that onto the Placer Ranch site in case you wanted to --
22 you have any questions about that.

23 So real quick, I just wanted to touch on Placer
24 Parkway, because it is a key, I would say, component of
25 the plan. This connects State Route 65 at the Whitney

1 Ranch Parkway to the State Route 70/99, the Sutter
2 County West. I'm going to actually flip to this
3 exhibit, because it's better to look at. So Caltrans
4 and the city of Rocklin have already constructed the
5 Whitney Ranch Parkway, State Route 65 interchange.
6 That's this area over here. Placer County Department of
7 Public Works is proposing to construct that second half
8 of the interchange and the Placer Parkway multi-lane
9 expressway to Foothills Boulevard, so it's seen here in
10 this cross-hatched area.

11 We have received the NEPA and CEQA clearance for
12 that, for a project level phase one of that. And our
13 Department of Public Works is working on final designs.
14 They do anticipate that to be under construction within
15 two or three years actually. And so the remainder of
16 the parkway would be designed and constructed over time
17 as funding becomes available. I do want to point out
18 that this parkway does serve existing development within
19 the region. It's really what we see as critical
20 infrastructure, provides improved circulation and is
21 really seen as a critical regional stipulation element
22 within West Placer.

23 So with that, I'm going to turn it over to
24 Michelle and Vance to touch on the Placer Ranch, and
25 then they will hand it back to me to walk through the

1 environmental document.

2 MS. KINGSBURY: Good morning, commissioners.
3 Michelle Kingsbury with the county executive office and
4 the other half of Crystal. I am the project manager on
5 the Placer Ranch site. I'll do a brief introduction and
6 then turn the presentation over for the Placer Ranch
7 component to Vance Jones as quick as I can with Stumps
8 Engineering who is our consultant on this project.

9 So as Crystal mentioned, the board took the
10 unique position in 2016 to insert itself more or less in
11 a developer role to continue the process for the Placer
12 Ranch Specific Plan. And I'll go through kind of a lot
13 of the notable reasons why we did that, and then we'll
14 delve into the actual land plan itself.

15 So in terms of a lot of these items, Crystal has
16 already mentioned, but I think it's important to
17 reinforce the goals and objectives of the Placer Ranch
18 Specific Plan. The first one being to complement the
19 Sunset efforts and the efforts that have been in place
20 for decades to turn the Sunset Area into a regional
21 employment hub, to provide for a balance of mixed jobs
22 and housing balance in the plan area as well as the
23 other key item is to provide for a site for a satellite
24 campus for Sac State in that area.

25 We do have a number of acres set aside for open

1 space preserves, and we are PCCP compliant, i.e., that
2 we are in that yellow area, as all of you are very
3 familiar with on the map, but the area does
4 (unintelligible) for growth. These projects are --
5 Placer Ranch and Sunset are both wholly within those
6 yellow areas.

7 We do, as Crystal mentioned, provide for
8 approximately three miles of reservation right-of-way
9 for the Placer Parkway to continue that effort along the
10 northern border of the plan area. There is a number of
11 transit routes, and Vance will get into more detail on a
12 lot of these items. And designation of that would be
13 RTA aligned through to the plan area as well. We've got
14 a regional serving bikeway path network with connection
15 up to existing facilities, as well as providing for
16 connections within into the Sunset Area Plan as well as
17 the adjacent jurisdiction.

18 It does provide, as Crystal mentioned, for a
19 town center. Juxtaposed next to the planned university
20 site is more a little bit denser, your high-density
21 residential units within that area. It does provide
22 for -- as Crystal mentioned, we are underway, we have a
23 draft and we are currently refining it in terms of a
24 fiscal impact as well as the public facility site
25 (unintelligible) to be financed, trying to provide for a

1 fiscally responsible plan. There is a number of school
2 sites -- excuse me -- two school sites; one an
3 elementary and one a middle school, in addition to the
4 university site that are designated within the plan
5 area. And last, but not least, parks, open space that
6 are in compliance with our general plan standards of
7 five acres per thousand for each one of those.

8 Obviously one of the major, if not the major
9 reason the board chose to insert itself in the Placer
10 Ranch Specific Plan processing was the opportunity to
11 provide for a satellite site for the Sacramento State
12 University. It provides for the donation of
13 approximately 300 acres. You'll see in the land plan
14 we'll get to next, it's the light blue color right in
15 the middle of land plan. It's anticipated that the
16 first phase could be anywhere between 500 and 2500 Sac
17 State students and a thousand Sierra College students.
18 It's planned for a Sierra College transfer center on
19 campus where it's almost seamless where students come
20 down, go to Sierra College and Sac State in one
21 location.

22 Over a 20-year horizon, we expect about 17,000
23 students broken up into 12,000 through Sac State and
24 5,000 for Sierra College. But the ultimate buildout
25 that we project would be 30,000 students, broken up

1 between 25 and 5 between Sac State and Sierra College.
2 However, as Crystal mentioned, it is a propriatic (sic)
3 analysis related to the university site, and they will
4 come back later on with their master planning efforts
5 and tier off the land use document.

6 This is an exhibit of the land plan, and with
7 this, I'm going to transition over to Vance Jones of
8 McCane and Stumps to provide a more detailed description
9 of the land uses and land plans, and certainly we're
10 available to answer any questions after that. And then
11 Crystal will come back and conclude the presentation.

12 MR. JONES: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and
13 members of the commission. Michelle put up here for
14 your consideration the land use plan for Placer Ranch.
15 Placer Ranch is actually about 2200 acres of the larger
16 Sunset industrial area, and I'll start by just quickly
17 orienting you to some of the roadways that lead into the
18 plan area. Along the southern area of Placer Ranch is
19 existing limits to the city of Roseville. There are
20 some existing roadways that serve this plan area. A
21 portion of Sunset Boulevard here comes in from the east
22 and connects to Highway 65, and then there is a portion
23 of Foothills Boulevard that extends from the terminus of
24 Sunset Boulevard, extends northwards to Athens Avenue,
25 all within the Sunset Area. And then right through the

1 middle of the plan area is Fiddymment Road, which is an
2 existing two-lane facility.

3 All of the balance of the roadways shown here on
4 the land use plan would be improved and/or expanded
5 through the development of the Placer Ranch Area. So
6 that includes the extension of Sunset Boulevard through
7 the plan area. It connects to the city of Roseville to
8 the east. We've actually got a specific plan called the
9 Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan that's been approved within
10 the city of Roseville that Sunset Boulevard would
11 eventually connect to. The same with the new
12 construction of Campus Park Boulevard which would
13 provide an east/west arterial and collect the roadway
14 system within the plan area that parallels Placer
15 Parkway.

16 And both Crystal and Michelle have mentioned the
17 right-of-way provisions of the Placer Parkway that are
18 included within Placer Ranch is about 158 acres
19 associated with the Placer Parkway right-of-way. That's
20 about a 312-foot right-of-way width with a corridor
21 established by the plan area that allows this parkway to
22 get constructed in the long term as plans and funding
23 come available.

24 As Michelle mentioned, the obvious component of
25 Placer Ranch is the 300-acre blue site, which is for

1 Sac State right in the center of the plan area aligned
2 along Fiddymment Road. To the north of that and nestled
3 against Placer Parkway is what we're calling the campus
4 park employment center. That's about 335 acres of
5 non-residential uses. Generates about 4.5 million
6 square feet of non-residential uses at full buildout.
7 And this has a -- and I'll talk to this a little bit
8 more -- a mixed-use approach that would support
9 professional office campuses, research and development,
10 warehousing, light industrial uses and even some limited
11 commercial uses.

12 And then here just to the south of the campus
13 park employment center and immediately east of the
14 university is what we're calling the town center
15 district, and that's got a mixture of uses of both
16 commercial mixed use as well as higher-density
17 residential uses on about a 200-acre area that are
18 intended to ultimately form a downtown light environment
19 that's purposely cited in proximity to the employment
20 center and the university.

21 The balance of the plan area, you can see there
22 is a lot of yellow. This is the low-density residential
23 uses. Those are focused primarily to the west of
24 Fiddymment Road. The light green part that we see here
25 is the open-space reserves that are included throughout

1 the plan area. The light blue parcels are -- this is an
2 elementary school site and a middle school site. The
3 green parts here -- the green parcels are park parcels,
4 the seven neighborhood parks provided throughout the
5 plan area. The couple instances is we've got the larger
6 parks cited adjacent to schools on purpose, so you could
7 maximize some joint use-recreation activities there.
8 And then smaller park spaces cited throughout the
9 residential neighborhoods, so there is always a park
10 space within a close distance to a residential
11 neighborhood.

12 Most notably there is a pocket of residential
13 here along the southern edge of the plan area which is
14 for an active adult community. Another pocket here
15 along the eastern edge of the plan area for a smaller
16 active adult community, and the parks within those
17 communities would more than likely develop as private
18 recreation centers that serve those active adult
19 communities.

20 What's important to point out here as well is
21 that this land use plan has evolved a little bit since
22 the commission last saw it last February. Some of the
23 key changes that were made to the plan in response to
24 various comments received last year, as well as working
25 with some of the adjacent jurisdictions. Over here in

1 this area, the plan -- well, first and foremost, we
2 pulled all of the school and residential uses outside of
3 the 2,000-foot buffer that was established for the
4 landfill facility. So what resulted there was this
5 school site slid southward and now is aligned along
6 Sunset Boulevard. That park grew. Some of the land
7 uses up here were adjusted. There were no longer
8 residential land uses, but instead campus park,
9 commercial and park uses.

10 Over on the eastern edge of the plan area,
11 Foothills Boulevard was realigned pursuant to
12 discussions with Roseville City staff. The aligning of
13 Foothill Boulevard used to come down like this on the
14 prior plan. It now has been shifted to the east a
15 little bit to utilize the Duluth corridor to the portion
16 of the Sunset Area Plan here. Ultimately, that would
17 connect with the existing northern terminus of Foothills
18 Boulevard located to the south in the city of Roseville.

19 In addition, we introduced some new residential
20 along the eastern edge of the plan area, that active
21 adult community that I mentioned used to be labeled as
22 campus park. And so we've done overall just some
23 re-balancing of the land uses within the project for a
24 couple of reasons: To make sure that we have a good mix
25 of residential uses, to pull the residential uses

1 outside of the 2,000-foot buffer, and then also we
2 increased the amount of park acreage to be consistent
3 with general plan policy, because the prior plan had a
4 slight shortfall that was originally intended be met
5 within (unintelligible). This plan stands on its own.
6 It meets general plan requirements of the five acres per
7 thousand.

8 Moving quickly into the land-use summary, for
9 residential, we've got 5,636 units allocated to the
10 Placer Ranch component of the Sunset Area Plan. About a
11 thousand of those are in an age-restricted, land-use
12 category, and about 1500 of those are in the
13 high-density residential category. Most of those HGR
14 units are focused in the town center district, and that
15 number also includes 300 -- they're called reserve
16 units, but they're really floating units that be could
17 allocated to any parcel within the town center district.
18 So if, as the town center builds out, some of the
19 commercial sites want to introduce a residential
20 component or some of the HGR sites want to have a
21 density bonus or something, that gives the county staff
22 the ability to rent those density bonuses.

23 For the non-residential component, all in
24 between the university and the campus park and the
25 commercial uses, the plan allocates about 8.4 million

1 square feet of non-residential units -- excuse me,
2 non-residential square footage, which could equate to
3 upwards of 15,000 new jobs added to this plan area.
4 Those numbers are slightly lower than in the plan that
5 you saw last February. We used to have about
6 9.5 million square feet. I should point out, too, that
7 the residential unit allocation has dropped as well with
8 the shifts in the land-use plan. That used to be about
9 5800 units and we dropped about 200 units with the
10 current plan.

11 In addition to that, we are providing a
12 significant amount of open space and parks to meet the
13 County's general plan requirements. In fact, we're
14 providing more open space than is needed by the general
15 plan. And then also we've noted here a separate line
16 item for the Placer Parkway corridor. That's about 158
17 acres that is allocated for the future right-of-way for
18 Placer Parkway.

19 I'll touch on this very, very briefly, because
20 I've hit on it a lot already. Residential units, again,
21 we've got about 5600 units allocated throughout the plan
22 area for residential. We've got several school sites
23 planned; a 10-acre elementary school site, a 22-acre
24 middle school site, and then we've got several other
25 public facility sites that, in aggregate, total about 10

1 acres for various needs that support the community.
2 We've got a site for a large water storage tank,
3 recycled water storage tank, groundwater wells, other
4 facilities like that that the county will need to
5 maintain a land area like this.

6 Parks and open space. Again, we've got seven
7 neighborhood parks included in the development plan,
8 nearly 240 acres of open-space preserves, and another 26
9 acres allocated for paseos. Paseos, for those that
10 aren't familiar with that term, it's very, very similar
11 to a park. Just think of it as a long, linear park.
12 It's developed much like a park, but has more passive
13 recreation opportunities. And within the land plan,
14 those features provide more trail linkages to connect to
15 neighborhoods with schools and other features.

16 Campus Park, I'll touch on that in a minute.
17 That, again, is a large employment center component of
18 Placer Ranch, and Michelle already touched on the
19 301-acre site that's allocated for Sac State's
20 university and center plan area.

21 Crystal touched on the general plan amendments
22 that are associated with Placer Ranch. Again, the
23 increase in the density for HGR is received by Placer
24 Ranch, particularly in the town center district, where
25 we expect the highest-density residential land uses to

1 occur. And then also the height limits for buildings,
2 particularly in the campus park district, the general
3 plan would be amended to allow those building to become
4 higher than the current zoning will allow.

5 Crystal touched on the 2,000-foot buffer from
6 the landfill. Like I said, we did revise the land-use
7 plan to pull all of the residential and school uses
8 outside of that 2,000-foot buffer. And even though we
9 have a specific plan in the development agreement that
10 could allow those uses to get as close as 1,000 feet, we
11 just felt that it was better planning to keep everything
12 outside the 2,000-foot level. So we're not seeking any
13 special -- any special considerations up 1,000 feet with
14 the current plans before you.

15 This slide here highlights the campus park
16 district. Again, that's about 335 acres located on the
17 northern edge of the Placer Ranch Plan Area, aligned
18 along Placer Parkway purposely so it has good visibility
19 from this future regional-serving roadway. Again, it's
20 about 4.5 million square feet of non-residential uses
21 could ultimately develop here. Community employment
22 overall, like I mentioned before, about 15,000 jobs
23 could be created through the implementation of buildout
24 of Placer Ranch.

25 And then I'll touch briefly on the town center

1 district here. Really, the notion here is you've got
2 about a 200-acre area that's adjacent to the university
3 and the campus park employment center -- excuse me --
4 campus park employment center is immediately to the
5 north, and the university is immediately to the west of
6 this district. Really, it's the area north of Sunset
7 Boulevard, kind of sandwiched in between Sunset, the
8 campus park employment center and the university where
9 the highest intensity and density of uses are planned.

10 Adjacent to the university, the commercial
11 mixed-use parcels there are intended to develop like a
12 small downtown setting, with commercial buildings, maybe
13 mixed with residential that feel like a small downtown.
14 That would be linked with the main street through a
15 high-density residential area to some more commercial
16 mixed-use parcels that are aligned along the Foothills
17 Boulevard corridor. Really, the thinking there is, is
18 that on the west edge of this district is the downtown
19 environment. On the east edge of this district is where
20 you would have more traditional, suburban
21 neighborhood-serving shopping center, like a grocery
22 store anchor. But the whole district is anchored by the
23 central village green that could be programmed by county
24 parks for farmers markets or concerts in the park once
25 this area develops. And all of that is surrounded by

1 higher intensity and density residential uses.

2 This slide really hits on the bikeway network
3 plan with Placer Ranch. If you focus on the green
4 dashed lines here, that's the class one,
5 street-separated bikeway system that's located either in
6 the parks, open space corridors and the paseo linkages
7 that I mentioned. And that's a ten-foot wide pathway
8 with a four-foot decomposed shoulder for joggers and
9 walkers that thread through all the open-space areas and
10 link up to various residential neighborhoods, to the
11 schools and parks and university.

12 In addition to that, there is -- what the pink
13 line work on this exhibit shows are all the trails that
14 are located in the landscaped corridors adjacent to
15 roadways. So in total, between those two systems,
16 you've got about 22 miles of street-separated pathways
17 that are provided in the plan area.

18 And then in addition to that, the light blue
19 dashed line would represent the on-street, Class II bike
20 lanes that are geared more for the bicycle commuters.
21 And those are provided on all major backbone roads,
22 including arterials and collective streets.

23 This slide highlights all of the open-space
24 parks and school sites in the plan area. I've hit on
25 those briefly, but again, we've got an elementary school

1 site on the far west of the plan, a middle school site
2 there, the university site and it's central to the plan
3 area. All of the open-space preserves are shown here as
4 well in light green. You can see through the university
5 site, there is actually going to be some open-space
6 preserves that will happen as the university develops,
7 too. So that's part of a larger, interconnected system
8 here. And then as well as the neighborhood parks are
9 illustrated on this diagram.

10 Major roadways, as I mentioned before, there are
11 several existing roads within the plan area, and those
12 are shown in dark blue; the connection of Sunset
13 Boulevard out to Highway 65 and the extension of
14 Foothills Boulevard north into the Sunset Area, as well
15 as Fiddymment Road through the middle of the plan area.
16 The dashed gray line shows the future route for Placer
17 Parkway that's being planned for. And then the lighter
18 blue lines are just some of the other major backbone
19 roadways planned within the plan area.

20 Within the core of the plan area, these are all
21 our arterial roadways, and then as you move further
22 west, because of the residential nature of the plan
23 area, those actually transition to collective streets.

24 Transit. Transit is something that the plan has
25 put a lot of forethought into. It's hard to really see

1 this at this level, but all of the roadways within
2 Placer Ranch have been designed to accommodate future
3 local bus service. So on the downstream side of every
4 major intersection in here, the bus turnouts have
5 already been predesigned, so there is space for busses
6 to be accommodated in the future as transit is
7 implemented here.

8 In addition to that, we've noted a conceptual
9 route for bus rapid transit, and that's shown in the
10 pink dashed line. And this route is by no way finalized
11 by PCTPA. This is a long-term vision for how BRT can be
12 accommodated within Placer Ranch, but the notion here is
13 that the portion of Placer Parkway is used for that BRT
14 route, and ideally, that route would come off-line of
15 Placer Parkway and come within the project where it
16 provides adjacency to the university, the employment
17 center and campus park, as well as the town center
18 before it links to neighboring jurisdictions in
19 Roseville.

20 In addition to that, the transit master plan
21 will be prepared by the county in the future. And that
22 will guide implementation of transit through this area
23 as Placer Ranch builds out.

24 I'll touch briefly on utilities, because there
25 are some critical infrastructure components here

1 associated with Placer Ranch. First and foremost is
2 working with PCWA on a 42-inch regional-serving water
3 line that connects to their treatment facility up in
4 Ophir and it comes all the way down to West Placer. And
5 that's shown here in this dark blue line, and really,
6 the Placer Parkway corridor is where that line will
7 originate. But that 42-inch water line comes into
8 Placer Ranch via Campus Park Boulevard. It will connect
9 to a future 5.1 million gallon water storage tank that
10 serves the region before it exits the plan area and
11 continues west.

12 In addition to that, there are several
13 inter-ties to Placer Parkway system here along Placer
14 Parkway corridor as well as existing facilities that are
15 located in Sunset Boulevard and Nichols. And then also
16 inter-ties are shown along the southern and the western
17 edge of the plan area where Placer Ranch's backbone
18 water system can tie into the systems located in the
19 city of Roseville. And the purpose of that is to
20 provide a redundant, reliable supply of water both for
21 the county as well as for the city.

22 Recycled water is shown here. It's probably a
23 little bit too much detail to go into at this level, but
24 the nuts and bolts of it are that at the southern edge
25 of the plan area where Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard comes

1 into Placer Ranch from the city of Roseville, Placer
2 Ranch can tie into existing infrastructure there to
3 provide recycled water for Placer Ranch and the Sunset
4 Area. And that pipeline would be extended into the plan
5 area to a storage tank and pumping facility, which then
6 feed lines throughout the plan area that would provide
7 irrigation water for all non-residential parcels as well
8 as roadway medians and landscape corridors and parks.

9 And then finally, the backbone wastewater
10 infrastructure system here is shown. There is a
11 regional-serving facility located in West Roseville, the
12 Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant. This project
13 would be served by that plant, and there are a couple of
14 tie-in points where offsite infrastructure would be
15 constructed to tie into the regional line to that
16 facility; one down here where Foothills Boulevard exits
17 the plan area, and one here where Fiddymont Road exits
18 the plan area. Those lines would be extended from
19 existing lines located in the city of Roseville, and
20 those are offsite improvements.

21 All right. Well, that's my portion of the
22 presentation. Turn it back over to Crystal to wrap it
23 up.

24 MS. JACOBSON: Thank you, Michelle and Vance.
25 Before we move into talking about the impacts that were

1 identified in the draft environmental document, we just
2 wanted to ask if there were any questions on the Sunset
3 Area Plan or the Placer Ranch Specific Plan. I think
4 this is the time where we could answer questions anyway.

5 CHAIRMAN MOSS: Questions?

6 COMMISSIONER HAGUE: Yeah. Why are we leading
7 in the ability to push residential to a thousand feet
8 within the facilities since they're not really planned
9 to be that close? It just opens up that some day,
10 somebody may want to come in and do a land-use change to
11 be closer, and if so, what are the things you're looking
12 for in the use permit which would allow us to be closer
13 to that landfill?

14 MS. JACOBSON: Well, we have made refinements to
15 the Placer Ranch project in response to comments that
16 we've received. And at this juncture, we have not made
17 those same refinements to the plan in terms of pulling
18 it out to 2,000. It's definitely something that we have
19 talked about. We do know that there is some interest
20 with surrounding properties around the landfill that may
21 come in with specific plans in the future and may want
22 to place work-force housing as close as a thousand. So
23 that was our goal right now is to leave it in at 1,000
24 with approval of a specific plan, master plan or a
25 development agreement.

1 However, I would just point out that the plan
2 itself, both plans can be modified and evolve all the
3 way up until adoption. So there is potential based on
4 comments that we will continue to receive that we would
5 make modifications there.

6 In terms of things that we are looking for with
7 a use permit would be -- would have to do with, like,
8 site design or even the uses that would be proposed. So
9 for example, we might not want to place daycare
10 facilities with outdoor playgrounds, those kinds of
11 things near as close as 1,000 feet. We would also be
12 looking for building designs, HVAC systems that would
13 help. Commercial uses, trying to maintain uses in that
14 area that would be indoor commercial and not necessarily
15 outdoor commercial. To some extent, I think the market
16 will drive that. But there -- we do have actually a
17 mitigation, and I don't have that number offhand, but
18 there is some mitigation in the land-use chapter of the
19 document that speaks to what those types of site and
20 building design features would be that we would be
21 looking for.

22 COMMISSIONER HAGUE: Okay. Another question.
23 Looking at the transit piece you have, what about future
24 alternatives transit modes, such as driverless cars or
25 pods, are they being considered in this transit plan?

1 And is there any kind of transfer station to get people
2 if you get it one location and then move out to other
3 locations?

4 MS. JACOBSON: Well, so I will speak to the
5 Sunset Area Plan. There are a lot of policies that
6 point to that, those types of new trends that would come
7 on-line. So we really did try to create policy in the
8 Sunset Area Plan that is reflective of the fact that
9 there could be changing trends when it comes to transit.
10 With respect to the transit master plan, that was not
11 prepared. That is something that will come in in the
12 future, and we would looking for the Sunset Area Plan
13 policies when we develop that.

14 I don't know. Michelle, do you or Vance want to
15 speak a little bit more to the transit master plan for
16 the Placer Ranch piece? But definitely, those types
17 of -- those types of new trends in transit would be
18 considered.

19 MS. KINGSBURY: Just adding on to what Crystal
20 said, as she mentioned, we'd be, just pretty typical,
21 process requiring a transit master plan to be prepared,
22 which would fine-tune it and delve into those details
23 and look at the policies in the area plan as well and to
24 cost it out. We've also had discussions with the
25 university about that interaction between the two and

1 providing for the kind of transfer center over there as
2 well. But we fine-tune that through the master plan.

3 COMMISSIONER HAGUE: Okay.

4 CHAIRMAN MOSS: Any other questions? No.

5 I have one, maybe just one. I don't know.

6 We'll see where it goes. The current Sunset Industrial
7 Plan has a considerable amount of property that is zoned
8 straight industrial; correct?

9 MS. JACOBSON: Correct. Uh-huh.

10 CHAIRMAN MOSS: The proposed plan does not have
11 any straight industrial proposed zoning. It goes down
12 to light industrial. Is that --

13 MS. JACOBSON: It's light industrial and
14 industrial mixed use, but we were very careful to carry
15 forward all of the existing uses. It's really a
16 re-branding of the title or the name of those zone
17 districts. But the intent is to recognize the existing
18 industrial uses on those sites and really to carry
19 forward those types of uses in the industrial area.

20 CHAIRMAN MOSS: So I guess my -- like I said,
21 there's the area in there that is being serviced by
22 railroad and by (unintelligible) for industrial uses,
23 and would pay to see that those be precluded for being
24 used for what they are ideally suited for, especially
25 with the limited amount of railroad-access property that

1 there is best suitable for those type of uses.

2 MS. JACOBSON: We agree. And that is exactly
3 why we're carrying forward those uses because of that
4 proximity to rail.

5 CHAIRMAN MOSS: And I mean not -- you're
6 carrying forward the actual uses and not users?

7 MS. JACOBSON: Allows users and allows uses,
8 yes.

9 CHAIRMAN MOSS: Okay. I think that takes care
10 of my questions. Thank you.

11 MS. JACOBSON: Uh-huh. Any other questions on
12 the plan before we dive into --

13 CHAIRMAN MOSS: And maybe -- let me stop and
14 take a quick check with our reporter. Are you holding
15 out all right or do we need to take a break for you now
16 before we dive into something new?

17 THE REPORTER: I'm fine.

18 CHAIRMAN MOSS: All RIGHT.

19 THE REPORTER: I just need you to slow down a
20 little bit.

21 MS. JACOBSON: I'm sorry.

22 THE REPORTER: Please.

23 MS. JACOBSON: Okay. I'll try. So I first want
24 to at least -- this line and the next line are just a
25 list of the proposed entitlements. You will find the

1 project description of the EIR. They really illustrate
2 the actions that our board will be asked to take and
3 your commission will be asked to make recommendation to
4 the board. So these have been analyzed. There are a
5 lot of them. They have been analyzed in the EIR. I do
6 want to point out this -- you know, we're talking about
7 planning an area of approximately 8500 acres. So with
8 two big projects, so a lot of actions would be asked for
9 the board's consideration at the end.

10 So for the notice of preparation, again, this
11 process, the environmental process started way back in
12 2016. They end there. The notice of preparation was
13 circulated from November 3rd to December 12th in 2016.
14 We did hold two public scoping meetings at that time.
15 No additional study was prepared with ALP as we assumed
16 and knew that there would be attacks that would be
17 significant and potentially significant, so we just
18 analyzed the full (unintelligible) on-site.

19 These are -- this is a list -- actually, before
20 I get to that, I just want to talk to -- about kind of
21 the timeline of the environmental document. So after
22 the scoping meetings, we did prepare the technical study
23 that I had talked about, a lot of coordination with our
24 neighboring jurisdictions on preparation of those
25 studies. And again, we prepared two different

1 administrative draft EIR's, and also worked with the
2 first one, coordinated with those agencies on
3 preparation of the first one.

4 And then, again, the preliminary public review
5 draft of the plans came out last year. The idea was to
6 get some input and make some changes. We actually did
7 make a lot of changes to transit policy in the Sunset
8 Area Plan, and then, as Vance had noted, we made some
9 modifications or refinements to the Placer Ranch
10 Specific Plan, too, in response to those comments. And
11 then finally, we released the draft document this
12 December.

13 So this list here outlines the areas of
14 controversy that were noted in the ALP. So the EIR does
15 focus on these. I'm sure I am not going to list -- to
16 read all these. But really, the environmental impact
17 tips on all of these areas. It's a long list.

18 And then this is just a list of the impact
19 analysis. Again, I want to point out a couple of
20 things, the sort of organization of the EIR. We
21 analyzed the Sunset Area Plan plan as (unintelligible),
22 Placer Ranch at a project level, real specific, because
23 as Vance highlighted, it gets down into (unintelligible)
24 project being proposed to (unintelligible) the
25 specifics, with the exception to that Sac State site.

1 The intent there is that they would tier off of this
2 document for their own master planning.

3 And then I wanted to point out that there are a
4 lot of offsite improvements associated with this project
5 that are actually outside of the County's jurisdiction.
6 So a lot of them are located in the city of Roseville or
7 they would fall under the jurisdiction of, for example,
8 the Placer PCCPA with the parkway improvement, that kind
9 of thing. So for those, what we have done is we have
10 identified them as other supporting infrastructure. So
11 if you did read the EIR, you will find that in each
12 resource section, we would break down the impact and the
13 conclusions for what we call other supporting
14 infrastructure. And so that could be what you would
15 find in the document as there is a lot of discussion
16 about the Pleasant Grove retention facility. This is a
17 facility located in the city of Roseville boundary, and
18 again, it's offsite and not within the Placer County's
19 boundary.

20 So that's really how the document is organized.
21 So really quick, I'm not going to touch base too much on
22 the no impact or less-than-significant impact. So this
23 was for the Sunset Area Plan and the Placer Ranch
24 Specific Plan, not the offsite, other supporting
25 infrastructure like I just mentioned. So they're listed

1 here, but there are impacts associated with these
2 resource chapters that were found to be either have no
3 impact or less-than-significant impact of mitigation.

4 Same thing for the other supporting
5 infrastructures. So I'm not going to get into those,
6 but what I am going to touch on are the significant and
7 unavoidable. And I just want to point out that, again,
8 large -- you know, about 8500 acres is what we had
9 analyzed. And so there, you probably found that there
10 were a lot of significant and unavoidable. However, I
11 want to provide a little clarity about them. We have --
12 I sort of broke them out into three different
13 categories. One, there are impacts that can be
14 mitigated that are outside the County's jurisdiction.
15 So for those offsite improvement projects, there were a
16 lot of significant and unavoidable impacts that actually
17 can be mitigated to the less-than-significant level.
18 But because they're outside of the County's
19 jurisdiction, we do not have control over the
20 implementation or timing of those mitigation. So they
21 have been deemed significant and unavoidable. And so
22 I'm going to -- I'll talk about what those are, and then
23 I'll dive into the significant and unavoidable that are
24 for the Sunset Area Plan/Placer Ranch, and then I'll
25 talk about the cumulative impacts.

1 So for the significant and unavoidable, these
2 are impacts that can be mitigated to less-than-
3 significant mitigation, but again, they're outside of
4 our control, because they are located offsite and
5 outside of the Placer County boundary, are related to
6 aesthetics, biology, archeological and historical and
7 tribal cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards,
8 hydrology and water quality, transportation, circulation
9 and utilities.

10 So I'm not going to dive into each of these, but
11 I will touch on a couple of them. So a lot of these
12 impacts here in the bio are related to impacts that are
13 associated with the Pleasant Grove retention facility,
14 which is located to the west of the project site in the
15 city of Roseville. All of them except for impact 4.4-8
16 is related to that site, and I want to point out that
17 there is mitigation, standard mitigation practice that
18 the county would implement ourselves, if it was within
19 the county, that would mitigate these impacts to less
20 than significant. Again, we drew a conclusion, a very
21 conservative -- we took a conservative approach, and we
22 do this with all of our projects, so you've probably
23 heard this before, where if the impact and mitigation is
24 outside of the County's authority to implement, then we
25 call it significant and unavoidable. So that is what

1 you see there.

2 Impact 4.4-8, I did want to talk a little bit
3 about. This is interference with -- substantially with
4 wildlife movement. So this has to do with wildlife
5 crossing really over the Placer Parkway. So we've got,
6 you know, a very large circulation system going through
7 the area, the planned area. And so we looked at
8 wildlife movement throughout the plan area and found
9 that there was an impact there. We do have mitigation
10 that would minimize this to less than significant with
11 maintenance of interconnected natural areas that would
12 really protect biodiversity and sustain our eco system
13 in this plan area; however, that mitigation would
14 involve coordination with the Placer County
15 Transportation Planning Agency, since they do have
16 jurisdiction over that parkway. And then the
17 feasibility of incorporating those movement features
18 into the design is (unintelligible), so this impact has
19 been considered significant and unavoidable.

20 And then touching on the aesthetics here, the
21 same thing -- all of these that you see listed here,
22 again, there are very standard mitigation that is
23 available that the County would utilize and implement if
24 it was within the County's jurisdiction, but it's not.
25 And so we have deemed these significant and unavoidable.

1 And I'm not going to -- for the sake of time, I'm not
2 going to touch on those in detail.

3 And then we get to hazards, hydrology and water
4 quality and utilities, and I do want to touch on a
5 couple of these. In the hazards section, especially if
6 it's hazardous materials during construction,
7 interference with implementing the emergency response
8 plan and vector-related health hazards, again very, very
9 standard mitigation is available for those. Those would
10 not have been deemed significant and unavoidable if they
11 were in the County's jurisdiction.

12 For hydrology and water quality, I did want to
13 touch on the two 4.9-3 and 4.9-4, same thing; very, very
14 standard mitigation that you would see the County
15 implement if it was in our jurisdiction. But 4.9-1 has
16 to do with stormwater runoff, and I kind of want to talk
17 a little bit about that. So the analysis includes
18 option for -- two options for mitigation of stormwater
19 runoff. And I'll point out that in this plan area, we
20 have a water shed break through the middle of the Sunset
21 planning area. The waters to the north would flow into
22 the Auburn Ravine and Orchard Creek water sheds, and the
23 waters to the south would flow onto the Pleasant Grove
24 Creek water shed. So for Placer Ranch, all of Placer
25 Ranch would flow into Pleasant Grove. We have had a lot

1 of coordination, a lot of meetings with the city of
2 Roseville about potentially utilizing that facility when
3 it comes on-line for mitigating impacts for the water
4 shed to the south, so all those flows that would run
5 into the Pleasant Grove Creek.

6 However, that facility, it has been approved.
7 It's a -- has gone through, like, a programmatic level
8 environmental analysis, but has not been constructed and
9 it has not gone through any project-level CEQA analysis
10 to date. But we have been engaged with them. The
11 intent is that the flows from Placer Ranch, so we do
12 that project-level analysis to show that that facility
13 that was expanded and that was analyzed in our document,
14 that that facility can handle the flows from the Placer
15 Ranch project and the Sunset, the southern portion of
16 the Sunset.

17 However, I'll point out that what we did is
18 provided for two different options in the mitigation.
19 One is to either -- like in the north, it would go to
20 the Lakeview -- what we call the Lakeview Farms, which
21 is in Lincoln. That site actually is under design and
22 construction to accept stormwater flows. And then in
23 the Placer Ranch and the southern portion of Sunset, it
24 would be to the Pleasant Grove site or retention
25 on-site. And so currently, what we do out there is

1 actually retention on-site. So if somebody comes in in
2 the Sunset Area, we do require them to retain their
3 stormwater flows on-site today. So there is mitigation
4 set up to be an either/or. So when those facilities
5 came on-line or our project came in in the Sunset Area,
6 for example, that's in the north, we would require them
7 to mitigate or retain on-site or to work with the
8 Lakeview Farms facility.

9 So the reason this is deemed significant and
10 unavoidable is because those two facilities, again, are
11 outside of our jurisdiction. So while we have
12 identified them as areas to mitigate stormwater flows,
13 it's really out of our control in terms of securing
14 agreements to do that.

15 And then -- let's see. So for the utilities, I
16 also wanted to touch on the utilities. Here is an
17 impact 4.15-2. This has to do with increased demand for
18 water supply conveyance and water treatment services. I
19 just want to point out this is not necessarily about
20 water supply, but really the conveyance. And so the
21 existing -- there is a -- PCWA has an existing Foothill
22 Water Treatment Plant and Sunset Water Treatment Plant
23 that don't -- that do not have sufficient capacity to
24 accommodate water treatment needs for buildout of the
25 Sunset Area and the Placer Ranch existing plan.

1 However, there is anticipated construction of the Ophir
2 Water Treatment Plant that would have that capacity. It
3 just -- it is not under construction to date. It is
4 planned with PCWA and would certainly accommodate it.
5 It's just not on-line to date. And so this has also
6 been deemed significant and unavoidable, because again,
7 the construction of that facility is outside of the
8 County of Placer jurisdiction.

9 And then for traffic element, there is a number
10 of impacts here. The same thing. They are impacts to
11 areas outside of our jurisdiction. Where mitigation is
12 available, I am going to kind of touch on these. The
13 first is an impact to signalize intersection operations
14 in the city of Roseville. This would increase -- the
15 studies show that would increase delay and degradation
16 for the level of service. The draft environmental
17 document does identify mitigation that would require
18 projects to pay traffic impact fees for their fair share
19 of the contributions to fund improvements to those
20 intersections; however, again, while mitigation is there
21 and it's likely that the city of Roseville will
22 implement that mitigation, it is outside of our control,
23 and so it's been deemed significant and unavoidable.

24 Same thing with the -- the next one is the
25 unsignalized intersection operations with the city of

1 Roseville. This is the same. There was an impact found
2 here. There is a mitigation again identified to pay
3 traffic fees to fund fair share contributions, but
4 again, because these improvements would require approval
5 and implementation by the city of Roseville, they're not
6 within our jurisdiction.

7 And then you'll see the same thing here with the
8 city of Rocklin. The impact associated here results in
9 degradation to level of service and increases delay at
10 intersections that are already operating at an
11 unacceptable level, so it's deemed significant. Again,
12 the mitigation here is the same. Paying traffic fees
13 towards fair share contribution to fund improvements
14 that would reduce these impacts. Again, outside of our
15 jurisdiction.

16 The city of Lincoln is a little bit different.
17 The impact to city of Lincoln is really significant and
18 unavoidable in the short term, because the phase one of
19 Placer Parkway would actually help with this impact. So
20 it's considered significant in the short term until that
21 phase one of Placer Parkway came on-line. But again,
22 any improvements would be outside of the County's
23 jurisdiction.

24 And then for Sutter County, the same thing here.
25 I want to point out that the improvements here, there

1 are -- there is mitigation monies that have already been
2 accepted from other developments in the region, and
3 improvements would be needed to Baseline Road and
4 Pleasant Grove Road north and Baseline Road to Pleasant
5 Grove Road south. And so this would be actually -- the
6 improvements are funded by traffic fees that have
7 already been provided by future development within the
8 Dry Creek Benefit District of Placer County in the CIT.
9 So those would mitigate impacts in that area, but again,
10 it's outside of our control in terms of the
11 implementation and timing of those improvements.

12 And then for Caltrans, here you'll see an impact
13 for 14-9. This would be an impact to the intersections
14 under the Caltrans jurisdiction. And the same thing, we
15 do have mitigation that's been identified in the draft
16 that you'll see for payment of traffic impact fees for
17 fair share contribution that would go towards
18 improvements of highway ramp terminal intersections, but
19 there again, it's -- we cannot ensure implementation of
20 that, of those improvements.

21 And that would be -- those intersections would
22 actually be -- it could be implemented definitely by
23 Caltrans, but also the city of Roseville or the city of
24 Rocklin would be involved in that, too.

25 And then you have impact of freeway operations

1 that you'll see here at the bottom, 4.14-10, and this
2 has to do with the freeway operations on 80 and 65.
3 I'll point out that phases 1-E through 1-C of the
4 Interstate 80/State Route 65 interchange improvements
5 and the phase one and phase two of State Route 65
6 widening project would help to mitigate this impact.
7 And the South Placer Regional Transportation Authority
8 fee program would address some of those; however, full
9 funding those improvements is not available. So because
10 we do have mitigation, again, that would require a fair
11 share contribution towards mitigation or towards this
12 impact; however, because there is only really partial
13 funding that has been identified for these improvements,
14 again, the State Route 65 widening project and the
15 Interstate 80/65 interchange improvement, this has been
16 deemed significant and unavoidable. And again, it's --
17 the authority for us to implement this is outside of our
18 control.

19 So what I'm going to do now is turn to the
20 significant and unavoidable impacts that are associated
21 with the Sunset Area Plan and Placer Ranch, and in some
22 cases, the other supporting infrastructure as well. And
23 that's a list of the resource tractors (sic) that I'm
24 going to touch on. So the first is the aesthetics.
25 Again, what I want to point out is that under CEQA, we

1 do analyze the project based on what we call baseline.
2 That's existing conditions. So while a lot of this land
3 back here is zoned for industrial and has existing
4 development capacity, a lot of it is undeveloped land.
5 And so when I touch on these two impacts, I just want to
6 point out that we think about it in that context; that
7 we're talking about land that is currently undeveloped,
8 we do not have existing development capacity.

9 So for aesthetics, we found that there was an
10 impact to substantial degradation of the existing visual
11 character or quality of the site and its surrounding
12 after buildout. So within the Sunset and the Placer
13 Ranch, we found that there would be a change in the
14 visual character that would be substantial in areas that
15 are currently undeveloped, and where needed,
16 substantially taller development would be proposed and
17 allowed with improvements of these plans. So in views
18 where project development would be placed adjacent to
19 preserves and open space, we also found some impacts
20 there. So we've got all those natural preserves to the
21 north of Sunset, and so it's that abrupt transition
22 between substantially taller developments and those
23 existing open spaces, there would be an impact. So the
24 impact is significant and unavoidable.

25 I have to point that we do have design

1 guidelines prepared for Sunset and Placer Ranch that
2 would certainly facilitate a cohesive outside appearance
3 to that development in landscaping throughout the
4 project area. However, there are no additional feasible
5 mitigation measures that would reduce this impact to a
6 less-than-significant level.

7 And then for -- we also have this impact 4.1-4
8 as it related to light and glare. So the impact is a
9 new source of substantial light or glare that would
10 adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area
11 after buildout. We do have general plan policies,
12 Sunset Area Plan policies and Placer Ranch policies and
13 design guidelines that would emphasize the use of
14 less-reflective surfaces and orientation of the
15 buildings as well as other lighting requirements to try
16 to limit these impacts. However, it's really the
17 quality -- excuse me, not quality -- the substantial
18 source of the light across the entire project area that
19 is the impact here. So there is really no feasible
20 mitigation beyond those policies and those guidelines to
21 lessen this impact.

22 The next one is related to ag resources. And
23 this has to do -- it's impact 4.2-1. This is a
24 conversion of farmland to a non-agricultural use. This
25 applies to the Sunset Area, Placer Ranch and the other

1 supporting infrastructure, mainly that Pleasant Grove
2 retention facility. So the DEIR found that
3 implementation of the project would require conversion
4 of farmland. We have planting farmland, farmland with
5 statewide or local importance and unique farmland
6 designations by the state. So it would convert it to a
7 non-agricultural use. Again, even though some of those
8 areas may have existing development rights, we're
9 talking about land that is designated by the state as
10 farmland.

11 So with resulting conversion of up to 7,295
12 acres of farmlands altogether, and although we do have
13 mitigation that would require a project to mitigate for
14 that loss on a one-to-one ratio, it would really only
15 partially offset the direct conversion of farmland. And
16 so this has been found to be significant and
17 unavoidable.

18 Moving onto air quality, there are a few impacts
19 here. The first is construction emissions of criteria
20 air pollutants and ozone precursors. And so the DEIR
21 found that construction emissions associated with the
22 project, again to be the Sunset Area Plan, the Placer
23 Ranch and the offsite, it would exceed applicable
24 thresholds, and thus contribute to the existing
25 non-attainment status of the Sacramento Valley Air Basin

1 with respect to these emissions. And so for that, we do
2 have mitigation that is identified in the EIR, point
3 that out in your staff report there, that would require
4 implementation of PCAPCD's, the air district recommended
5 construction mitigation measures to include the dust
6 control plans and things like that. However, because of
7 this scale and expense of this project and really the
8 timing of this buildout over a number of years, this
9 impact was found significant and unavoidable.

10 The next is the long-term operational emissions
11 of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors. This
12 found that operations of the project after full buildout
13 would generate emissions, which are precursors to ozone
14 and would exceed the applicable amount of emission
15 thresholds recommended by the air district. So the
16 long-term emissions produced by this project would
17 conflict with their air quality planning efforts and
18 contribute substantially to the non-attainment status of
19 the air basin. So this is significant.

20 Again, we do have a lot of mitigation identified
21 for this, which would require future development
22 projects to demonstrate reduction of area source
23 emissions, mobile source emissions, (unintelligible)
24 emissions as well as purchasing offset through the air
25 district's offsite mitigation fee program. And while

1 that mitigation would reduce these impacts, it cannot be
2 reduced -- it has found that it cannot reduced to less
3 than significant.

4 And then the next impact 4.3-5 has to do with
5 sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants. This
6 applies to both Sunset and Placer Ranch, not the offsite
7 infrastructure. And this found that the development of
8 new residential land uses or other sensitive receptors
9 within 500 feet of State Route 65, which is considered a
10 high-volume roadway, traffic volumes that exceed 100,000
11 trips per day, which is a setback distance recommended
12 by the California Air Resources Board. And then also
13 development of land uses that would be -- excuse me --
14 some of the land uses under the project are trucks
15 loading near residences, schools or child daycares could
16 result in exposure of these sensitive receptors to
17 contaminants. So we do have mitigation that requires
18 incorporation of site and building design features for
19 future development to reduce this impact; however, this
20 impact was found to not -- was not reduced to less-than-
21 significant levels.

22 And then -- oops, I'm sorry. I missed one here.
23 The one at the bottom here, impact 4.3-6, create
24 objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of
25 people. This applies to the Sunset and Placer Ranch and

1 has to do with the change in the buffer policy. And
2 really, it has to do with increased odors at the
3 landfill that are a result of waste generated from this
4 project. So that's specifically what the analysis is
5 doing here, is demonstrating. So the project would
6 generate waste that would be received, processed and
7 disposed of at the Placer County Western Regional
8 Sanitary Landfill, thereby contributing to sources of
9 the landfill odor over time. I'll lose my voice here.
10 As odor generation is generally proportionate to the
11 volume of the waste generated and processed, the DEIR
12 found that the project would, at its peak, represent
13 about 16 percent of the odor currently generated at the
14 landfill site. And at the time that the landfill closes
15 in 2058, it would represent approximately 8 percent of
16 the odor emissions. So it goes down over time. And I
17 do have a specialist here to answer questions if you
18 have any about the odor. It's actually my first dive
19 into odor analysis, but we do have somebody here if you
20 have questions about this.

21 So while the project would not necessarily -- it
22 doesn't create objectionable odors, it would establish
23 residential and other land uses and bring people closer
24 to the odor source, that's the landfill. And that's as
25 a result of that change in the buffer. So based on some

1 existing data that you'll see in the DEIR, namely, there
2 is an exhibit, it's 4.3-1 that shows the location of
3 existing complaint -- odor complaints that the landfill
4 gets on an annual basis. Based on that data, we found
5 that residents beyond one mile are being impacted to
6 date, and there is also some modeling and analysis of
7 post-project landfill odor. So we found that new
8 residents in the Sunset and Placer Ranch Area would be
9 exposed to objectionable odors and may complain about
10 those odors. So the overall number of complaints lodged
11 about odors would potentially increase.

12 As you'll note in our environmental document,
13 the Western Placer Waste Management Authority is engaged
14 with the community. They continually engage with the
15 community on odor management. They are also assessing
16 the viability of odor-reducing approaches through pilot
17 studies. They have pilot studies going on. And they
18 are actively planning a facility and operational
19 improvements as part of what they call a Renewable
20 Placer Waste Action Plan, and the plan is to address
21 growth regulatory requirements and other goals and
22 objectives, including odor controls as a piece of that.
23 However, I want to point out that these measures, again,
24 are beyond the control of Placer County. Annually, the
25 nature, degree and effectiveness of these odor-control

1 measures are unknown at this time. Their planning is
2 still underway. So this is then significant and
3 unavoidable.

4 Okay. Moving onto biological resources. These
5 two here that you see, I just want to point out that
6 with implementation, they are identified as significant
7 and unavoidable. We have two different approaches for
8 mitigation where they can approach through the Placer
9 County Conservation Plan if it were -- when and if it's
10 approved. And if it was approved, these two mitigations
11 that you see -- or excuse me -- these two impacts that
12 you see here could be mitigated to less than significant
13 because of the Placer County Conservation Stratus
14 approach of large-managed reserve systems that would
15 really protect and conserve land rather than a project
16 by project kind of fragmented and isolated approach to
17 mitigation.

18 So you will see impacts here associated with the
19 Sunset and Placer Ranch and other supporting
20 infrastructure related to the loss and degradation of
21 state or federally protected waters as well as vernal
22 pool and western spadefoot habitat. But again, I'll
23 just point out that they are deemed significant and
24 unavoidable. The intent, though, is for projects to
25 mitigate through the Placer County Conservation Plan.

1 And then for greenhouse gas emissions, I want to
2 touch on that. There is an impact associated with
3 operational greenhouse gas emissions. It applies to
4 just the Sunset Area Plan and the Placer Ranch, not the
5 offsite infrastructure. So operation of land uses
6 developed under these plans estimate it should generate
7 about 380,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide implements
8 at buildout. That's for the Sunset. I'm sorry. Excuse
9 me. For Placer Ranch, it would be about 200,000. These
10 levels exceed the air district threshold and have a
11 potential to result in considerable contribution to
12 emissions and climate change and would conflict with
13 state greenhouse gas-reduction targets that have been
14 set.

15 So we do have mitigation identified for this
16 impact, which would require all feasible site and
17 building design features for new development which could
18 offset a single year of operation-related greenhouse gas
19 emissions and reduce those impacts related to
20 operational greenhouse gas emissions; however, that
21 mitigation alone would not reduce the emissions for the
22 life of the project below those thresholds.

23 Okay. Moving on to land use, there is an impact
24 related to consistency and compatibility to the Western
25 Regional Landfill. So this is really a land use and

1 compatibility impact, similar to the one I just
2 described about air quality, except this is really
3 about, again, compatibility of all residential uses up
4 next to a landfill site. So again, the project has
5 proposed a reduction of that buffer, and which would
6 result in putting residential uses closer to the
7 facility than would otherwise be today under the current
8 general plan. And again, based upon that data, we found
9 that it's quite possible that odor complaints would
10 rise. And because of that, it could create pressure on
11 the Western Placer Waste Management Authority to
12 implement additional odor control reduction measures at
13 that site. And that absent those odor sources, it could
14 interfere with the ability of the landfill to expand or
15 modify their operation. So we have identified some
16 mitigation, again, this is the one I talked about
17 earlier about site and building design that we would
18 require when projects came in through a specific plan
19 and master plan or development agreement.

20 However, we did find that it could not be
21 mitigated to less than significant. So while that
22 mitigation would not eliminate, it doesn't eliminate the
23 source of that odor or any of the factors that
24 contribute to the identification of range or perception
25 of odor. So the wind, temperature, that kind of thing;

1 we can't control that. So this has been found to be
2 significant and unavoidable.

3 Where are we at? So the next has to do with
4 noise, and the first is exposure to existing sensitive
5 receptors to construction noise --

6 CHAIRMAN MOSS: I'm sorry. I'm just worried
7 about our reporter here. Maybe if we -- do you think if
8 we could, would this be an appropriate time to take a
9 few minutes here and let her do this and -- how much
10 more -- where --

11 MS. JACOBSON: I am just about done with the
12 significant and unavoidable before I go into the
13 cumulative impact. So there is more to come, but --

14 CHAIRMAN MOSS: So maybe if we could, let's --

15 MS. JACOBSON: Want me to get through these? I
16 have, like, three left and then take a break? Would
17 that be --

18 CHAIRMAN MOSS: I mean, we're past kind of the
19 hour and a half threshold I was given. If you don't
20 mind --

21 MS. JACOBSON: Okay.

22 CHAIRMAN MOSS: -- and the commissioners don't
23 mind, we'll take a break here and let you do this, and
24 be back at 10 till or something like that.

25 MS. JACOBSON: Great. Thank you.

1 (Recess.)

2 CHAIRMAN MOSS: Please be seated. We'll try and
3 wrestle once again and we'll let you get wrapped up
4 here.

5 MS. JACOBSON: Okay. I'm going to -- I know
6 it's taken a long time. I'm sorry. There is a lot of
7 material. But out of respect of folks' time, all this
8 information, I will point out is in the staff report.
9 So what I'm going to do is just read the impact
10 statement, and just -- we have a couple more to cover
11 here, same with cumulative, and then I'll touch on
12 alternatives, because I think that is important to speak
13 to and then I'll close.

14 CHAIRMAN MOSS: Thank you.

15 MS. JACOBSON: So again, these two impacts are
16 to the land use that I just spoke about previously, and
17 then two related to noise that have been deemed
18 significant and unavoidable exposures, existing
19 sensitive receptors to construction noises, and then
20 exposing new and existing sensitive receptors to
21 project-generated transportation noise. Again, going
22 from an undeveloped site to a development, you get that
23 transportation impact.

24 And then two; one related to population
25 employment and housing, just putting, you know, new

1 growth in the area, and then one related to
2 transportation circulation, the vehicle-miles-traveled
3 impact.

4 Cumulative impacts, there are two to aesthetics.
5 I'm not going to touch on these, because they are really
6 the same as the ones I touched on earlier in the
7 significant and unavoidable. Air quality is the same as
8 I had touched on earlier, and they are also deemed
9 cumulative. And then you get into bio. The same thing
10 here, except I will point out, as I mentioned earlier,
11 with approval or adoption of the Placer County
12 Conservation Plan, these impacts can be reduced to less
13 than significant. But they are considered cumulative in
14 this document.

15 And then down here, same thing with the
16 archeological, historical and tribal. There was an
17 impact found there. Noise. The two noise impacts that
18 I just talked about, again, those are considered
19 cumulative. Population, employment and housing; again,
20 new growth in the area. And then a number of
21 transportation and circulation impacts, and again, those
22 are related to the impacts that I described within the
23 neighboring jurisdictions.

24 Okay. So that brings me to the alternatives.
25 I'm going to touch on those. There are five

1 alternatives talked about in the document. Alternative
2 one is a no project. So that would be just that, no
3 project. So assume the project is not approved and
4 development would occur consistent with the 1997 adopted
5 plan.

6 Alternative two is what we call the reduced
7 scale. This is in response to significant impacts
8 associated with aesthetics. And it's that transition to
9 taller buildings and an undeveloped area like I talked
10 about earlier. So this would result -- would reduce
11 overall scale of development by reducing the allowed
12 maximum building height. The alternative would also
13 help to transition between developed areas and
14 undeveloped preserve areas. And then under this
15 alternative, the Sac State Placer Center would not
16 change.

17 For alternative three, this is what we call a
18 reduced footprint, reduced development potential. And
19 so -- yes, three. Sorry. So for three, this is in
20 response to impacts related to the vernal pool recovery
21 core area. So again, what you would be doing here with
22 this alternative is to try to avoid those areas. So the
23 project would, again, result in preservation of about,
24 under this alternative, 29 percent or 2,140 square feet
25 of the core area of the vernal pool habitat. This

1 alternative is designed to address the significant
2 project impact by increasing the amount of core area
3 preserved to 3,600 acres. This alternative would reduce
4 the area subject to development as compared to the
5 project and reduce the overall development potential of
6 the project. It also addresses some other impacts
7 associated with this project, including traffic, the
8 VMT, greenhouse-gas emission, air quality and noise.
9 And then under this alternative, the Sac State Placer
10 Center would not change.

11 Alternative four is similar. It's a reduced
12 footprint, similar development potential. So it's much
13 like alternative three. It would achieve a smaller
14 reduction in the project-related impact to the core
15 vernal pool habitat. It would maintain a similar
16 development pattern to what is proposed, and it has
17 almost 1,500 fewer developable acres. It results in a
18 more compact development with a shift from lower-density
19 residential to higher-density residential. So that's
20 how you would achieve this. And then non-residential
21 structures would be slightly taller and may include
22 parking structures. And then under this, again, the Sac
23 State Placer Center would not change.

24 Alternative five is in response to impacts
25 related to VMT. So in VMT, one of the larger sort of

1 components of the impact had to do with the
2 entertainment mixed-use area and its draw for -- it's
3 a -- it's considered a regional draw. Also, there is a
4 lot of VMT associated with that land use. So under this
5 alternative, it would aim to achieve a reduction of VMT
6 by eliminating the non-residential uses from that
7 designation. It resulted in a 20 percent reduction in
8 non-residential floor area in the net Sunset Area Plan
9 area, and then the Placer Ranch Specific Plan under this
10 alternative will not change.

11 So for the environmentally superior alternative,
12 we are required to identify one, and to be identified
13 environmentally superior alternative is implementing a
14 no project. So the benefit or the reduced impacts would
15 be related to air quality, land-use compatibility and
16 population and employment growth. It is important to
17 note that under this alternative, you would -- it would
18 result in more severe, significant biological resource
19 impacts associated with the vernal pool habitat. And I
20 just want to point out that this would not meet the
21 primary objectives of the Sunset Area Plan would not or
22 the Placer Ranch Specific Plan objectives.

23 So I am at the end. So thank you for bearing
24 with me.

25 CHAIRMAN MOSS: Any questions?

1 COMMISSIONER HAGUE: Regarding the significant
2 and unavoidable because of other agencies, is the
3 County pursuing any agreements with those other agencies
4 or at least some and the impact on the environmental
5 impact report (unintelligible)?

6 MS. JACOBSON: Yes. I would say we have met
7 with -- well, I can speak to we've had a lot of meetings
8 with the city of Roseville. A lot of those impacts are
9 associated with the city of Roseville. So we've met
10 with them on a continual basis on the Pleasant Grove
11 retention facility as well as the traffic impacts.
12 Those discussions are ongoing. There are no agreements
13 in place to date. I think a lot of the concerns that
14 you made here today or you have already heard may be
15 dealt with in the development agreement for the Placer
16 Ranch project or any future development agreement that
17 comes in for the project.

18 COMMISSIONER HAGUE: When do we expect the
19 development agreement?

20 MS. JACOBSON: The development agreement will
21 come before your commission when we're ready for
22 deliberations on the project. So it's under -- it's
23 being drafted. It's actually in administrative draft
24 right now, and so we will be -- begin, again, to dive
25 into some negotiations with outside jurisdictions, but

1 the intent is that that document would be prepared for
2 your commission's consideration.

3 COMMISSIONER HAGUE: Thank you.

4 COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: About the relationship
5 with the (unintelligible), you mentioned collecting fair
6 share, and that that's pending with the development
7 agreement or is this something that's already planned
8 and approved?

9 MS. JACOBSON: I may -- I may have to ask -- I
10 believe so, that that will be included in that, but in
11 terms of the mechanism there for the fair share
12 contribution, the mitigation is identified, and I don't
13 know if -- is Rich in the room?

14 MR. MOREHEAD: Yes.

15 MS. JACOBSON: You want to come up? Sorry,
16 Rich.

17 I'm going to have Rich kind of just talk a
18 little bit about -- there is a lot of impacts with
19 (unintelligible) the fair share contributions, so I'll
20 let Rich kind of touch on that.

21 MR. MOREHEAD: So to answer that directly, you
22 don't get down to the specificity of it, we're using the
23 same mitigation strategy that's been used for the other
24 specific plans in the region. It does say that the fair
25 share contribution. And we start those negotiations

1 after approval of the plan. It's in the current
2 mitigation measure. We have met with the city of
3 Roseville and we've talked through a lot of the issues
4 that are going on, and one of the things I would like to
5 point out that a lot of those impacts themselves are
6 really the existing plus project impacts. So if you
7 take this entire plan and drop it in today without any
8 improvements in place, once the cumulative setting gets
9 in place and you have -- the improvements are assumed
10 that are funded, those impacts come down to a
11 significantly less level. But the idea would be to
12 negotiate that out after the approval of the documents.
13 You wouldn't have the specificity, but there would be
14 details in the DEA on how that would occur if that
15 helps.

16 MR. IVALDI: Can you spell your full name for
17 the record, please.

18 MR. MOREHEAD: Sorry. I'm Richard Morehead with
19 public works.

20 MR. IVALDI: Thank you.

21 COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Thank you.

22 MS. JACOBSON: Thank you, Rich.

23 CHAIRMAN MOSS: Any other questions?

24 COMMISSIONER NADER: I was gonna say I do have
25 some comments related to the landfill and Placer

1 ordinances. I have questions and comments. But maybe
2 those people have been very patient in the room waiting
3 to speak on this. So maybe I'll just wait until after
4 the public comments to make my statements.

5 CHAIRMAN MOSS: Thank you. Okay. I guess we're
6 getting ready for public comment. It has been expressed
7 to me that there has been concern over the time and
8 available as far as for people who are waiting to speak
9 that might not be able to wait this out. We'd like to
10 remind you that you can submit your comments in writing.
11 You will have no time restraints on you that you will
12 for public comment. So you can maybe elaborate a little
13 more if you'd like to submit those in writing versus
14 getting up to speak or waiting around to speak. That
15 option is certainly available to you.

16 We'd like to remind everybody that these
17 comments are directed to the environmental document
18 only, not to the merits of the project. We are going to
19 have the timer going. We're going to limit this to
20 three minutes per individual. If you are representing a
21 group, please identify your group you represent, and you
22 will be given up to five minutes. There is a sign-up
23 sheet, and we'll be calling names off of that.

24 With that being said, Karen?

25 MR. IVALDI: I have the comment sign-up sheet in

1 front of me and I have 13 people signed up right now.
2 So what I will do, I'll call three names off at a time
3 so you'll know what order you're in. And we'll get
4 started whenever the commission is ready.

5 CHAIRMAN MOSS: Please.

6 MR. IVALDI: First name, and please forgive me
7 if I'm mispronounce any of your names, Ellen Garber, Sue
8 Ingoll, Robin Baral.

9 MS. GARBER: Good morning, Mr. Chair, and good
10 afternoon, commissioners. My name is Ellen Garber with
11 the law firm of Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger, and I'm
12 speaking on behalf of the city of Roseville. Before we
13 begin our comments on the EIR, I would just like to
14 emphasize the city's complete support of the development
15 of the university in this area as well as of the concept
16 of the proposed project.

17 The proposed project shares a three-mile common
18 border with the northern boundary of the city of
19 Roseville. In addition, key roadway connections either
20 exist, Fiddymment Road, or a plan to connect to the
21 project area, such as Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard and
22 Foothills Boulevard. Given this interface, this project
23 will have a disproportionate impact on the city of
24 Roseville and its residents and businesses. Therefore,
25 it is imperative that the city and county work together

1 to reduce impacts as much as possible. Because the city
2 cares about the effects of the project, we have reviewed
3 the EIR and will be submitting detailed comments, but
4 would like to take this opportunity to highlight the
5 city's major concerns.

6 First, the city's concern that the analysis of
7 the Sunset Area Plan is at a program level and is also
8 incomplete, which could understate the impacts of the
9 project. The proposed buildout period for the area plan
10 is 80 years, but the analysis ends in the year 2036,
11 even though specific land uses will become part of the
12 general plan approved and the property will be zoned
13 consistent with those land uses. Therefore, the
14 land-use program at buildout is known at this time and
15 is reasonably foreseeable and has not been analyzed in
16 the EIR.

17 Another major concern -- area of concern is a
18 lack of fully enforceable mitigation measures as
19 required by CEQA to mitigate the impacts of the project
20 in Roseville on traffic and on public services such as
21 police, fire, parks and library services. The EIR fails
22 to disclose the potential for public services such as
23 the city fire department, law enforcement, parks and
24 libraries that will increasingly provide services to new
25 development resulting in increasing service levels and

1 substantial physical deterioration of parks and
2 recreation facilities, necessitating construction of new
3 facilities without assured mitigation from the planning
4 areas. However, the mitigation measures consist of
5 vague statements that the city will negotiate in good
6 faith to achieve a commitment to collect fair share fees
7 with no mechanism in place and no development trigger
8 and no promise to use the fees for the improvements
9 needed to offset impacts in Roseville.

10 The city's also concerned about the failure to
11 mitigate for the county's proposal to amend the general
12 plan and significantly reduce the land-use buffers
13 around the landfill. This change will almost certainly
14 create significant odor impacts to nearby populations
15 and will create incompatible land uses due to the
16 county's decision to remove the buffer zone land use and
17 replace it with residential and other uses. These
18 impacts will require the joint powers authority, of
19 which the city is a member, to implement additional
20 mitigation in order to avoid odor complaints and
21 regulatory enforcement actions. However, the EIR did
22 not acknowledge the need for mitigation or require the
23 county and/or development in the plan areas to pay for
24 their fair share of the improvements.

25 For drainage impacts, the EIR relies on

1 construction of the city's planned Pleasant Grove
2 detention basin. There is no mitigation requiring the
3 plan areas to fund and maintain future improvements that
4 are directly related to the use of this facility to
5 provide capacity for the project. This analysis needs
6 to be revised and recirculated to acknowledge the
7 potential impacts and provide for enforceable mitigation
8 measures.

9 Traffic impacts are also of major concern to the
10 city. The EIR concludes that the project will reduce
11 the number of intersections in Roseville operating at
12 level of service E from 84 percent to 68 percent, which
13 is inconsistent with the city's general plan policies.
14 In addition, unsignalized intersections will be reduced
15 from level of service C to an unacceptable level of
16 service F. An example of the significant impact that
17 will not be mitigated is that the development of
18 Foothills Boulevard has been identified as a traffic
19 improvement necessary to support the project. The EIR
20 states that a six-lane facility will ultimately be
21 required.

22 Do I have an extra two minutes?

23 CHAIRMAN MOSS: I think you've actually had more
24 than the five to start with. I cranked it up a little
25 when you were --

1 MS. GARBER: Okay. In summary, in the spirit of
2 cooperation forged between the city and county since
3 1994, the city requests the county to revise it's EIR
4 based on these comments and on the city's written
5 comments. We would request the planning commission to
6 direct staff to work with the city of Roseville to
7 develop appropriate and adequate mitigation to address
8 all offsite impacts between the city of Roseville.

9 Thank you. Members of the city staff are here
10 and available to answer any questions.

11 CHAIRMAN MOSS: Thank you. Okay. I'd just like
12 to remind you that when the yellow light comes on,
13 that's your one minute warning and time to kind of get
14 your thoughts wrapped up and --

15 MS. INGOLL: Okay.

16 CHAIRMAN MOSS: -- so you won't get caught off
17 guard by the red light and the beeping.

18 MS. INGOLL: All right. I'm representing a
19 large group.

20 CHAIRMAN MOSS: What group is that?

21 MS. INGOLL: And that group is the Placer County
22 Solid Waste Task Force. My name is Sue Ingoll, and I'm
23 representing the Solid Waste Task Force today. I'm
24 going to refer to them as the task force, because it's
25 such a long term.

1 Whose on this task force? We have
2 representatives from the cities of Roseville, Rocklin
3 Lincoln, Auburn and Colfax, the town of Loomis, two
4 waste haulers, the landfill and MRF operators, county
5 board of supervisors, county planning commission, an
6 environmental group and the general public.

7 The task force was established by the boards of
8 supervisors in 1990 to advise the board on matters
9 related to solid waste. I'm here on their behalf. The
10 task force has significant concerns with the proposed
11 modification to the current landfill buffer zone of one
12 mile down to 1,000 or 2,000 feet and urges the county to
13 maintain and enforce existing General Plan Policy
14 4.2.11. As noted on 4.10-15, the EIR acknowledges that
15 the Placer Air Pollution Control District and the CEQA
16 handbook recommends a screening distance for sanitary
17 landfills of one mile.

18 Chapter 4.3, the air quality section, pages
19 4.3-6 and 8, odors. The task force would support the
20 EIR's acknowledgment in the ways that odors can affect
21 people, can cause psychological issues, anger,
22 irritation, anxiety to physiological, of respiratory
23 effects, nausea, vomiting and headaches. By bringing
24 incompatible land uses in close proximity to the
25 landfill, this will expose people to these conditions as

1 part of their everyday life.

2 Odor complaints, Table 4.3-3 of the EIR lists
3 the number of current complaints from 2012 to 2017. The
4 EIR does not address how additional complaints would be
5 handled. We think this is insufficient.

6 Chapter 4.10, land use. The task force is
7 supportive of the findings under impact 4.10-2 that
8 bringing residential development closer to the landfill
9 would result in incompatible use with the landfill.
10 Incompatible land uses could cause conflicts with the
11 current landfill operation. The inherent odors from the
12 landfill Merk (sic) and composting facility could
13 adversely affect the public's ability to participate in
14 outside activities.

15 Mitigation measure 4.10-2 on the deed
16 notification. The task force appreciates inclusion of
17 such mitigation measures in the deed notification, but
18 the language proposed does not preclude a property owner
19 from seeking legal restitution due to odors. The task
20 force recommends that, to the extent legally
21 permissible, the deed be modified particularly for
22 parcels within the one-mile buffer to the landfill and
23 include language that would prohibit a property owner
24 from litigating against the landfill based on odors.
25 The task force appreciates all the proposed mitigation

1 measures, but we would like to point out that current
2 technologies do not exist to eliminate or fully mitigate
3 landfill odors inside or out. So imagine buying a new
4 house in Placer Ranch where you can't open your windows
5 due to offensive odors.

6 Utilities Chapter 4.15, the impact 4.15-11, the
7 EIR states that most likely the odor complaints would
8 not shut down the landfill and makes it a
9 less-than-significant finding. But the task force
10 disagrees and feels that these impacts are -- these are
11 potential impacts and quite real and significant. There
12 have been lawsuits in the past and regulatory actions
13 taken against solid waste facilities such as Newby
14 Island in San Jose and Sunshine Canyon in Southern
15 California. Right now, the landfill is looking at
16 expansion, and say if this type of development was
17 allowed next to the landfill, it could potentially shut
18 the landfill down.

19 We would like to have these -- we appreciate to
20 have this opportunity to comment on the draft EIR, and
21 we trust that these comments will be given -- that
22 you'll give direction to the county staff and to the
23 county board of supervisors. Thank you for the ability
24 to comment.

25 CHAIRMAN MOSS: Thank you.

1 MR. IVALDI: Robin Baral is next, and then the
2 next three, Scott Johnson, William Walters or Waters and
3 Jean Getty.

4 MR. BARAL: Good afternoon, commissioners. My
5 name is Robin Baral. I'm an attorney with Churchwell,
6 White in Sacramento. We are here speaking on behalf of
7 Western Placer Waste Management Authority. It's been a
8 long morning. I'll keep my comments brief.

9 First, I wanted to acknowledge all the work
10 that's gone into all these documents. I think there
11 is -- when I acknowledge that, you know, it's been a
12 long process. It's been three administrative drafts of
13 the EIR. I want to acknowledge that some of the changes
14 that have been made regarding Placer Ranch and changes
15 to the land uses to try to accommodate proximity to the
16 landfill site, but I think that, you know, generally
17 with regard to the Sunset Area Plan, the authorities
18 generally supportive have been staying (unintelligible)
19 throughout this whole process. Obviously, the major
20 concern we have is with regard to the buffer and making
21 sure that if this project is going to get approved, it
22 needs to be done the right way, implementing all the
23 feasible mitigation that's possible to make sure that we
24 have a reduction in future land-use conflicts as this
25 area builds out.

1 So I just wanted to give you an update that I've
2 been brought on to help the Authority review the
3 project. We've brought on some of our own experts who
4 are looking at some of the odor analysis. We'll be
5 submitting our own comment letter evaluating the
6 existing reports and to sort of build on the
7 collaborative dialogue that's been going on already to
8 make sure that we can help produce the best possible
9 project that will reduce potential land-use conflicts to
10 the maximum extent feasible. And I think part of that
11 process will be to identify additional mitigation
12 measures that can and should be implemented, and as
13 required under CEQA to be implemented to make sure that
14 potential impacts are reduced to the maximum extent
15 feasible.

16 So I'm not going to go into a lot of details,
17 because it's already been a long morning. But I just
18 wanted to say that I look forward to working with the
19 county and working with the other development
20 stakeholders to make sure that the right set of
21 mitigations are implemented to reduce potential impacts
22 to the site and to reduce potential impacts to the land
23 uses that are proposed to develop within that area.

24 So thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN MOSS: Thank you.

1 MR. JOHNSON: Hello. I'm Scott Johnson,
2 Bancroft Road, Auburn. I've reviewed the County's draft
3 EIR for the proposed Sunset Area and Placer Ranch Plan,
4 and I have questions, comments and concerns that I
5 respectfully request be addressed by the county.

6 Table 2-1 of the executive summary lists the 57
7 significant and unavoidable environmental impacts that
8 would result from implementing the SAP. And some of
9 these impacts are unavoidable because they're outside
10 the jurisdiction of the county; likely expansion of the
11 Pleasant Grove retention facility in the city of
12 Roseville. The environmental document for the expansion
13 of this facility to accommodate the stormwater from the
14 SAP has not been created. Yet the SAP relies entirely
15 on this expansion, and I question whether it's even
16 legal for Placer County to proceed with the SAP process
17 under this tenuous situation. There is no guarantee
18 that there will be anyplace for the stormwater runoff
19 from the SAP to go.

20 Section 3-4 of the project description contains
21 the goals and objectives of both the SAP and PRSP, but
22 the SAP and PRSP are in conflict with these goals in
23 many areas. And my additional written comments will
24 address a number of these conflicts, but here is a
25 couple. The goal -- one goal of the PRSP is to foster a

1 sustainable community design by aiding the county and
2 achieving its objectives for long-term sustainability
3 through project design and building practices that
4 incorporate measures to reduce energy, conserve water,
5 incorporate water-efficient landscaping, treat
6 stormwater and reduce reliance on the automobile.

7 However, the project design does not meet these goals.

8 Since an initiated Smart Growth Plan, which is
9 being provided to you as an alternative to the SAP, does
10 go much farther than every one of the above-listed,
11 long-term sustainability goals, I think it would prudent
12 for you to recirculate the draft EIR and to allow a full
13 and thorough analysis of the Alliance For Environmental
14 Leadership's Citizen-Initiated Smart Growth Plan.

15 Another goal of the PRSP is to enable blueprint
16 consistency, create a development plan that's consistent
17 with the growth principles identified in the Sacramento
18 Area Council of Government blueprint, which consists of
19 providing high-density residential neighborhoods, more
20 compact forms of development and alternative
21 transportation options, such as bus, rapid transit and
22 bicycle use and the interconnected network of
23 residential neighborhoods, commercial nodes and
24 employment centers.

25 The plan fails to meet the SACOG blueprints and

1 it fails to provide bus, rapid-transit-compliant
2 development, but the citizen plan does.

3 Thank you.

4 MR. WATERS: Thank you. I'm William Waters. I
5 am a board member of Sarsis (phonetic spelling). We
6 will be (unintelligible) of Clipper Gap and a lifetime
7 resident of Placer County. As Sarsis we will be
8 commenting. Most of our concerns are with water flow
9 and so forth, the pollution, et cetera. So making it
10 brief, a lot of my concerns have been addressed, but
11 with Jeffrey Moss, I agree. The rail track should be
12 penciled in as a railroad track, not just to the
13 industrial sites, but it should go to the transfer
14 station. Because sooner or later, we're going to be in
15 the same boat as Sacramento County. They're pushing
16 development out towards their dump and the old railroad
17 site. And we're going to have to truck that over the
18 Sierras. But better to put it on the trains. And
19 that's the only place the landfill is going to be
20 suitable for that.

21 As a -- I've also been an elected member of the
22 Almond Recreation District Board, so I know how boards
23 are supposed to run and in a representative democracy.
24 There is a real problem with this. This has been rolled
25 out from the top down, just like a Communist Chinese

1 plan. A lot of these boards of supervisors have already
2 stated that they are driving this plan, and we taxpayers
3 are outraged that we have had to have spent millions of
4 dollars for our supervisors to turn our planners into
5 shills for angelistic (unintelligible).

6 Thank you.

7 MR. IVALDI: Okay. Jean Getty. No? Jean
8 Getty. Maybe she's left.

9 The next three are Veronica Blake, Emily Ward
10 and Leslie Warren.

11 MS. BLAKE: I'm Veronica Blake, Placer Community
12 Foundation. I'm here today to talk about affordable
13 housing in this project. Although the high density
14 doesn't necessarily mean affordable, it wasn't clear to
15 us why the number of high-density residential units were
16 reduced from the original plan. The EIR doesn't provide
17 a detailed jobs housing balance analysis that evaluates
18 whether the plan provides sufficient housing to
19 accommodate the salaries of the new work force in the
20 plan area.

21 The EIR states that the plan will comply with
22 the county's requirement of providing ten percent
23 residential units and specific plans to be affordable,
24 but it doesn't provide the specifics on how it will
25 implement housing policies B-4, B-6 and B-13. What we

1 want to know is will the affordable units, will they be
2 spread throughout the different subdivisions or will
3 they be concentrated in one area?

4 The EIR should also clarify that student housing
5 will not count towards the developments of affordable
6 housing requirements. In-lieu fees should not be
7 accepted for the construction of the affordable -- for
8 construction of affordable units. The project's impact
9 to affordable housing will be significant, and housing
10 elements policies should be used as mitigation measures
11 to help reduce the severity of the impact as required by
12 Government Code 65454. The specific plan needs to be
13 consistent with the county's general plan, and this
14 project should be consistent with the other project EIRs
15 within the county.

16 Given the challenges in constructing of
17 affordable housing and subsidies that are needed to get
18 those units constructed, the affordable units should
19 receive priority for access to infrastructure, transit,
20 and they should also not have the additional costs
21 associated with being located in the floodplain.

22 It doesn't appear that any land has been set
23 aside for future light rail or some form of mass
24 transit, and the question -- other than the bus stops.
25 And the question that comes to mind is, Is the density

1 going to be high enough to support rapid transit?

2 And then lastly, I would just add that we remain
3 concerned about the health impacts of reducing the
4 buffer zone and placing residential near the landfill.
5 It seems that the county years ago had a policy that
6 that buffer zone made a lot of sense. But now that
7 they're developing a project, I don't understand why
8 that buffer zone will be reduced.

9 Thanks for allowing us to comment.

10 CHAIRMAN MOSS: Thank you.

11 MS. BLAKE: Hello, my name is Emily. I am a
12 concerned resident of Roseville. And so I was looking
13 over the draft EIR, and Roseville intersections are
14 already operating at a sub-optimum level, and this plan
15 would allow our intersections to operate at level half,
16 which is the lowest you can go. And this would cause an
17 additional 200 seconds of wait time per vehicle, which
18 would cause a lot of clogging in our intersections.

19 Furthermore, this project does not reserve
20 future transit options, like many of the supporters were
21 suggesting previously. In fact, this plan, the Sunset
22 Area Plan is an urban sprawl and only 17 percent of it
23 is planned as a structure.

24 As far as the environmental impacts, each year
25 this plan will add a combined 600,000 metric tons of CO2

1 per year. Not to mention that this suggested buffer
2 zone of 2,000 feet from a landfill will affect children
3 who will be participating in schools, young people who
4 will be participating in colleges and folks who would be
5 representative of work-force housing, which I don't
6 believe is fair.

7 The county, in their scoping session, have
8 established objectives for this project under CEQA. The
9 project must meet these objectives in their effort, and
10 on almost every objective, this county has failed to do
11 so.

12 So thank you very much for this opportunity to
13 comment.

14 CHAIRMAN MOSS: Thank you.

15 MR. IVALDI: After Leslie Warren, Albert
16 Scheiber, Richard Joy, Cheryl Berkinaw.

17 MS. WARREN: Hello. My name is Leslie Warren,
18 and I'm representing the 14 organizations affiliated
19 with the Alliance For Environmental Leadership. So
20 please afford me five minutes.

21 The Alliance For Environmental Leadership, as I
22 mentioned, is 14 organizations that have organized to
23 address projects of regional significance. This project
24 is one of regional significance. We have developed, by
25 our initiative and own funding, a parallel development

1 plan for the site, which is called the Citizen-Initiated
2 Smart Growth Plan, and I'd like to have it entered into
3 the record that the Citizen-Initiated Smart Growth Plan
4 is -- if we were to compare the county's objective
5 fulfillment in the draft EIR with the project as
6 proposed and with the project that we are proposing, the
7 fulfillment of the county objectives are met with the
8 Citizen-Initiated Smart Growth Plan where they are not
9 met in the county's proposed project, and therefore, we
10 respectfully request that the draft EIR be recirculated
11 and the Citizen-Initiated Smart Growth Plan be evaluated
12 as the environmentally superior alternative six.

13 The staff made a lengthy presentation to you
14 today, but I feel that the sense of scale about this
15 project was omitted. The footprint of this project is
16 comparable to the existing city of Roseville. The
17 generation of CO2 gases is 550,000 metric tons annually,
18 and a metric ton exceeds an American ton by 25 percent.
19 The number of new daily vehicular trips on our existing
20 roadways is 900,000 new vehicles. And when we collect
21 fees to remedy impacts of these new vehicles on
22 intersections, the fees don't generate at the onset of
23 the impact. They accumulate over time, and then there
24 is a huge design construction condemnation, demolition
25 period whenever these intersections will be brought

1 forward as to mitigate the impacts that the EIR
2 addresses. So for the county to go forward with a
3 project before the impacts are adequately addressed at
4 the onset, I feel is irresponsible governance.

5 Basically, we feel that we are evaluating the
6 adequacy of an EIR in evaluating -- that is evaluating a
7 plan, that in its basic framework, is so egregious that
8 it creates the environmental impacts itself. And were
9 we to step back -- and that the EIR basically is
10 mandating impacts in a plan that is structurally flawed.
11 And were we to step back and approach the development of
12 the site in a way that we have done through the
13 Citizen-Initiated Smart Growth Plan, at a framework
14 scale, we would address the significant and unavoidable
15 impacts that the environmental impact report has
16 identified.

17 Just an example. Were the Citizen-Initiated
18 Smart Growth Plan to be adopted, greenhouse gas
19 emissions would be reduced by 75 percent, and that would
20 be by implementing the county's own declared intentions
21 in the objectives to create compact communities. In the
22 county's plan, the jobs housing balance is 22 jobs for
23 one home, and inasmuch as most of the homes in the
24 Sunset Area Plan/Placer Ranch development are to be
25 built for primary wage earners and most of the employees

1 in the industrial area are going to be hourly
2 blue-collar workers, the jobs housing balance is even
3 more egregious than 22 to 1, because the people that can
4 least afford to commute are going to be the ones
5 commuting to this site because of the housing mix as
6 proposed.

7 In the Citizen-Initiated Smart Growth Plan, jobs
8 housing balance is three jobs to one home. You may know
9 that the SACOG recommended jobs housing balance as two
10 jobs to one home. And we do this by compact development
11 and integrating the workers with their own residences.

12 Finally, the EIR fails to relocate the
13 university out of the smell zone in any of its
14 alternatives. We've relocated it out of the smell zone,
15 which I think if the county's objective is to bring a
16 high-class university to Placer County, it's going to
17 need to move it out of the residential smell zone and
18 off of 300 acres of high-quality vernal pools.

19 CHAIRMAN MOSS: Thank you.

20 MS. WARREN: Thank you for your time.

21 MR. SCHEIBER: Good afternoon. Albert Scheiber.
22 I'm a resident of Lincoln. My family has a ranch just
23 north of your project. I attended the scoping meeting
24 early on for this project. I made comments in NOP. I
25 was disappointed to find out those comments would not be

1 answered. They would be considered. I know a lot of
2 other people made comments in the NOP and I assume
3 they're getting the same treatment. That's kind of
4 disappointing, because it seems like comments and so on
5 and so forth are just going to get swept under the rug
6 and disregarded, which is a shame.

7 I also find it troubling that at least two
8 developers tried to make this project work, private
9 developers, and could not. So it baffles me why the
10 county would take on a project that private citizens
11 could not do at the taxpayers' expense.

12 So I have a lot of issues with the EIR itself.
13 There is a lot of inconsistencies in it. I can -- I can
14 see I'm running short on time, so you'll be getting
15 written comments from us during that comment period.

16 One of the issues I have is with the groundwater
17 and how your project is going to affect the groundwater
18 in the area and sub-basin. I believe that's all just
19 been swept under the rug, no consequences there, even
20 though the county has -- Placer County Water Agency has
21 two wells. We're proposing two more wells. You're
22 going to use them in the dry period as emergency backup
23 is what it states. And if you look at what -- Lincoln's
24 past, Lincoln has existing ground wells that they pull
25 out of. They use a ten percent goal. Nothing

1 committing them to that. They want to put six more
2 wells in for the Village V project, which unfortunately,
3 we're located in. Also, they want to use it in times of
4 backup for a draught.

5 So I would like to know when the draught hits
6 and you all turn your pumps on, how is that going to
7 affect my well and my water rights? Because none of
8 that's addressed in your EIR.

9 Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN MOSS: Thank you.

11 MS. BERKINAW: Hi. My name is Cheryl Berkinaw.
12 I'm a Placer County resident, and I'm a representative
13 of Granite Bay, so I'd like five minutes, please.

14 In December 2018, several concerned citizens
15 made public and written requests of Placer planning that
16 the many projects that were being introduced by planning
17 be rescheduled and staggered appropriately to allow time
18 for public review. Time extensions were also requested
19 due to excessive document sizes, which were far beyond
20 CEQA guidelines. Many of these projects were thousands
21 of pages in length. In addition, several major hearings
22 were also scheduled within the same time frame, such as
23 zoning, text amendments. There are a list of others.

24 Our concern is the Sunset Area Plan is the
25 largest regional project known, was introduced during

1 this onslaught of document dumping, again, overwhelming
2 the public. The county's website has actually been in a
3 state of migration the past three days. This was also
4 done during almost a month of federal shutdown. So for
5 people to be able to contact the federal government on
6 housing, federal environment issues and for the Placer
7 County conservation program, the timing I
8 would say is not really optimal, and would suggest that
9 a 2019, 120-day review be generated with the addition of
10 the plan that Leslie Warren mentioned for the
11 Citizen-Initiated Growth Plan.

12 I think that CEQA's purpose is to inform
13 decisionmakers, and if we don't get the opportunity to
14 actually respond and reply because we're inundated with
15 so many thousands of pages of documents, that we're not
16 doing CEQA justice and we're in violation there.

17 The Sunset industrial plan was previously,
18 approximately a decade ago, made great promises;
19 however, the project objectives were not realized. The
20 Sunset Area Plan was shown not to be economically
21 feasible, the huge associated price tag we have to pay
22 as residents and now we're doing the same thing.

23 We already -- we would like a response as to --
24 for all the documentation, thousands of pages, again,
25 that have been produced, who is paying for this? We are

1 no -- the Sunset Area Plan EIR is deficient in the
2 following areas also. I'll skip over the ones that have
3 already been mentioned. But there are no developers
4 committed to th Sunset Area Plan, putting the county and
5 taxpayers at significant risk. The county is the
6 applicant and the approver, which is a conflict of
7 interest. The county has failed to show that the
8 project is economically feasible. There are no
9 innovators mentioned in the DEIR. Stating you're
10 creating an innovation center doesn't mean they will
11 come.

12 No university is committed to the Sacramento
13 area plan, so what you saw there is pie in the sky. No
14 one has signed from the university. Two other
15 universities have already said that they are not willing
16 to, and have dropped out of the race in terms of putting
17 a university there. Again, objectives are not being met
18 for that university.

19 It would destroy significant vernal pools,
20 habitats and endangered species, and as the planner, we
21 are very disappointed that the planner said that CEQA
22 and NAPA are not being used as responses to all the
23 mitigations. So someone owes a response to the 44 pages
24 of significant and unavoidable impacts. And to put a
25 box around yourself and say that you're not responsible

1 is putting your head in the sand. We are owed those
2 responses from both CEQA and NAPA on the wetlands, both
3 U.S. and on the California environmental impacts.

4 It's not energy efficient, and there is no
5 mention -- we are living in the 21st Century. There is
6 no mention of any alternative energies being produced.
7 To have a project of this scale, there should be solar,
8 some things that are being presented. Also, in terms of
9 mitigations, CEQA does not allow the promise of future
10 action associated with the mitigation measures that are
11 currently not feasible or funded. Placer County
12 Conservation program has not been adopted, therefore has
13 no mitigation measure. So anything that's current law
14 should be represented as a mitigation measure, and I
15 think you're violating the law by not doing that.

16 A project of this magnitude requires more than a
17 workshop or public hearing and an article in The
18 Sacramento Bee. I think that it has not been
19 socialized. If you ask almost any resident in
20 Sacramento or Placer County, they will go, "Oh, yeah. I
21 think I saw that picture." They will have no clue the
22 size and impact that's being suggested today. So again,
23 I would suggest that the county spend more money on
24 socializing this project. And I think you have an
25 opportunity -- we had a world-class designer that has

1 done designs for some of the most innovative countries
2 in the world present this citizens plan. I hope you
3 understand the gift that you've been given and consider
4 that as an option and put it in the EIR.

5 Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN MOSS: Did we skip Richard?

7 MR. IVALDI: Yes. I had Richard Choi still on
8 the list, and then the last one Angela Torren, last
9 names on the list.

10 CHAIRMAN MOSS: Are you Angela?

11 MS. TORREN: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN MOSS: Come on up.

13 MS. TORREN: I thought I was last, so thank you.
14 Hi. My name is Angela Torren. I'm a resident of
15 Rocklin. I'm a former CPAC chair in the Franklin/Laguna
16 area, and during the time when I reviewed several
17 developments coming into the Elk Grove area before they
18 were incorporated, I did so on behalf of the county
19 supervisors. And at the time, I know that there was a
20 great deal of work put into the specific plans, a great
21 deal of work concerning the mitigating circumstances
22 that the residents might have to experience due to the
23 sewer treatment plant in Elk Grove. I know that there
24 were several similar problems that I see in these
25 particular plans today.

1 I also noted that from my knowledge of the CEQA
2 law, there are requirements that whenever there are
3 significant, unavoidable impacts, however before that
4 particular classification becomes or is deemed
5 acceptable, it should be fully vetted by not only the
6 public, but you here at the planning commission, and
7 that when you are vetting these significant and
8 unavoidable impacts, whether they're air,
9 transportation, and these are great impacts in this
10 large, large project, that you give yourself enough time
11 to reach to various studies and other policies and
12 programs that might support the buildout of this
13 particular plan.

14 I noted that when I was in Elk Grove, that the
15 plans after Laguna town hall was built were approved by
16 the public generally because there was promises that
17 they would bring jobs to the area. Those promises never
18 really fully materialized. The area became a bedroom
19 community at -- you know, at the opposition of many of
20 the people who live there. They were crying about
21 having to commute long distances to work. These are the
22 same experiences we have in Placer County. I'm a
23 24-year transit pedestrian taker you might say. I
24 availed myself of all transit services in Placer County.
25 I was never able to take any type of a metro downtown,

1 but I went through various cars, using them in
2 traveling. And I really don't want to put that same
3 kind of pressure on the future residents here in Placer
4 County with buildout that doesn't take into serious
5 consideration the significant and avoidable
6 circumstances.

7 And I say they're avoidable, because I really
8 would like to plead to you today that you find studies,
9 whether they be through SACOG or the air resources board
10 or through various cities who have had similar projects
11 approved, that you find those studies that have
12 significantly, if not successfully, mitigated the
13 significant impacts upon the public, the public health
14 and our children in the future.

15 Thank you very much for having me today.

16 CHAIRMAN MOSS: Thank you.

17 MR. IVALDI: So some folks might have signed up
18 on a list for the other project, so maybe if there is
19 time to ask if there is anybody else who would like to
20 comment on the Sunset Area Plan and Placer Ranch.

21 CHAIRMAN MOSS: Is there anybody else who did
22 not sign up who would like to address the commission
23 now?

24 MR. RAVINES: I do believe we did sign up, but
25 anyway, my name is Don Ravines. I'm with the Sierra

1 Foothills Audobon Society and our members are in Placer
2 County and in Nevada County. And these comments are on
3 behalf of our audobon society.

4 The impact I'm going to speak mainly on are
5 greenhouse gas emissions. The impact measure 4.7.2 says
6 this impact would be significant in operational
7 greenhouse gas emissions. Various mitigations are
8 proposed, but are still considered significant and
9 unavoidable. Whether the -- what they're talking about
10 is conforming to Title 16 of building standards, and
11 that would reduce some of the emissions. There is a
12 Title 16 is now Title 19, which is going to be enforced
13 on January 1st, 2020. I might read from that.

14 "California's 2019 building energy efficiency
15 standards officially take effect on January 1st.
16 Single-family homes built in the 2019 standards will use
17 about seven percent less energy due to energy efficiency
18 measures versus those built under the 2016 standards.
19 One rooftop solar electricity generation spec in homes
20 built under the 2019 standards will use about 53 percent
21 less energy than those in the 2016 standards. This will
22 reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 700,000 metric tons
23 over three years in California."

24 So we ask that either the building permits are
25 granted this year, given the climate emergency in the

1 California renewable goals, that these projects be
2 required to meet the 2020, Title 24, Chapter 6 building
3 rules of zero net energy for all single residential
4 homes in the project area. This would reduce your
5 mitigation requirements for this particular project and
6 may even be completely unavoidable -- avoidable at that
7 point, which you'd use the 2019 standards. And I don't
8 know how many permits are going to be allowed before
9 2020, but I guess at this point, you may not have any.

10 There is also the -- by 2030, all
11 non-residential home buildings are supposed to reach
12 zero net efficiency also. In lieu of a climate crisis,
13 I would ask that you implement those standards also for
14 non-residential in this area.

15 You also have certain policies where you are
16 going to encourage people to do things, that they should
17 do things, but we ask the county to include the actual
18 (unintelligible) and set standards that will indicate
19 whether the developer has made sufficient effort to
20 actually implement the standards that are actually used
21 in the building industry. The county EIR are much
22 stronger projected greenhouse gas emissions after the
23 required changes are made.

24 And finally, just one point that I notice there
25 was nothing in here about requiring solar to be used

1 anywhere. Many places, like in Nevada County, we have
2 solar farms being proposed. Solar farms are there
3 providing renewable energy, and that might, again, meet
4 the mitigation problems at this project if they had
5 solar providing the energy for this project.

6 Other questions we raised in the past through
7 this mention all kinds of trails that could use compact
8 and crushed rocks, cheaper, faster, permeable, produces
9 less C02 emissions than concrete. You can plant grass
10 lawns and water conservation leading to less energy use.
11 You can use only lead only for nighttime glare and
12 minimize electric car charges for carbon use, smart
13 glass, Electrochromatic windows, draught-resistant
14 trees, solar P.B. in all the parking lots. There is a
15 lot of things that aren't mentioned in this that would
16 actually make this project more likely to be amenable.

17 Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN MOSS: Thank you. Is there anybody
19 else?

20 MS. RAVINES: Good afternoon. I expected it to
21 be morning however, and happy Valentine's Day. My name
22 is Barbara Ravines and I live in Nevada County, but I'm
23 very, very interested in this plan, because as residents
24 of Nevada County for 22 years, about the age of the
25 first inception of this plan, I believe, I -- resident,

1 I don't pay taxes here and I vote for -- I don't vote
2 for the politicians making decisions in Placer County,
3 but I do absorb the GHG's, the ozone and the
4 ever-increasing vehicular traffic in the region and the
5 loss of open space, vernal pools, and I'm not especially
6 happy about that.

7 We've been residents of California for about 52
8 years, a special and sterling place as the state is, and
9 in those 52 years, it's changed dramatically in this
10 area from the old, dotted landscape that once was rural
11 Placer County. Today we discuss another Placer project
12 opening the county to more sprawl, adding 575,000 metric
13 tons per year of greenhouse gases emissions from the
14 projected 870 daily vehicular trips from the assortment
15 of new housing and industry in the Sunset Plan.

16 The Sunset Plan would encompass about 14 square
17 miles. It's primarily wetland, grassland, farmland, and
18 give us a new city covering about 80 percent of the
19 surface parking and remainder of buildings. The housing
20 is to be primarily low density, not at all what's needed
21 in the changing demographics and economics of our
22 current world. It does take into consideration,
23 however, the jobs, but -- nearby. However, it's giving
24 us more car travel trips in an already congested area
25 underserved by public transit.

1 For me, the most glaring and disturbing aspect
2 of this plan is it's utter lack of imagination and
3 concern for climate and what we're witnessing today
4 actually in real time. We've had atmospheric rivers
5 with unprecedented catastrophic fires in our region,
6 every state and every state in the west, the polar
7 vortex. The End Device is a new book which describes
8 the absolute hourly loss of ice in our polar region
9 spelling an evolution of a whole new climate system, and
10 yet this plan is not taking into consideration any of
11 the world that we are going to be facing in the future.

12 I just urge you to move into this plan that has
13 been described, the Citizen Initiative Plan that Leslie
14 has described and --

15 CHAIRMAN MOSS: Thank you.

16 MS. RAVINES: -- I'd like to urge you to do
17 that.

18 Thank you.

19 MS. SCHEIBER: Good afternoon. Connie Scheiber.
20 We have a ranch up north of your project in Lincoln.
21 First, I want to read a part of the EIR, just a small
22 part. The project will result in the conversion of
23 72 -- 7,295 acres of farmland, although the actual total
24 would be less because of the fact of the Pleasant --
25 some areas of Pleasant Grove retention facility property

1 would likely continue to be farmed, although that's not
2 a guarantee. The project would result in the conversion
3 of almost six percent -- let me say that again -- six
4 percent of Placer County's total farmland. This is a
5 considerable contribution to the -- this is a
6 considerable contribution to the significant cumulative
7 impact associated with overall farmland conversion in
8 the region.

9 My understanding is Placer County has a right to
10 farm county. We're supposed to be pro ag. Once you
11 convert six percent of Placer County's available
12 farmland out of production, that can never be reclaimed.
13 It's gone. It's gone for good. So I'm not really sure
14 how that is pro ag.

15 The other point I'd like to make is the EIR
16 relies on several entities, I guess, for lack of a
17 better term, that are not really entities yet. The
18 first one is troubling. The Placer County Conservation
19 Program, PCCP, we've been trying to get a draft of that
20 program for probably at least two years. As far as I
21 know, that's still not available for public review. So
22 you're relying on a program that even the public can't
23 look at it and see what it's about.

24 The Pleasant Grove retention facility, as far as
25 I know, that's still not an entity. They already talked

1 about the Ophir Water Treatment Plant. It's not yet
2 even started, no ground broken. And also the
3 groundwater sustainability plan, we go to all those
4 meetings, and I know for sure that that one is not an
5 entity yet.

6 Thank you for your time.

7 CHAIRMAN MOSS: Thank you.

8 MR. WHEELER: Good afternoon. Matt Wheeler,
9 community development director for the city of Lincoln
10 first. I want to say that we consider ourselves a
11 development partner with the county and moving forward
12 with growth plans with Western Placer. And as such, we
13 appreciate the time that your staff has taken to meet
14 with us to talk through this project, our concerns and
15 look through mitigating the issues that have been
16 identified.

17 One item that we'd like to highlight today is in
18 relation to the landfill buffer, and in a nutshell, it's
19 this: The reduction of the setback in that buffer area
20 for the landfill is not a benefit to ratepayers, solid
21 waste ratepayers in Placer County and the city of
22 Lincoln and other jurisdictions that are outside this
23 plan area. And as such, we don't believe that any of
24 the costs associated with that landfill buffer should be
25 borne by ratepayers outside of that planning area.

1 With that, we appreciate the opportunity to
2 continue to work with your staff and identifying issues
3 and working through the mitigations for growth.

4 Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN MOSS: Thank you. Is there anybody
6 else? All right. Seeing none, we'll go ahead and close
7 the public comment. For this item, there is no action
8 to be taken. So with that, we are going to take about a
9 15 minute break.

10 COMMISSIONER NADER: I wanted to comment.

11 CHAIRMAN MOSS: I'm sorry. Mr. Nader.

12 COMMISSIONER NADER: I wanted to give the public
13 a little chance to put their comments in, and they've
14 been patient. You want that. There you go.

15 I first want to say that, you know, I think the
16 rest of the commissioners spent a lot of time going
17 through piles of documents on this, and there is one
18 section that I have to say I'm absolutely bewildered by,
19 and that is relation to the -- we referred to comments
20 on the landfill and Placer Ranch. And it seems to me
21 that, as you read that section, it seems like there
22 should be lots of red lights flashing, like, "Okay.
23 Don't do this."

24 So I just wanted to highlight just a couple of
25 them as I go through this, and I'll try to be very brief

1 on it. Obviously, the policy, if -- I'm going to go by
2 page on this, 4.10 through 8, and for the policy, the
3 4-G-11, obviously the thing that jumps out to me is that
4 that policy states that the landfill's the dominant land
5 use in the area, and it is set up to protect these
6 facilities from compatibility. And that should get your
7 attention right away. And the -- and then 4.10.14, as
8 we are looking at consideration of lessening that one
9 mile buffer, incompatibility sort of jumps out right
10 away as soon as that is addressed, and it is expected
11 the complaints lodged about conditions of odors would
12 increase. And that could interfere with the ability for
13 the landfill to expand or modify needed operations. The
14 impact to land-use in the landfill are potentially
15 significant, which is something we hear a lot in this
16 section.

17 And then as referenced by one of the speakers,
18 4.10 through 15 mentions the Placer County Air Pollution
19 Control District handbook, and that it also has
20 protection of a buffer within a mile. And it says,
21 also, that it is to protect the incompatibility of the
22 encroachment of development. The landfill is an
23 important and valuable county asset. It has been and
24 will continue to be, as you've heard, the operations go
25 out to 2038, I believe. And then residential

1 encroachment in that section, it also -- the residential
2 encroachment could create pressure on the landfill
3 operations resulting in the need to entertain other
4 solutions. And then in that section also says would
5 likely be infeasible given the cost.

6 So it is likely that residential development
7 anywhere in Placer Ranch Specific Plan would be subject
8 to odor from the landfill. So we're not just talking
9 about, you know, 1,000 or 2,000 feet that may be
10 impacted, but throughout the whole project. If the
11 less-restrictive buffer amendment is amended with
12 residential development close to the landfill, it would
13 result in incompatible uses with the landfill. And
14 incompatible is something we hear a lot of in this
15 section.

16 The odor complaints, going to 4.10 to 16, odor
17 complaints by the landfill could result in enforcement
18 action and/or the addition of additional odor control,
19 which we kind of heard someone else as well. Comparing
20 other landfills to the one in Placer County, in my
21 opinion, is meaningless. Every landfill has unique
22 conditions that are very unique. The terrain and
23 atmospheric conditions play a large role in the impact,
24 it's use of the ground at the landfill. You know, and
25 this is not theoretical. We're not talking about the

1 possibility of issues. We know we already have issues
2 within a mile. So to me, I mean, we're already -- we're
3 just opening it up to more issues.

4 Then 4.10 through 17, pressures of the landfill
5 to implement additional odor control. Okay. That's in
6 there. Enclosing compost operations counter -- what is
7 stated in the report is stated that those costs are
8 not -- would not be that significant. I don't know if
9 any of you have been out to the landfill. The green
10 operation is gigantic, and the wind rows are very
11 significant, and to try to cover that would be an
12 extremely expensive process. And really, I think from a
13 standpoint of, okay, if you cover it, where does that
14 odor go anyway? It's all going to be exhausted at some
15 point, and especially in the heated times of the year.
16 Those enclosed structures will obviously cook whatever
17 is in there. And so I'm saying resulting in doing that
18 doesn't ensure that the odors in the operation can be
19 contained.

20 Transportation. What I'm addressing is what
21 they're saying the landfill could do to mitigate the
22 impact to the surrounding community. Transporting waste
23 to another facility would be extremely costly. Finding
24 an alternative, isolated, non-controversial location
25 within the county to process material of green waste

1 would be nearly impossible, and I think that in this
2 study, if we're looking for alternatives, that needs to
3 be looked at more closely if we make this really into a
4 feasible alternative.

5 So-called odor neutralizing misters do not
6 eliminate odors. They only cover them up. It's --
7 obviously a very heavily perfumed, I guess lavender
8 smell might be better than what is coming out of the
9 facility, but I think the effect is pretty questionable.

10 No compensation. And I think this is really
11 important, because it doesn't say this anywhere in the
12 report and it needs to address it. No compensation from
13 the developer or the county has been offered. So the
14 costs related to, a minimum, the impact of the landfill
15 on nearby properties would have to be absorbed by the
16 ratepayers, which somebody else brought that up as well,
17 which constitutes a large segment of the Placer County
18 population. So I think for one project, we're forcing
19 this on the rest of all of Western Placer County to
20 offset the cost of the impact and that really was not
21 addressed. I think that needs to, and I'm saying that
22 it needs to evaluate the impact to the ratepayers.

23 Then 4.10 through 18, I want -- I have a
24 question, and this addresses where the project can do
25 things to offset the impact, over-impact or the impact

1 of the landfill. And where in building designs,
2 landscaping designs and fee restrictions proven truly to
3 lessen the complaints related to the landfill,
4 especially if odor impacts it, it doesn't really say
5 that they have experience in other areas that
6 (unintelligible) for that. These measures would not
7 eliminate the source of odor. It actually, you know,
8 states that in there. Therefore, this impact would be
9 significant and unavoidable.

10 Almost done. 4.6-3 through 6. Excuse me.
11 4.3-6, need to specify that the reference to alternate
12 daily cover, and more particularly sludge as it was
13 mentioned, is sewage waste from the nearby Lincoln Water
14 Treatment Plant. It is used to help facilitate the
15 breakdown of waste material on the landfill. The sewage
16 waste was noted as a high contributor to the detection
17 of offensive odors coming from the landfill. So I think
18 that really needs to be addressed about the impact of
19 this sewage sludge that's coming -- that is into the
20 facility, and it doesn't adequately (unintelligible) of
21 sludge.

22 Okay. I counted eight times where
23 incompatibility and questioned compatibility were
24 mentioned in relation to the landfill operations and
25 residential zones. Seems like a fair statement is that

1 this project, as currently proposed, it is now and
2 wide -- a wide-ranging of negative implications of
3 residents of Placer County. In my opinion, we are
4 trying to force a proverbial square peg into a round
5 hole. This plan needs to accommodate the landfill
6 rather than the landfill accommodating the plan. I
7 believe the real test of whether this plan is based on
8 reasonable, acceptable facts is whether the developer or
9 those that prepared the report or any of you in this
10 room would want to live or have any of your family
11 members live in this community. If you're truly being
12 honest, I think the answer is no.

13 That's my comments. Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN MOSS: Thank you. With that, I think
15 we'll take 15 before we get back to our next item.
16 Thank you.

17 (The hearing on the above item concluded at 1:07 p.m.)

18 ---o0o---

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

1

2

3 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

4 COUNTY OF PLACER) ss.

5

6 I LORI G. PINKERTON, a certified shorthand

7 reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing 120 pages

8 comprise a full, true and correct transcription of the

9 Placer County Planning Commission proceedings had and

10 testimony taken at the Community Development Resource

11 Agency hearing in the hereinbefore-entitled matter.

12 In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand

13 this 6th day of March, 2019.

14

15

16

17

18

19 )

20 LORI G. PINKERTON, CSR No. 6031

21

22

23

24

25