

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 TYPE AND PURPOSE OF THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

An EIR is an informational document which will inform public agency decision-makers and the public generally of the significant environmental effect of the project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project (14 CCR 15121[a]).

This Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is an assessment of the impacts that reasonably could be expected from construction and implementation of the Alpine Sierra Subdivision (proposed project). The project applicant, Alpine Sierra Partners LLC, proposes to develop a combination of single-family detached residential units and halfplex units on ± 45.5 acres adjacent to the Alpine Meadows Ski Resort. This Draft EIR considers two project alternatives at an equal level of detail – one that would develop 47 single-family residential units (Alternative A) and one that would develop 38 single-family residential units (Alternative B).

1.1.1 Type of EIR

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that consideration of the proposed project development include preparation of an EIR (California Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.). The EIR must meet the content requirements identified in CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.), Sections 15120 through 15132. Because the project is “a specific development project,” the EIR must also meet the definition of a project EIR provided in Section 15161 of the CEQA Guidelines. This Draft EIR evaluates the environmental effects of the proposed Alpine Sierra Subdivision project and identifies mitigation measures to ensure that significant impacts of the project, including cumulative impacts, are minimized or compensated to the extent feasible. As discussed in Section 1.2, the scope of this Draft EIR is focused on effects determined to have a potentially significant impact on the environment, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15128.

1.1.2 Purpose of an EIR

As required by CEQA, Placer County is the Lead Agency responsible for ensuring that the proposed project is evaluated for its possible effects on the environment. As Lead Agency, Placer County “is responsible for the adequacy and objectivity of the draft EIR” (14 CCR 15084[e]).

This Draft EIR was prepared in accordance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and Placer County’s Environmental Review Ordinance (Chapter 18 of the Placer County Code) (Placer County 2015). A

Draft EIR is an informational document prepared to provide public disclosure of potential impacts of a project; it is not intended to serve as a recommendation of either approval or denial of a project.

CEQA provides that public agencies must require implementation of all feasible means available to substantially lessen a project's significant environmental effects. CEQA allows that economic, environmental, social, and technological factors may be considered when determining whether an action is "feasible." CEQA also directs that actions considered feasible should be capable of being accomplished in a successful manner and within a reasonable period of time.

This Draft EIR provides an assessment of environmental impacts associated with construction and operation of the proposed project. Through consideration of mitigation measures and project alternatives, this EIR presents feasible means to reduce significant impacts where possible.

Development of the project site is governed by the goals and policies of the Placer County General Plan (Placer County 2013); the Alpine Meadows General Plan (Placer County 1968); the Subdivision Ordinance, which is Chapter 16 of the Placer County Code; the Placer County Zoning Ordinance, which is Chapter 17 of the Placer County Code (Placer County 2015); and other discrete sections of the Placer County Code pertaining to construction and operation of residential land uses. This Draft EIR incorporates by reference the analysis contained in the Placer County General Plan EIR (Placer County 1994). The relevant analysis from the General Plan EIR is summarized in this EIR where applicable. Copies of the plans and the associated EIR are available from the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency at 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, California, 95603. In addition, the Placer County General Plan and the Alpine Meadows General Plan can be accessed online (<http://www.placer.ca.gov/departments/communitydevelopment/planning/documentlibrary/commplans>). The Placer County Code, including the Subdivision Ordinance (Chapter 16), the Zoning Ordinance (Chapter 17), and the Environmental Review Ordinance (Chapter 18), can also be accessed online (<http://qcode.us/codes/placercounty/>).

1.2 SCOPE OF THE DRAFT EIR AND EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

1.2.1 Scope

The scope of this EIR, as provided for by the CEQA Guidelines, is focused on specific resources that the proposed project may affect, as determined by preliminary evaluations conducted by Placer County. Placer County prepared and circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for this Draft EIR. The NOP included a general description of the project and a summary of the anticipated scope of the EIR, and is included in Appendix A to this Draft EIR.

The scope of this EIR is based on the analysis from the project’s Initial Study, which provides a preliminary evaluation of possible environmental impacts resulting from construction and operation of the proposed project. The Initial Study is provided in Appendix A to this Draft EIR. Based on the Initial Study analysis, it is expected that the proposed project may have a significant impact in the following 11 environmental resource areas:

- Land Use
- Visual Resources
- Biological Resources
- Transportation and Circulation
- Noise
- Air Quality
- Greenhouse Gases
- Geology and Soils
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Public Services and Utilities

The NOP was circulated for public review from April 8 through May 9, 2014. No information contradictory to any of the conclusions reached in the Initial Study and NOP was received subsequent to public review of the NOP. The comments received during the NOP review period served to refine the focus of this EIR. The Initial Study and NOP and comments on the NOP are provided in Appendix A to this Draft EIR. Verbal comments were received at a public scoping meeting held on April 28, 2014. A summary of these comments is also provided in Appendix A. NOP comments were received from the following State of California departments/offices: California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE), Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board, and the State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit. Comments on the NOP were also received from the Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, Tahoe–Truckee Sanitation Agency, Friends of the West Shore, and 33 community members.

1.2.2 Project Alternatives

At the time that the NOP was circulated, a project alternative that would provide access to the eastern portion of the project site through the adjacent Bear Creek Association subdivision was under consideration. That alternative was determined to be infeasible because the Bear Creek

Association membership voted against allowing for a roadway connection to the privately maintained roads within that subdivision.

Instead, another project alternative was developed to address issues related to consistency with Placer County policies and development standards. This alternative, Alternative B, is evaluated in this EIR at an equal level of detail as the proposed project, which is referred to as Alternative A in the analysis chapters. In addition, this EIR considers other project alternatives as part of the reasonable range of alternatives required under CEQA.

1.2.3 Effects Found Not to Be Significant and Excluded from EIR

The Initial Study concluded that the proposed project does not have the potential to result in significant impacts in certain resource areas. In accordance with Section 15128 of the CEQA Guidelines and Section 18.20.030 of the Placer County Environmental Review Ordinance, resource topics for which the project was determined to have a less-than-significant impact are not evaluated in this EIR. A brief discussion of the prior analysis of each resource topic excluded from evaluation in this EIR is provided below.

1.2.3.1 Agricultural/Forestry Resources

The project site and adjacent properties do not currently support any agricultural or forestry activities. Some trees will be removed during construction of the project, and impacts due to their removal are evaluated in Chapter 6, Biological Resources, of this EIR. The project would not result in any impacts to agricultural resources, and this topic is not evaluated in this EIR.

The project site supports forest habitat but does not currently and has not historically supported timber production or other forestry uses. Although the NOP and Initial Study indicated that the project would not adversely affect forestry resources, the potential impacts related to conversion of forest resources to non-forestry uses are evaluated in this EIR in consideration of comments received on the NOP from CAL FIRE.

1.2.3.2 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Evaluations related to avalanche risk and wildland fire risk are included in Chapter 13, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of this EIR. No other hazards or hazardous materials are known to occur on the undeveloped project site; therefore, an evaluation of potential environmental impacts related to hazardous materials is not included in this EIR.

1.2.3.3 Cultural Resources

A survey of the project site was conducted, and no evidence of archaeological, paleontological, or historical resources was observed. However, there is a possibility that archaeological,

paleontological, and/or historical resources could be present below the ground surface. The Initial Study (Appendix A) notes that standard construction conditions would apply to the project, requiring that if any archaeological, paleontological, or historical resources are uncovered during construction, all work must stop until the resources can be properly evaluated by a qualified expert and protected as necessary. No further analysis of these potential impacts is included in the EIR.

1.2.3.4 Mineral Resources

The project site and adjacent properties are not known to support any mineral removal activities. The project would not result in any impacts to mineral resources. This topic is not evaluated in this EIR.

1.2.3.5 Population and Housing

Although new housing is proposed under the proposed project, the number of units is consistent with that permitted by the underlying zoning. Therefore, substantial population growth is not anticipated. In addition, the project site is vacant; therefore, construction of new housing would not displace existing housing or existing persons. As such, this topic is not further evaluated in this EIR.

1.2.4 Discrete Impacts from Other Resource Topics Excluded from EIR

The analysis in the Initial Study demonstrates that the project would have no impacts relative to the following discrete issues. Although this EIR includes chapters evaluating the major topics listed below (such as aesthetics and biological resources), it does not address the following specific issues:

Land Use – *Physical division of an established community or disruption or division of the physical arrangement of an established community.* The proposed project would develop vacant land located between two existing residential developments. The existing developments are not connected and the proposed development would not divide or disrupt any established communities. This issue is not evaluated in the EIR.

Land Use – *Causing economic or social changes that would result in significant adverse physical changes to the environment such as urban decay or deterioration.* Development of the site for residential uses at densities consistent with existing zoning is not anticipated to cause economic or social change that could result in urban decay or deterioration. This issue is not evaluated in the EIR.

Visual Resources – *Substantial damage to scenic resources visible from a State Scenic Highway.* As evaluated in the Initial Study, State Route 89, which is identified by the California Department of Transportation as an Eligible State Scenic Highway (Caltrans 2013), is located approximately 2.7 miles east of the project site. Due to mountainous terrain, the project site is

not visible from State Route 89; therefore, no impacts to scenic resources within a State Scenic Highway are anticipated. This issue is not evaluated in this EIR.

Biological Resources – Oak woodlands. The site does not support any oak woodland habitat; therefore, the project would have no impact on oak woodlands. This issue is not evaluated in the EIR.

Biological Resources – Conflict with Habitat Conservation Plan. There is no adopted habitat conservation plan applicable to the project site, and the project would have no impact related to conflict or consistency with such a plan. This issue is not evaluated in the EIR.

Transportation/Traffic – Air traffic patterns. The project site is not within the vicinity of a public or private airport or airstrip and development of the project would have no effect on air traffic patterns. This issue is not evaluated in the EIR.

Noise – Airport noise exposures. The project site is not within the vicinity of a public or private airport or airstrip, and the project site is not exposed to noises from aircraft overflights. Impacts associated with airport noise are not evaluated in this EIR.

Air Quality – Objectionable odors. The proposed residential land uses would not generate substantial objectionable odors that could affect other residences nearby. This issue is not evaluated in the EIR.

Geology and Soils – Loss of unique geologic features. As reflected in the Geotechnical Evaluation for the project site, there are no unique geologic features on site, and the project would have no impact related to loss of such features. This issue is not evaluated in the EIR.

Geology and Soils – Hazards related to expansive soils. As reflected in the Geotechnical Evaluation for the project site, soils in the project area are not expansive and the project would have no impact related to construction on expansive soils. This issue is not evaluated in the EIR.

Hydrology and Water Quality – Adverse effects to groundwater quantity, quality, flow direction, or rate of flow. The proposed project would not pump groundwater directly or otherwise deplete groundwater supplies. The project would receive water supply from the Alpine Springs County Water District. As groundwater is the only water source for the Alpine Springs County Water District, the project would use groundwater. The adequacy of groundwater supplies to meet the project demands are evaluated in Chapter 14, Public Services and Utilities. Based on soil and geologic conditions, the project site does not provide opportunities for groundwater recharge, and development of the site would not reduce groundwater recharge, lead to degradation of groundwater quality, or alter the rate and/or flow of groundwater. These issues are not evaluated in this EIR.

Hydrology and Water Quality – *Exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.* The project site and the surrounding Alpine Meadows area are not located within the boundaries of a County-delineated levee or dam inundation zone. The nearest dam in the project vicinity, the Lake Tahoe Dam, is maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation and is located approximately 5 miles southeast of the project site at the confluence of the Truckee River and Lake Tahoe in Tahoe City. Due to distance and site elevation, the project site would not be exposed to flooding hazards. This issue is not evaluated in the EIR.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials – *Emission of hazardous emissions, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.* The project site is not located within 0.25 miles of an existing or proposed school. The nearest existing school, Squaw Valley Academy, is located approximately 3 miles north of the site in Squaw Valley. This issue is not evaluated in the EIR.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials – *Location on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and resultant creation of a significant hazard to the public or the environment.* As discussed in the Initial Study, the project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to California Government Code Section 65962.5. This issue is not evaluated in the EIR.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials – *Safety hazard due to proximity to a public or private airport or airstrip.* The project site is not located within the boundaries of an airport land use plan and is not located within 2 miles of a public/public use airport. The nearest airport to the project site, the Truckee–Tahoe Airport, is located approximately 11 miles northeast of the site in the town of Truckee. In addition, there are no private airstrips in the Alpine Meadows Valley/Bear Creek Valley or Squaw Valley. This issue is not evaluated in the EIR.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials – *Creation of or exposure of people to health hazards.* There are no known health hazards or environmental contaminants on the project site, and the proposed residential development is not anticipated to expose people to existing sources of health hazards or to create new health hazards. This issue is not evaluated in the EIR.

1.3 BASELINE CONDITIONS

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15125(a), an EIR must include a description of the “physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the project, as they exist at the time the notice of preparation is published.” This setting constitutes the “baseline physical conditions by which a lead agency determines whether an impact is significant.” Impacts can include direct and indirect physical changes to the baseline conditions. In this EIR, the baseline conditions for the

project site and region are identified in Chapter 3, Project Description, and in the Environmental Setting section of each resource chapter.

1.4 IMPACT SIGNIFICANCE

The analysis of project impacts relies on background information (including the Alpine Meadows General Plan), the project application and proposed plans, technical reports, memos, surveys, and consultation with experts in pertinent resource areas. Supporting material is cited throughout the document and listed in Chapter 18, References. The severity of each impact is evaluated in light of identified significance criteria, which identify conditions under which the proposed project would have a significant environmental impact. The significance criteria used in this Draft EIR were developed based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, Placer County policies established in the Placer County General Plan and the Alpine Meadows General Plan, and ordinances identified in each chapter of this Draft EIR. Evaluation of impacts against the established significance criteria was based on the conclusions of technical reports, memos, surveys, and consultation with experts prepared and conducted for this project.

1.5 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation measures are included throughout this Draft EIR to mitigate impacts by avoiding them, reducing them to less-than-significant levels, or providing compensation for unavoidable impacts. Placer County will also prepare a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) in accordance with Section 21081.6 of the California Public Resources Code. The MMRP will describe the implementation program for each mitigation measure included in this EIR and in the Initial Study for this project. In accordance with Section 18.28 of the Environmental Review provisions of the Placer County Code, mitigation measures are to be included in the conditions of approval for this project. Placer County monitors compliance with conditions of approval through a variety of permit processes, as listed below:

- Design Review Committee Approval
- Improvement Plan Approval
- Improvement Construction Inspection
- Encroachment Permit
- Final Map Recordation
- Building Permit Approval
- Certification of Occupancy

Before Placer County issues a permit or approval, it will verify that certain conditions of approval and/or mitigation measures have been met. The issuance of any of the listed Placer County approvals or permits facilitates monitoring of those conditions of approval and/or mitigation measures that are identified as prerequisites for a particular approval or permit.

The MMRP will also identify mitigation measures that cannot be monitored through Placer County's standard monitoring program. For such measures, the MMRP will identify specific implementation and monitoring requirements and procedures.

1.6 ORGANIZATION OF THE EIR AND DEFINITION OF TERMS

Each resource chapter in this EIR includes the following three sections:

- **Environmental Setting** – This section describes existing conditions and resources in the project area that could be affected by the proposed project.
- **Regulatory Setting** – This section identifies federal, state, and local policies, regulations, and laws that are applicable to the proposed project.
- **Impacts** – This section provides the significance criteria applicable to the resources being addressed, identifying those criteria for which impacts were determined in the Initial Study to be less than significant and those criteria for which impacts are further evaluated in this EIR. The “Impacts” section then describes the potential impacts of the project on the existing environment, and determines the level of significance of the impact before and after implementation of mitigation measures, if required. The full text of each mitigation measure required is also presented in this section.

In the “Impacts” section of each resource chapter, each impact is numbered with the chapter number followed by the impact number. For example, the first impact in the Biological Resources chapter is Impact 6.1. The mitigation measures associated with that impact carry the same number, and multiple mitigation measures for the same impact are denoted by a letter. For example, the first two mitigation measures for Impact 6.1 would be numbered Mitigation Measure (MM) 6.1a and MM 6.1b. The significance of impacts and mitigation measures for each impact are identified in a table format that lists the significance before mitigation is implemented, the proposed and recommended mitigation measures (refer to definition of terms below), and the significance after implementation of all mitigation measures. If a mitigation measure applies to more than one impact, it is repeated and/or referenced for each impact.

Following are the definitions of the terms used to denote the significance of each impact:

- **No Impact:** No change in existing conditions is anticipated if the project is implemented.

- ***Less Than Significant:*** No substantial adverse environmental change is anticipated. Mitigation for a less-than-significant impact is usually not necessary.
- ***Potentially Significant:*** Substantial environmental change may result from implementing the project. Mitigation is identified to reduce the magnitude of the impact, or to avoid or compensate for the impact.
- ***Significant:*** Adverse environmental change is likely to occur. Mitigation is identified to reduce the magnitude of this impact, or to avoid or compensate for the impact.
- ***Significant and Unavoidable:*** Substantial adverse environmental change will occur. This impact cannot be avoided. Although the magnitude may be reduced with implementation of mitigation, there is no feasible mitigation that would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

This EIR includes mitigation measures intended to reduce identified impacts. Mitigation measures may be proposed by the project applicant or recommended by Placer County. The proposed mitigation measures are those that have been incorporated into the project design or agreed to by the project applicant, and the recommended mitigation measures are additional measures that have been identified by Placer County and the EIR preparers as necessary to reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels. If the EIR is certified and the project approved (refer to Section 1.7), the project applicant/developer would be required to implement all mitigation measures included in the EIR as certified. As discussed in CEQA Guidelines Section 15370, mitigation strategies can include the following:

- Avoiding the impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action.
- Minimizing the impact by limiting the degree of magnitude of the project and its implementation.
- Rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the impacted environment.
- Reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the project.
- Compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments.

1.7 PROJECT REVIEW AND CEQA PROCESS

1.7.1 CEQA Statutes

CEQA was adopted in 1970 with the goal of protecting the environment.

It is the intent of the Legislature that all agencies of the state government which regulate activities of private individuals, corporations, and public agencies which

are found to affect the quality of the environment, shall regulate such activities so that major consideration is given to preventing environmental damage, while providing a decent home and satisfying living environment for every Californian (California Public Resources Code, Section 21000[g]).

This legislative intent is met through the preparation of comprehensive, multi-disciplinary analyses of environmental impacts. The analyses must disclose the significant impacts to the environment of proposed activities, and identify feasible alternatives and mitigation measures to avoid or reduce impacts. Section 21002 of CEQA directs that “public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental impacts of such projects.”

1.7.2 CEQA Guidelines

In addition to the requirements expressed in CEQA, the State Office of Planning and Research developed the CEQA Guidelines to direct public agencies in the appropriate implementation of CEQA. The CEQA Guidelines were adopted by the State Resources Agency at the direction of the state legislature, as expressed in Section 21083 of CEQA. They are updated regularly in response to legislative actions and case law.

1.7.3 CEQA Implementation

CEQA applies to all discretionary activities of public agencies. A discretionary activity is one in which the public agency has the authority to approve or deny issuance of permits or project approvals. Section 15002(i) of the CEQA Guidelines defines a discretionary action as one in which “a governmental agency can use its judgment in deciding whether and how to carry out or approve a project.” In formulating the decisions of “whether and how” to act, the public agency must adhere to the CEQA requirements for evaluating the potential environmental impacts of the action and identifying feasible alternatives and/or mitigation measures to lessen those impacts.

A primary goal of CEQA is to inform decision makers and the public of the potential environmental impacts of discretionary actions, and to disclose to the public the reasoning used by the agency to reach their decision. To facilitate this disclosure, both CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines establish requirements for public notice and review of CEQA documents, as discussed below.

CEQA requires that governmental agencies establish standards and procedures by which to conduct the required environmental review of their actions. Placer County’s Environmental Review Ordinance, Chapter 18 of the Placer County Code, serves this function.

The contents of this EIR are governed by Sections 21100 and 21100.1 of CEQA and by Sections 15120 through 15132 of the CEQA Guidelines. In short, the EIR must describe the proposed

project and the existing environmental setting of the project area; evaluate the potential environmental impacts of the project, including cumulative impacts to which the project would contribute; and consider mitigation measures and alternatives to the project that could avoid or reduce those impacts.

1.7.4 CEQA Process and Public Review Opportunities

Public and agency review of documents prepared pursuant to the mandates of CEQA is an integral part of the CEQA process. The following discussion provides details of the overall CEQA process for this project, information on the opportunities for public review and public comment, and where to submit comments on this Draft EIR. Refer to CEQA Section 21105 and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15082, 15083, and 15087 for additional details.

1.7.4.1 Notice of Preparation

When the Lead Agency identifies potentially significant environmental impacts of a proposed project or action, an NOP is prepared pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15082. The NOP, which includes a description of the project and its probable environmental effects, is circulated to the public and to agencies that may have jurisdiction over some aspect of the project or the resources that would be affected by the project. The NOP for the Alpine Sierra Subdivision project was circulated from April 8 through May 9, 2014. A public scoping meeting to inform the public of the CEQA process and the proposed scope of the EIR was conducted on April 28, 2014. The public and agencies were thus provided the opportunity to comment on the scope and content of the EIR. CEQA Guidelines Section 15084(c) states that “the Lead Agency must consider all information and comments received” during the scoping process in preparation of the EIR. Consideration of the comments generated in response to circulation of the NOP is reflected in Section 1.2 and in Chapters 4 through 17 of this Draft EIR. Those comments are included in Appendix A of this Draft EIR.

1.7.4.2 Draft EIR

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15087, Placer County provided public notice of availability of this Draft EIR and submitted this Draft EIR to the State Clearinghouse for distribution to state agencies. This Draft EIR is being circulated for a 45-day public comment period.

A public hearing regarding the information contained in this Draft EIR will be held during the public comment period, during which verbal comments on the Draft EIR will be accepted. Public notice of the hearing will be provided.

Public comment on the Draft EIR will be accepted in written form and should be limited to the scope and content of the EIR. All comments or questions regarding the Draft EIR must be submitted no later than November 3, 2017, and should be addressed to the following:

Shirlee Herrington
Placer County Environmental Coordination Services Division
3091 County Center Drive
Auburn, California 95603
Email: cdraecs@placer.ca.gov

1.7.4.3 Response to Comments/Final EIR

The Final EIR will be prepared upon completion of the Draft EIR review period. The Final EIR will provide direct responses to each comment submitted on the Draft EIR. Should responding to comments require revisions to the text of the Draft EIR, those revisions will be presented in the Final EIR. The Final EIR will be made available for review by the agencies, organizations, and individuals who commented on the Draft EIR, as well as by the general public.

1.7.4.4 Certification of the EIR/Project Consideration

Placer County will review and consider the Final EIR. If the County finds that the Final EIR is “adequate and complete,” the County may certify the Final EIR in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15090. As discussed above, an MMRP would also be adopted to ensure that mitigation measures required by the EIR to reduce or avoid significant impacts are carried out during project implementation. Upon review and consideration of the Final EIR, Placer County may take action to approve, revise, or reject the project.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK