

ADDENDUM TO FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Project Name: Whitehawk I Subdivision (PLN15-00300)
General Plan Amendment, Rezone, Vesting Tentative
Subdivision Map, Conditional Use Permit and Variance

Project Location: South side of Douglas Boulevard, east of Woodgrove Way
Granite Bay, Placer County

This Addendum to the Whitehawk I & II Projects Final Environmental Impact Report has been prepared pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 and Placer County Environmental Review Ordinance Section 18.16.090. An Addendum to a Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary. The addendum need not be circulated for public review but can be included in or attached to the previously prepared FEIR.

Project History

This document is an Addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Report and Errata approved for the Whitehawk I & II Projects (PLN15-00300 and PLN15-00301) (SCH# 201608209 and 2016082010) as certified by Placer County in February 2019.

The 2019 Final Environmental Impact Report (Attachment A) and Errata were prepared and circulated in accordance with Section 15161 of the State CEQA Guidelines for the Whitehawk I & II Projects (WHI and WHII). The EIR includes the following project-level analytical scenarios:

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

This approach was intended to provide the community, interested agencies, the Planning Commission, and ultimately the Board of Supervisors with sufficient information to understand the impacts of each project separately, as well as combined.

The Whitehawk II Project consists of a 55-lot Planned Residential Development with nine open space and common area lots on a 32.97-acre parcel. Two Errata were prepared prior to entitlement hearings:

1. The First Erratum to the FEIR provided responses to one additional public comment letter that was inadvertently omitted in the Final EIR released to the public on February 25, 2019. The comment letter addressed the proposed Emergency Vehicle Access to Quartzite Circle and the Alternatives Analysis.
2. The Second Erratum to the FEIR included revisions made to Chapters 14 and 17 of the Whitehawk I & II EIR to clarify that the following three study intersections are subject to

Placer County's thresholds of significance, rather than the City of Roseville's thresholds: Sierra College Boulevard and Douglas Boulevard; Sierra College Boulevard and Renaissance Creek/Granite Bay Business Park; and Sierra College Boulevard and Eureka Road.

On April 23, 2019, the Placer County Board of Supervisors took final action to approve the Whitehawk II project and certified the Whitehawk I & II Projects FEIR and Errata but did not grant any entitlements for the Whitehawk I project at that time.

On June 14, 2019, an applicant submitted applications for entitlements necessary for the Whitehawk I project. The Placer County Environmental Review Committee subsequently evaluated the submittal for consistency with the adopted Whitehawk I and II Projects Final Environmental Impact Report and Errata.

Rationale for Preparation of the Addendum

CEQA Guidelines Section 15164, subdivision (a) provides that the lead agency or a responsible agency shall prepare an Addendum to a previously certified Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or Negative Declaration (ND) if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or ND have occurred (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15164, subd. (a)).

An Addendum need not be circulated for public review but can be included in or attached to the Final EIR or ND (CEQA Guidelines Section 15164, subd. (c)). The decision-making body shall consider the Addendum with the Final EIR prior to making a decision on the project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15164, subd. (d)). An agency must also include a brief explanation of the decision not to prepare a subsequent EIR or ND pursuant to Section 15162 (CEQA Guidelines Section 15164, subd. (e)).

Consequently, once an EIR or ND has been certified for a project, no subsequent EIR or ND is required under CEQA unless, based on substantial evidence:

- (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
- (2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:
 - (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;
 - (B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
 - (C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
 - (D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

This addendum and attached documents constitute substantial evidence supporting the conclusion that preparation of a supplemental or subsequent EIR is not required prior to approval of the proposed entitlements, and provides the required documentation under CEQA.

Whitehawk I Project Description

The applicant, Folsom Oak Tree, Ltd., seeks entitlements to permit the development of a Planned Residential Development consisting of 24 single-family detached dwellings on an 18.1-acre parcel located on the south side of Douglas Boulevard, east of Woodgrove Way, in Granite Bay (see proposed Tentative Map, Attachment B). Proposed lot sizes range from a minimum of 9,049 square feet in size to a maximum of 16,661 square feet in size at a density of 0.75 dwelling units per acre. The lots would be accessed from new private streets which would connect to Douglas Boulevard at a gated entryway. Fifty-four percent of the project site would remain as undeveloped common area and open space.

The proposed layout and development impact match the unit count, lot size, and configuration of the Whitehawk I subdivision that was analyzed in the Whitehawk I and II Projects Final Environmental Impact Report and Errata.

Entitlements Required

Requested entitlements include:

- General Plan Amendment/Community Plan Amendment (Granite Bay Community Plan) from Rural Low Density Residential (.9 to 2.3 acre minimum) and Rural Residential (2.3 to 4.6 acre minimum) to Low Density Residential (0.4 to 0.9 acre minimum) and Open Space.
- Rezone from RA-B-100 PD = 0.5 (Residential Agricultural, minimum Building Site of 100,000 square feet combining Planned Residential Development of 0.5 units per acre) to RA-B-20 PD = 1.4 (Residential Agricultural, minimum Building Site of 20,000 square feet combining Planned Residential Development of 1.4 units per acre) and O (Open Space).
- Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map for the subdivision of 18.1 acres into a 24-lot Planned Residential Development with multiple open space/common area lots.
- Conditional Use Permit to construct a Planned Residential Development; and
- Variance to lot coverage allowing up to 50 percent coverage for single-story residences, where 25 to 40 percent is normally allowed.

Scope of the Addendum

The proposal requires an Addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Report and Errata previously-certified by the Board of Supervisors on April 23, 2019 when it approved entitlements for the Whitehawk II project. The Addendum includes the following:

1. The results of an analysis of traffic conditions at the Wellington Way/Eureka Road and Barton Road/Eureka Road intersections.
2. A discussion on the transition from an LOS metric to a vehicle miles traveled (VMT) metric in the transportation impacts section.
3. Removal of Mitigation Measures resulting from utilization of the VMT metric rather than the LOS metric contained in the DEIR.

Changes to the Final Environmental Impact Report

1. Additional Traffic Analysis

In response to a comment received on the Whitehawks Project Draft EIR questioning the adequacy of determining impacts to intersections and segments along Eureka Road that may be generated from trips

to Granite Bay High School generated by the project the following is added to Chapter 14, Transportation and Circulation Section 14-3, Existing Plus Project Impacts on Segments:

Additional Roadway Segments

The table below shows the existing and cumulative traffic volumes and LOS for Barton Road from Douglas Boulevard to Eureka Road and Eureka Road from Barton Road to Wellington Way based on the analysis prepared for the Granite Bay Community Plan (GBCP) Circulation Element Update. As shown, both operate at LOS A under existing conditions and LOS C or better under cumulative conditions.

Additional Study Roadway Segments

Study Roadway Segment	LOS C/D ADT Threshold ¹	Existing Conditions			Cumulative Conditions ⁴		
		ADT ²	V/C ³	LOS	ADT ²	V/C ³	LOS
Barton Rd.: Douglas Boulevard. to Eureka Rd.	12,000	8,300	0.55	A	10,600	0.71	C
Eureka Rd.: Wellington Way to Barton Rd.	12,000	4,600	0.31	A	7,100	0.47	A

Notes:

1. Based on the daily traffic volume thresholds from Table 14-7 of the *Placer County Countywide General Plan EIR* for low-access control arterial.
2. ADT = average daily traffic; ADT values rounded to the nearest 100 vehicles.
3. V/C = volume-to-capacity ratio
4. Cumulative Conditions include trips generated by Whitehawk I and Whitehawk II, as well as planned, proposed, and approved development in Granite Bay.

Source: Granite Bay Community Plan Circulation Element Update, 2019.

Based on the existing traffic volumes shown in the table above, the project would need to add more than 3,700 daily trips to Barton Road and 7,400 daily trips to Eureka Road to result in an unacceptable LOS D under existing plus project conditions.

The cumulative traffic forecasts shown in the table above include traffic for both Whitehawk I and Whitehawk II, as well as planned, proposed, and approved development in Granite Bay. As shown, with both Whitehawk I and Whitehawk II, both Barton Road and Eureka Road operate at an acceptable LOS C or better. Even if more trips from Whitehawk I and/or Whitehawk II would use Barton Road as suggested by the comment, an additional 1,400 daily trips on top of what is already included from Whitehawk I and Whitehawk II would need to be added to cause the roadway segments to degrade to an unacceptable LOS D under cumulative conditions.

Additional Intersections

Per Placer County’s Impact Analysis Methodology of Assessment memorandum, a project would have a significant impact if it would cause an unsignalized (i.e., stop-controlled) intersection currently operating at an unacceptable LOS to experience a 2.5-second or greater increase in delay and meet the MUTCD traffic signal warrant.

In January 2020, Fehr & Peers prepared a Focused Traffic Analysis for the Wellington Way/Eureka Road and Barton Road/Eureka Road intersections. Both intersections are unsignalized with all-way stop-control. The Granite Bay Benefit District of the Placer County Countywide Capital Improvement Program (CIP) identifies a new traffic signal at Wellington Way/Eureka Road and either a roundabout or a new signal at Barton Road/Eureka Road funded by County traffic impact fees.

Whitehawk I and Whitehawk II vehicle trips were distributed based on a review of existing traffic counts, Eureka Union School District boundaries for school trips, and a select zone analysis of the Granite Bay travel forecasting model. The a.m. peak hour and p.m. peak hour distributions are slightly different to account for differences in trip activity and trip purposes (i.e., greater amount of school trips during a.m. peak hour; higher frequency of commercial/shopping trips during the p.m. peak hour; etc.).

With the addition of trips generated by Whitehawk I and Whitehawk II, under existing plus project conditions both intersections would continue to operate unacceptably during the a.m. peak hour and acceptably during the p.m. peak hour. However, the project would only increase the average delay at the Wellington Way/Eureka Road intersection by 0.5 second per vehicle and at the Barton Road/Eureka Road intersection by 0.4 second per vehicle during the a.m. peak hour. Based on the significance criteria used in this study and documented in the Placer County Department of Public Works Impact Analysis Methodology of Assessment memorandum, this increase in average control delay would not exceed County thresholds.

The cumulative conditions traffic analysis for the Granite Bay Community Plan (GBCP) Circulation Element Update shows that the Wellington Way/Eureka Road would operate at LOS C during the a.m. peak hour as a signalized intersection. Since the Wellington Way/Eureka Road intersection operates at an acceptable LOS C under cumulative conditions, which already includes Whitehawk I and Whitehawk II trips, the project is not anticipated to have a significant cumulative impact at this intersection. Nonetheless, even if the increase in trips triggered the 2.5 second thresholds for the identified intersections at Barton Road/Eureka Road and Wellington Way/Eureka Road, the project is already required to lessen incremental increases at these traffic locations, as well as others within the greater Community Plan area, through payment of traffic fees consistent with the Traffic Fee Ordinance and Capital Improvement Program currently in place. Specifically, the Placer County Capital Improvement Program includes a traffic signal at both Barton Road/Eureka Road and Wellington Way/Eureka Road.

The cumulative conditions traffic analysis for the GBCP Circulation Element Update shows that the Barton Road / Eureka Road intersection is forecasted to operate at LOS D during the a.m. peak hour as a signalized intersection. Since it is anticipated to be signalized under cumulative conditions, the project would have a significant impact if it would cause the Barton Road/Eureka Road intersection to experience a 4.0-second or greater increase in delay per the Placer County Impact Analysis Methodology of Assessment memorandum. The sensitivity analysis showed that 55 a.m. peak hour trips toward Granite Bay High School could be added to Barton Road/Eureka Road before triggering the 4.0-second threshold, which is substantially more trips than Whitehawk II would generate.

Peak Hour Intersection Operations – Existing Plus Project Conditions

Intersection	Traffic Control	Peak Hour	Existing Conditions		Existing + Project	
			Delay ¹	LOS ²	Delay ¹	LOS ²
1. Wellington Way / Eureka Rd.	All-Way Stop-Control	A.M.	41.1	E	41.6	E
		P.M.	14.3	B	14.5	B
2. Barton Rd. / Eureka Rd.	All-Way Stop-Control	A.M.	52.4	F	52.8	F
		P.M.	24.1	C	24.3	C

Notes:

1. Average control delay for all-way stop-controlled intersections is the weighted average for all movements. Delay is reported as seconds per vehicle.
2. LOS = level of service; calculated based on methodologies contained in the HCM 6th Edition.

Bold indicates unacceptable operations.

All intersections are analyzed in Synchro 10.

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2019.

Signal Warrant Analysis

Fehr & Peers conducted a signal warrant analysis for the Eureka Road/Wellington Way intersection to determine whether conditions warrant a traffic signal. The analysis considered factors related to operations and safety that are reflected in the traffic signal warrants contained in the California MUTCD, 2014 Edition, Revision 4 (Caltrans, 2019). The California MUTCD identifies nine signal warrants, seven of which are applicable to the Wellington Way/Eureka Road intersection. The California MUTCD states that satisfaction of a traffic signal warrant or warrants shall not in itself require the installation of a traffic signal; and that a traffic signal should not be installed unless one or more factors described in the warrants are met.

The results of this signal warrant analysis indicate that traffic conditions at the Wellington Way/Eureka Road intersection may not merit a traffic signal. This is supported by MUTCD standards that state the Peak Hour Warrant (Warrant 3) should be “applied only in unusual cases, such as office complexes, manufacturing plants, industrial complexes, or high-occupancy vehicle facilities that attract or discharge large numbers of vehicles over a short time,” and the overall MUTCD standard that “satisfaction of a traffic signal warrant...shall not in itself require the installation of a traffic signal.”

Fehr & Peers concluded that the combined effect of Whitehawk I and Whitehawk II would not result in a significant increase in peak hour traffic delay at either of the two study intersections.

2. Additional Traffic Analysis

Since the certification of the Final EIR, the Third Appellate District Court published an opinion (December 18, 2019) regarding *Citizens for Positive Growth & Preservation v. City of Sacramento* (2019). Among other points, Citizens challenged the City of Sacramento’s adoption of its General Plan based on its use of the level of service (LOS) metric instead of the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) metric in the transportation impacts section. In response to this case, the County has added the following VMT discussion to page 14-68 of the Transportation and Circulation section of the EIR, following Impact Statement 14-6.

Vehicle Miles Traveled

In 2018, the Secretary of the Natural Resources Agency promulgated and certified CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 to implement Public Resources Code Section 21099(b)(2). Public Resources Code Section 21099(b)(2) states that, “upon certification of the guidelines by the Secretary of the Natural Resources Agency pursuant to this section,

automobile delay, as described solely by level of service or similar measures of vehicular capacity or traffic congestion shall not be considered a significant impact on the environment pursuant to this division, except in locations specifically identified in the guidelines, if any.”

In response to PRC 21099(b)(2), CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 notes that “Generally, vehicle miles traveled is the most appropriate measure of transportation impacts.” The Guidelines section further states that although a lead agency may elect to be governed by this section immediately, lead agencies are not required to utilize VMT as the metric to determine transportation impact until July 1, 2020. The inconsistency between the implementation date of July 1, 2020 allowed by the Guidelines and the requirement of PRC 21099(b)(2) to no longer use congestion metrics creates a gap or "interim" period when use of traffic congestion metrics is no longer allowable; however, the lead agency may not yet have an established VMT threshold(s), as is currently the case for Placer County.

A recent court case (*Citizens for Positive Growth & Preservation v. City of Sacramento* (2019) 2019 WL 6888482) attempted to add clarity to the timing issue surrounding the transition between transportation impact metrics. The court ruled that although CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, requiring use of VMT as the transportation impact metric, does not apply until July 1, 2020, Public Resources Code Section 21099(b)(2) is already in effect. As a result of the ruling, although lead agencies are not yet required to analyze transportation impacts under the VMT metric, they can no longer draw a transportation impact significance conclusion using a metric that measures traffic congestion (e.g., level of service (LOS)).

Subsequent to the certification of the CEQA Guidelines, the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) published the Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA (December 2018). OPR’s advisory document identifies a potential approach which an agency could utilize as the basis for determining significant transportation impacts. Specifically, the OPR Technical guidance recommends consideration of whether the project is consistent with the applicable Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). The guidance aligns with CEQA Guidelines Section 15125(d), which requires that an EIR should discuss inconsistencies between the proposed project and the regional transportation plan. For the SACOG region, this consists of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan/SCS (MTP/SCS).

The proposed project is located within an area designated as an Established Community in both the 2016 and 2020 MTP/SCS. The MTP/SCS is aimed at reducing greenhouse gas emissions through VMT reduction, and these efforts are primarily focused on urban areas, where investments in the roadway system and transit, bike, pedestrian infrastructure are built into the MTP/SCS to achieve identified air quality targets. In this “interim” period, the following qualitative discussion of VMT has been provided for the proposed project.

According to the MTP/SCS, Established Community areas are typically the areas adjacent to, or surrounding, Center and Corridor communities. Many are characterized as “first tier”, “inner ring” or mature suburban communities. Local land use patterns aim to maintain the existing character and land use pattern in these areas. Land uses in Established Communities are typically made up of existing low- to medium-density residential neighborhoods, office and industrial parks, or commercial strip centers. Depending on the density of existing land uses, some Established Communities have bus service; others may have commuter bus service or very little service. For unincorporated Placer County, the 2020 MTP/SCS assumes an additional 15,080 jobs and 3,160 housing units would be

developed in Established Communities by 2040 (see Appendix C of the 2020 MTP/SCS). Note this represents an increase in the forecasts provided in the 2016 MTP/SCS for Year 2035 (12,090 jobs and 2,760 housing units).

Figures 3-10 and 3-11 of the 2020 MTP/SCS show the 2016 and projected 2040 vehicle miles traveled per capita for the six-County SACOG region. The sub-region in which the project is located is shown as having both now, and in the future, <= 100-115% of the regional average VMT per capita. The MTP/SCS anticipates some increased activity/growth within Established Communities. Additionally, these areas are recognized as having high VMT per capita both now and in the future (2040 MTP/SCS Planning Period). Thus, it can be concluded that the potential increased activity associated with the proposed project would not conflict with the MTP/SCS' strategy for reducing VMT through investments in roadway and multi-modal infrastructure primarily in urban areas and therefore the project's impact associated with VMT increases are considered less than significant.

The foregoing revisions and additions are made for amplification purposes in response to recent court case law, and are not considered significant new information that warrants subsequent review pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162.

3. Modifications to Mitigation Measures

The *Citizens for Positive Growth & Preservation v. City of Sacramento* (2019) 43 Cal.App.5th 609) court case attempted to add clarity to the timing issue surrounding the transition between transportation impact metrics. The court ruled that although CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, requiring use of VMT as the transportation impact metric, does not apply until July 1, 2020, Public Resources Code Section 21099(b)(2) is already in effect. As a result of the ruling, although lead agencies are not yet required to analyze transportation impacts under the VMT metric, they can no longer draw a transportation impact significance conclusion solely through a metric that measures traffic congestion (e.g., level of service (LOS)).

While Chapter 14, Transportation and Circulation and Chapter 17, Cumulative Impacts and Other CEQA Sections focus primarily on the traffic congestion effects of the proposed project, LOS is no longer considered a significant impact on the environment. The LOS data is retained in these chapters for informational purposes only. Instead, the transportation impacts of the proposed project are evaluated using VMT as the metric as discussed above.

Based on the transition to the VMT metric, traffic-related Mitigation Measures required by the LOS analysis are no longer appropriate in a CEQA impact analysis context. However, to ensure consistency with General Plan policy, County-related traffic impact thresholds must still be evaluated using a LOS metric. Therefore, to ensure consistency with the General Plan, these congestion-related measures will now be Conditions of Approval rather than CEQA Mitigation Measures. This change affects the following Mitigation Measures contained in the FEIR and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program:

Previous Mitigation Measure 14-2: Study Intersections Under Existing Plus Project Conditions

The Improvement Plans shall show the construction of a raised median at the existing intersection of Woodgrove Way/Quail Oaks Drive/Douglas Boulevard that will prohibit northbound and southbound left-turn movements onto Douglas Boulevard from Woodgrove Way and Quail Oaks Drive. In addition, the raised median shall allow for eastbound and westbound left-turn movements onto Quail Oaks Drive and Woodgrove Way from Douglas Boulevard. The construction of the new raised median shall also require the reconstruction of the existing landscaped median to a narrower, stamped, colored, concrete median that will provide a 12-foot-wide eastbound left-turn lane along Douglas Boulevard. The design shall be to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works and shall conform to any applicable criteria specified in the latest version of the Caltrans Highway Design Manual for a design speed of 55

miles per hour (mph), unless an alternative is approved by the Department of Public Works. This improvement shall only be required with the development of the second of the two Whitehawk projects to be developed.

Previous Mitigation Measure 14-3: Study Roadway Segments Under Existing Plus Project Conditions

The Improvement Plans shall show the construction of the widening of Douglas Boulevard between Sierra College Boulevard and Cavitt Stallman South Road from a four-lane segment to a six-lane segment with appropriate lane transitions as shown in Figure 14-15 of the Whitehawk I & II Projects Draft EIR. Additional widening and/or reconstruction may be required to improve existing structural deficiencies, accommodate auxiliary lanes, intersection geometrics, signalization, bike lanes, or conformance to existing improvements. Traffic striping shall be done by the developer's contractor. The removal of existing striping and other pavement markings shall be completed by the developer's contractor. The design shall conform to criteria specified in the latest version of the Caltrans Highway Design Manual for a design speed of 55 miles per hour (mph), unless an alternative is approved by the Department of Public Works. Rubberized asphalt consistent with any existing pavement along Douglas Boulevard is required, unless otherwise approved by the DPW. The roadway structural section shall be designed for a Traffic Index of 10.0, but said section shall not be less than 3 inches Hot Mix Asphalt (HMA) over 8 inches Class 2 Aggregate Base (AB), unless otherwise approved by DPW and ESD.

This improvement shall be required with the development of the second Whitehawk project to be developed as determined by Placer County. If this improvement has been previously constructed as determined by Placer County, then the project's obligation for construction of this improvement will be considered satisfied.

Previous Mitigation Measure 17-15: Study Intersections Under Cumulative Plus Project Conditions

Implement Mitigation Measure 14-2.

Previous Mitigation Measure 17-16: Study Roadway Segments Under Cumulative Plus Project Conditions

Prior to issuance of any Building Permits, this project shall be subject to the payment of traffic impact fees that are in effect in this area (Granite Bay), pursuant to applicable Ordinances and Resolutions. The applicant is notified that the following traffic mitigation fee(s) shall be required and shall be paid to Placer County DPW:

- A. County Wide Traffic Limitation Zone: Article 15.28.010, Placer County Code
- B. South Placer Regional Transportation Authority (SPRTA)

The current estimated fee is \$7,426 per single family residential unit. The fees were calculated using the information supplied. If the use or the square footage changes, then the fees will change. The fees to be paid shall be based on the fee program in effect at the time that the application is deemed complete.

Analysis

On April 23, 2019, the Placer County Board of Supervisors passed a Resolution certifying the Whitehawk I and II Projects FEIR and Errata, and adopting Findings of Fact and a Statement of Overriding Considerations and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan.

Based on the analysis contained earlier in this Addendum, Transportation and Circulation Impacts 14-2, 14-3, and Cumulative Impacts 17-15 and 17-16 are no longer considered impacts of the project in the CEQA context. Nevertheless, pursuant to General Plan policy, the former Mitigation Measures associated with these congestion impacts shall be implemented as project Conditions of Approval.

Table 2-1 of the Executive Summary, Chapter 2 of the DEIR summarized “no impact” or a “less-than-significant” impacts to resource areas. Table 2-1 is revised as shown in strikethrough and underline below:

- Air Quality (Chapter 5, Impacts 5-2, 5-3, and 5-4)
- Biological Resources (Chapter 6, Impacts 6-3, 6-6, 6-8, and 6-9)
- Geology and Soil/Mineral Resources (Chapter 8, Impacts 8-1, 8-4 and 8-5)
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Chapter 9, Impacts 9-1, 9-3, 9-4, and 9-5)
- Hydrology and Water Quality (Chapter 10, Impact 10-5)
- Land Use and Planning/Population and Housing (Chapter 11, Impacts 11-1 through 11-5)
- Noise (Chapter 12, Impact 12-1)
- Public Services and Recreation (Chapter 13, Impacts 13-1 through 13-5)
- Transportation and Circulation (Chapter 14, Impacts ~~14-4~~ 14-2 through 14-6)
- Utilities and Service Systems (Chapter 15, Impacts 15-1 through 15-5)
- Cumulative Impacts and Other CEQA Sections (Chapter 17, Impacts 17-1 through ~~17-14~~ 17-16)

Less-than-Significant Impacts with Mitigation

The DEIR identified “potentially significant” impacts to the environmental resource areas noted below. These resource areas include impacts that would be “less than significant” with implementation of mitigation measures identified in the DEIR, summarized in Table 2-1 of the Executive Summary, Chapter 2 of the DEIR.

- Aesthetics (Chapter 4, Impacts 4-1 and 4-2)
- Biological Resources (Chapter 6, Impacts 6-1, 6-2, 6-4, 6-5, and 6-7)
- Cultural Resources (Chapter 7, Impacts 7-2, 7-3, 7-4, and 7-5)
- Geology and Soil/Mineral Resources (Chapter 8, Impacts 8-2, and 8-3)
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Chapter 9, Impact 9-2)
- Hydrology and Water Quality (Chapter 10, Impacts 10-1 through 10-4)
- Noise (Chapter 12, Impacts 12-2 and 12-3)
- Transportation and Circulation (Chapter 14, Impacts ~~14-1, 14-2, and 14-3~~)
- Cumulative Impacts and Other CEQA Sections (Chapter 17, Impacts ~~17-15, 17-16, and 17-17~~)

The proposed Whitehawk I project would develop a project with a 24-unit Planned Residential Development with the same general footprint, at the same site, and subject to the same environmental conditions as analyzed in the FEIR. The total number of units included in the proposed project would not increase, nor would there be any expansion of the types of uses that were analyzed in the Whitehawk I and II Projects FEIR and Errata. No new resources would be subject to impacts and no increase in effects would occur.

Mitigation

Implementation of mitigation measures discussed in the 2019 Whitehawk I and II Projects FEIR and Errata would ensure that effects associated with the proposed Whitehawk I project would be less-than-significant except for three environmental impacts listed below. For those environmental effects of the project not subject to specific mitigations, standard County construction standards and practices will ensure no additional impacts will occur. These impacts were found to remain significant and unavoidable even with implementation of recommended mitigation measures:

- **Air Quality**

Impact 5-1 (Violation of Any Air Quality Standard):

Although emissions from construction-related activities would be reduced through implementation of the standard air quality conditioning and mitigation measures, emissions related to WHI alone, and WHI and WHII combined, would be anticipated to continue to exceed the Placer County Air Pollution Control District's thresholds for such emissions. Therefore, construction of the WHI project alone, as well as the combined construction of the WHI and WHII projects, the project's short-term, construction-related emissions would remain *significant and unavoidable*.

- **Traffic**

Impact 14-3 (Roadway Segments, Existing Plus Project):

Impacts to all study roadway segments under Existing Plus WHI would be less than significant, with the exception of Douglas Boulevard from Woodgrove Way to Seeno Avenue. Given the lack of feasible mitigation for this segment, the impact is considered *significant and unavoidable*.

Impacts to all roadway segments under Existing Plus WHI and WHII would be less than significant, with the exception of Douglas Boulevard between Sierra College Boulevard and Seeno Avenue. The segment between Sierra College Boulevard and Cavitt Stallman Road South would be less than significant with mitigation (expansion to six lanes). The remaining segment between Cavitt Stallman Road South and Seeno Avenue would be considered *significant and unavoidable* given the lack of feasible mitigation.

- **Cumulative Impacts**

Impact 17-16 (Roadway Segments, Cumulative Plus Project):

The project's incremental contribution to the significant cumulative impact would be less than cumulatively considerable, with the exception of Sierra College Boulevard from Douglas Boulevard to Renaissance Creek and Douglas Boulevard from Woodgrove Way/Quail Oaks Drive to Seeno Avenue. Even with mitigation, the project's incremental contribution to the significant cumulative impact would be cumulatively considerable and *significant and unavoidable*.

The projects' incremental contribution to the significant cumulative impact under Cumulative Plus WHI and WHII would be less than cumulatively considerable, with the exception of Sierra College Boulevard from Douglas Boulevard to Renaissance Creek and Douglas Boulevard from Cavitt Stallman Road South to Seeno Avenue. Even with mitigation, the projects' incremental contribution to the significant cumulative impact would be cumulatively considerable and *significant and unavoidable*.

Based on the transition from an LOS metric to a VMT metric to evaluate traffic impacts under CEQA, Impact 14-3 and Impact 17-16 are no longer considered CEQA impacts. The project-related impacts to Douglas Boulevard between Cavitt Stallman Road South and Seeno Avenue exceed County LOS thresholds but there are no feasible roadway improvements to lessen the impacts to this road segment (i.e. expansion to six lanes) that could be applied to the project as a Condition of Approval. Therefore, the FEIR is updated to reflect the removal of these two impacts as *significant and unavoidable*.

Environmental Conclusion

The certified 2019 Whitehawk I and II Projects FEIR and Errata evaluated the environmental impacts that might reasonably be anticipated to result from the implementation of the projects. This Addendum was prepared to evaluate the environmental impacts that may result from the Whitehawk I project as described above and determine whether any new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified impacts would result from the project as proposed.

The Environmental Review Committee has reviewed the proposed Whitehawk I project and has determined that the proposed project is within the scope of the previously-certified EIR. There have been no new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; no substantial changes in circumstances which would require major revisions due to involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant effect; and no new information of substantial importance that shows significant effects that were not discussed or that are substantially more severe than identified in the EIR. As such, the proposed project would not result in any conditions identified in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, and a subsequent EIR is not required.

The changes in this Addendum represent minor clarifications/amplifications to the analysis contained in the Final EIR and do not constitute significant new information that, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines, Section 15162, would trigger the need for subsequent review. However, the Addendum, along with the FEIR, must be considered by the decision-making body prior to making a decision on the project.

Intended Uses of the Addendum

This Addendum will be used by the County as a tool in evaluating the environmental impacts of the proposed Whitehawk I project. As the Lead Agency under the provisions of CEQA, Placer County has discretionary approval authority and the responsibility to consider the environmental effects of the project.

Attachments

- Attachment A – Whitehawk I & II Projects Final Environmental Impact Report and Errata
- Attachment B – Proposed Whitehawk I Project Tentative Map
- Attachment C – Fehr & Peers Focused Traffic Analysis (January 2020)