



**COUNTY OF PLACER**  
Community Development Resource Agency

John Marin, Agency Director

**ENVIRONMENTAL  
COORDINATION  
SERVICES**

Gina Langford, Coordinator

**NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

In accordance with Placer County ordinances regarding implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, Placer County has conducted an Initial Study to determine whether the following project may have a significant adverse effect on the environment, and on the basis of that study hereby finds:

- The proposed project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment, therefore, it does not require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report and this Negative Declaration has been prepared
- Although the proposed project could have a significant adverse effect on the environment, there will not be a significant adverse effect in this case because the project has incorporated specific provisions to reduce impacts to a less than significant level and/or the mitigation measures described herein have been added to the project. A Mitigated Negative Declaration has thus been prepared.

The environmental documents, which constitute the Initial Study and provide the basis and reasons for this determination are attached and/or referenced herein and are hereby made a part of this document

**PROJECT INFORMATION**

<b>Title:</b> Penryn Townhomes Planned Development	<b>Plus#</b> PSUB T20060767
<b>Description:</b> Proposed to construct twenty-three town homes on a 3.2 acre parcel which includes common interest lots owned by all homeowners.	
<b>Location:</b> East of Penryn Road, approximately .1 mile north of I-80 interchange in Penryn.	
<b>Project Owner:</b> Penryn 3.2 Investors LLC, 2250 Douglas Blvd., Suite 200, Roseville, CA 95661 (916)677-8124	
<b>Project Applicant:</b> Uhora Engineering & Planning Inc., 2901 Douglas Blvd., Suite 285, Roseville, CA 95661 (916)780-2500	
<b>County Contact Person:</b> Leah Rosasco	530-745-3091

**PUBLIC NOTICE**

The comment period for this document closes on June 8, 2007. A copy of the Negative Declaration is available for public review at the Community Development Resource Agency public counter and at the Penryn Library. Property owners within 300 feet of the subject site shall be notified by mail of the upcoming hearing before the Planning Commission. Additional information may be obtained by contacting the Community Development Resource Agency, Environmental Coordination Services, at (530) 745-3132 between the hours of 8:00 am and 5:00 pm at 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603.

If you wish to appeal the appropriateness or adequacy of this document, address your written comments to our finding that the project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment: (1) identify the environmental effect(s), why they would occur, and why they would be significant, and (2) suggest any mitigation measures which you believe would eliminate or reduce the effect to an acceptable level. Regarding item (1) above, explain the basis for your comments and submit any supporting data or references. Refer to Section 18.32 of the Placer County Code for important information regarding the timely filing of appeals.

Recorder's Certification

08/06/2007

POSTED \_\_\_\_\_  
through \_\_\_\_\_  
JENNIFER L. COOPER, CLERK  
By: *J. Woodman* \_\_\_\_\_



John Marin, Agency Director

Gina Langford, Coordinator

3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190 • Auburn • California 95603 • 530-745-3132 • fax 530-745-3003 • www.placer.ca.gov/planning

## INITIAL STUDY & CHECKLIST

This Initial Study has been prepared to identify and assess the anticipated environmental impacts of the following described project application. The document may rely on previous environmental documents (see Section C) and site-specific studies (see Section I) prepared to address in detail the effects or impacts associated with the project.

This document has been prepared to satisfy the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.) CEQA requires that all state and local government agencies consider the environmental consequences of projects over which they have discretionary authority before acting on those projects.

The Initial Study is a public document used by the decision-making lead agency to determine whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment. If the lead agency finds substantial evidence that any aspect of the project, either individually or cumulatively, may have a significant effect on the environment, regardless of whether the overall effect of the project is adverse or beneficial, the lead agency is required to prepare an EIR, use a previously-prepared EIR and supplement that EIR, or prepare a Subsequent EIR to analyze the project at hand. If the agency finds no substantial evidence that the project or any of its aspects may cause a significant effect on the environment, a Negative Declaration shall be prepared. If in the course of analysis, the agency recognizes that the project may have a significant impact on the environment, but that by incorporating specific mitigation measures the impact will be reduced to a less than significant effect, a Mitigated Negative Declaration shall be prepared.

### A. BACKGROUND:

Project Title: <b>Penryn Townhomes Planned Development</b>	Plus# PSUB T20060767
Entitlements: Conditional Use Permit (Planned Development), Subdivision Tentative Map	
Site Area: 3.2 acres	APN: 043-060-061
Location: East side of Penryn Road, approximately .1 mile north of Interstate 80 interchanges.	
Project Description: This project includes a Planned Residential subdivision including 23 residential lots (townhomes) on 3.2 acres, with remaining open space to be used as parking and circulation areas, and open space and recreation features. The project also includes frontage and interior landscaping. Site topography is flat to moderately sloped with elevations ranging from approximately 468 to 497 feet above mean sea level. Surface runoff tends to flow from east to west toward Penryn Road. The site is comprised primarily of mixed oak woodland with fruit trees scattered throughout the parcel. There are numerous large rock outcroppings throughout the site.	

### B. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

Location	Zoning	General Plan / Community Plan	Existing Conditions & Improvements
Site	Neighborhood commercial combining Use Permit, combining Design Scenic Corridor (C1-UP-DC)	Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan/Penryn Parkway	Undeveloped
North	Same as project site	Same as project site	Existing plant nursery
South	Same as project site	Same as project site	Existing commercial development
East	Same as project site	Same as project site	Existing commercial development

West	Same as project site	Same as project site	Penryn Road with undeveloped land and existing church beyond
------	----------------------	----------------------	--

### C. PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT:

The County has determined that an Initial Study shall be prepared in order to determine whether the potential exists for unmitigatable impacts resulting from the proposed project. Relevant analysis from the County-wide General Plan and Community Plan Certified EIRs, and other project-specific studies and reports that have been generated to date, were used as the database for the Initial Study. The decision to prepare the Initial Study utilizing the analysis contained in the General Plan and Specific Plan Certified EIRs, and project-specific analysis summarized herein, is sustained by Sections 15168 and 15183 of the CEQA Guidelines.

Section 15183 states that "projects which are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified shall not require additional environmental review, except as may be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or site." Thus, if an impact is not peculiar to the project or site, and it has been addressed as a significant effect in the prior EIR, or can be substantially mitigated by the imposition of uniformly applied development policies or standards, then additional environmental documentation need not be prepared for the project solely on the basis of that impact.

Section 15168 relating to Program EIRs indicates that where subsequent activities involve site-specific operations, the agency should use a written checklist or similar device to document the evaluation of the site and the activity, to determine whether the environmental effects of the operation were covered in the earlier Program EIR. A Program EIR is intended to provide the basis in an Initial Study for determining whether the later activity may have any significant effects. It can also be incorporated by reference to address regional influences, secondary effects, cumulative impacts, broad alternatives, and other factors that apply to the program as a whole.

The following documents serve as Program-level EIRs from which incorporation by reference can occur:

- ➔ County-wide General Plan EIR
- ➔ Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan EIR

The above stated documents are available for review Monday through Friday, 8am to 5pm, at the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603. For Tahoe projects, the document will also be available in our Tahoe Division office, 565 West Lake Blvd, Tahoe City, CA 96145.

### D. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

The Initial Study checklist recommended by the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines is used to determine potential impacts of the proposed project on the physical environment. The checklist provides a list of questions concerning a comprehensive array of environmental issue areas potentially affected by the project (see CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G). Explanations to answers are provided in a discussion for each section of questions as follows:

- a) A brief explanation is required for all answers including "No Impact" answers.
- b) "Less Than Significant Impact" applies where the project's impacts are insubstantial and do not require any mitigation to reduce impacts.
- c) "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The County, as lead agency, must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level (mitigation measures from earlier analyses may be cross-referenced).
- d) "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- e) All answers must take account of the entire action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts [CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(a)(1)].

- f) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, Program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15063(c)(3)(D)). A brief discussion should be attached addressing the following:
- **Earlier analyses used** – Identify earlier analyses and state where they are available for review.
  - **Impacts adequately addressed** – Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of, and adequately analyzed in, an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards. Also, state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - **Mitigation measures** – For effects that are checked as "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- g) References to information sources for potential impacts (i.e. General Plans/Community Plans, zoning ordinances) should be incorporated into the checklist. Reference to a previously-prepared or outside document should include a reference to the pages or chapters where the statement is substantiated. A source list should be attached and other sources used, or individuals contacted, should be cited in the discussion.

**I. AESTHETICS – Would the project**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (PLN)				X
2. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, within a state scenic highway? (PLN)				X
3. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (PLN)			X	
4. Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (PLN)			X	

**Discussion- Item I-1:**

The proposed project is not located within a scenic vista and therefore will not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

**Discussion- Item I-2:**

The proposed project is not located within a state scenic highway and will not damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway.

**Discussion- Item I-3:**

The proposed project would include the construction of a new subdivision with 23 townhomes on individual lots on a 3.2-acre parcel that is currently vacant. The site currently contains multiple oak trees and rock outcroppings on relatively flat land. The site is bound on the south and east by a parcel that is developed with commercial retail uses and on the north by an existing plant nursery. The land to the west of the subject parcel includes Penryn Road and vacant land beyond, with a church located further west. While the proposed project will include transforming vacant land to townhomes and will contain soundwalls along areas for which the project would be impacted by noise generated from Interstate-80, it is not anticipated that the project would substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings as the zoning designation of Design Scenic Corridor requires approval of a Design Site Agreement prior to acceptance of Improvement Plans. Although the proposed project will change the aesthetics of the project site potential impacts to the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings are considered less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion- Item I-4:**

The proposed project will include the construction of a new subdivision that will include 23 new townhomes. The project includes street lighting along interior streets and there will be lights associated with typical multi-family residential uses and structures (porch lights, etc.). While the project will create a new source of light or glare, it is not anticipated that the lighting associated with the proposed project would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area as the zoning designation of Design Scenic Corridor requires approval of a Design Site Agreement prior to acceptance of Improvement Plans. No mitigation measures are required.

**II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCE – Would the project**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? (PLN)				X
2. Conflict with General Plan or other policies regarding land use buffers for agricultural operations? (PLN)				X
3. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? (PLN)				X
4. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland (including livestock grazing) to non-agricultural use? (PLN)				X

**Discussion- Item II-1:**

The proposed project will not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use as it is proposed on a 3.2-acre parcel that is not comprised of land suitable for agricultural uses.

**Discussion- Item II-2:**

The proposed project will not conflict with General Plan or other policies regarding land use buffers for agricultural operations as there are no agricultural operations within the project vicinity.

**Discussion- Item II-3:**

The proposed project will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract as there are no agricultural uses or Williamson Act contract lands within the project vicinity.

**Discussion- Item II-4:**

The proposed project will not involve changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland (including livestock grazing) to non-agricultural use as there are no agricultural uses on the project site or surrounding parcels.

**III. AIR QUALITY – Would the project**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (APCD)				X
2. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (APCD)			X	
3. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (APCD)			X	

4. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (APCD)			X	
5. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (APCD)			X	

**Discussion- Item III-1:**

The project will not conflict with the Air Quality Management Plan.

**Discussion- Items III-2,3:**

This proposed project is located in the Sacramento Valley Air Basin portion of Placer County. This area is designated as non-attainment for the federal and state ozone standard and non-attainment for the state particulate matter standard. The project is below the District's thresholds and the air quality impacts will be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion- Items III-4,5:**

The project is in close proximity to I-80. The I-80 vehicular emissions are dispersed due to the fact that the project is uphill from I-80 and there is a commercial business center on the south side of the project. Thus, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. No mitigation measures are required.

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations or by the California Department of Fish & Game or U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service? (PLN)		X		
2. Substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number of or restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species? (PLN)			X	
3. Have a substantial adverse effect on the environment by converting oak woodlands? (PLN)			X	
4. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations or by the California Department of Fish & Game or U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service? (PLN)			X	
5. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (PLN)				X
6. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? (PLN)			X	
7. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (PLN)		X		

8. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (PLN)				X
--	--	--	--	---

**Discussion- Item IV-1:**

The Biological Resource Assessment prepared by Foothill Associates (dated August 15, 2005) states that the project site provides suitable habitat for special-status species, that special-status raptors are present on the site, and that there is a high likelihood that the White-tailed kite, also a special-status species, is present on site. While the site itself contains no suitable foraging habitat, there are suitable foraging areas adjacent to the site. The proposed project would include the removal of 14 oak trees and the introduction of 23 townhomes and associated parking, circulation, and open space/recreation areas, which would result in the loss of the site as suitable nesting habitat. The proposed project could have a substantial adverse effect, through habitat modifications, on special status raptor species whose active nests are protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and the California Department of Fish & Game. Mitigation measures set forth in this document will reduce impacts to species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measures- Item IV-1:**

**MM IV 1** Prior to any grading or tree removal activities, during the raptor nesting season (March 1 - September 1), a focused survey for raptor nests shall be conducted by a qualified biologist. A report summarizing the survey shall be provided to Placer County and the California Department of Fish & Game (CDFG) within 30 days of the completed survey. If an active raptor nest is identified appropriate mitigation measures shall be developed and implemented in consultation with CDFG. If construction is proposed to take place between March 1<sup>st</sup> and September 1<sup>st</sup>, no construction activity or tree removal shall occur within 500 feet of an active nest (or greater distance, as determined by the CDFG). Construction activities may only resume after a follow up survey has been conducted and a report prepared by a qualified raptor biologist indicating that the nests (or nests) are no longer active, and that no new nests have been identified. A follow up survey shall be conducted 2 months following the initial survey, if the initial survey occurs between March 1<sup>st</sup> and July 1<sup>st</sup>. Additional follow up surveys may be required by the DRC, based on the recommendations in the raptor study and/or as recommended by the CDFG. Temporary construction fencing and signage as described herein shall be installed at a minimum 500 foot radius around trees containing active nests. If all project construction occurs between September 1<sup>st</sup> and March 1<sup>st</sup> no raptor surveys will be required. Trees previously approved for removal by Placer County, which contain stick nests, may only be removed between September 1<sup>st</sup> and March 1<sup>st</sup>. A note which includes the wording of this condition of approval will be placed on the Improvement Plans. Said plans will also show all protective fencing for those trees identified for protection within the raptor report.

**Discussion- Item IV-2:**

The proposed project includes the development of a 3.2-acre parcel with 23 townhomes, and associated parking, circulation, and open space/recreation areas. The site is currently comprised of oak woodland that will be either removed or impacted by the introduction of residences. The proposed project would have no impacts on fish populations as there is no habitat on site that would support fish populations. While the site does contain habitat that could support special status raptor species, due to the relatively small size of the site it is not anticipated that the proposed project would substantially reduce the habitat of a wildlife species, cause a wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened species. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion- Item IV-3:**

The proposed project includes the removal of 36 oak trees totaling 552" DBH, and grading disturbance within the roofline of an additional 13 trees that total 235" DBH. While these represent impacts to trees that will require mitigation under the Placer County Tree Preservation ordinance, these impacts will result in a less than significant impact on the environment by converting oak woodlands. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion- Item IV-4:**

The proposed project will not result in a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat, as the project site does not contain any riparian habitat. The project will result in substantial adverse effect on the oak woodland area contained on the project site, which is considered a sensitive natural community. Mitigation measures set forth in this document will reduce the level of impacts to this sensitive natural community to a less than significant level. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion- Item IV-5:**

The proposed project will not result in a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act as there are no federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act on the project site.

**Discussion- Item IV-6:**

The proposed project would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. While the proposed site does contain habitat that supports native resident raptors, the project site does not provide adequate area or resources for the movement of wildlife species and is not part of a migratory route, or wildlife corridor.

The project site may contain wildlife nursery sites in the form of raptor nests, however mitigation measures set forth in this document would reduce any impacts to nursery sites to a less than significant level. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion- Item IV-7:**

The proposed project will conflict with the County's Tree Preservation Ordinance as it includes the removal of 36 protected native oak trees totaling 552" DBH, and grading disturbance within the roofline of an additional 13 protected native oak trees that total 235" DBH. Mitigation measures set forth in this document will reduce any impacts to trees protected by the County's Tree Preservation Ordinance to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measures- Item IV-7:**

MM IV 2 The applicant shall mitigate for the removal of and impacts to trees on-site by replacing trees on-site on an inch-for-inch basis. Prior to approval of Improvement Plans the applicant shall submit to the DRC for review and approval a Planting Plan that details the tree replacement, irrigation, and monitoring plan for the mitigation of impacted trees (including removal and impacts to dripline) In lieu of replacement on-site the applicant may mitigate impacts to the trees with payment into the Tree Preservation fund at a rate of \$100.00 per inch removed.

**Discussion- Item IV-8:**

The proposed project will not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan as no such plans have been adopted in Placer County.

**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project,**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Substantially cause adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5? (PLN)		X		
2. Substantially cause adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5? (PLN)		X		
3. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (PLN)		X		
4. Have the potential to cause a physical change, which would affect unique ethnic cultural values? (PLN)				X
5. Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? (PLN)				X
6. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (PLN)		X		

**Discussion- Items V-1,2,3:**

The Archaeological Survey prepared for the project site, dated June 27, 2005, does not identify any historic, archeological, or paleontological resources on-site. The Archeological Survey states that the evaluation of the site

included an inventory-level, surface survey only, and that the possibility exists that significant historic, archeological, or paleontological resources could be unearthed as a result of project construction activities. Any significant historic, archeological, or paleontological resources located on the site could be significantly negatively impacted as a result of grading required for the construction of this project. Mitigation measures set forth in this document will reduce the level of impacts to these resources to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measures- Items V-1,2,3:**

MM V.1 If any archaeological artifacts, exotic rock (non-native), or unusual amounts of shell or bone are uncovered during any on-site construction activities, all work shall stop immediately in the area and a certified archaeologist retained to evaluate the deposit. The Placer County Planning Department and Department of Museums shall be contacted for review of the archaeological find(s).

If the discovery consists of human remains, the Placer County Coroner and Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted. Work in the area may only proceed after authorization is granted by the Placer County Planning Department. A note to this effect shall be provided on the Improvement Plans for the project.

Following a review of the new find and consultation with appropriate experts, if necessary, the authority to proceed may be accompanied by the addition of development requirements which provide protection of the site and/or additional mitigation measures necessary to address the unique or sensitive nature of the site.

**Discussion- Item V-4:**

The proposed project does not have the potential to cause a physical change, which would affect unique ethnic cultural values, as there are no unique ethnic features on the site.

**Discussion- Item V-5:**

The proposed project will not restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area as there are no religious or sacred uses on the site.

**Discussion- Item V-6:**

The proposed project includes grading of 52% of the project site (approximately 72,500 square-feet) will be graded as a result of the proposed project, with cuts up to four feet. On-site grading activities required for the construction of the proposed project could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, or disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. Mitigation measures set forth in this document will reduce impacts resulting from disturbance of human remains to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measures- Item V-6:**

Refer to text in MM V.1

**VI. GEOLOGY & SOILS – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Expose people or structures to unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures? (ESD)		X		
2. Result in significant disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcrowding of the soil? (ESD)		X		
3. Result in substantial change in topography or ground surface relief features? (ESD)		X		
4. Result in the destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features? (ESD)				X
5. Result in any significant increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site? (ESD)		X		
6. Result in changes in deposition or erosion or changes in siltation which may modify the channel of a river, stream, or lake? (ESD)		X		

7. Result in exposure of people or property to geologic and geomorphological (i.e. Avalanches) hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards? (ESD)			X	
8. Be located on a geological unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse? (ESD)			X	
9. Be located on expansive soils, as defined in Table 18, 1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? (ESD)				X

**Discussion- Items VI-1,2,3:**

This project proposal will result in the disturbance of the currently vacant 3.2 acre site for the construction of 23 single family attached units (townhomes) on individual lots as well as approximately 1.5 acres of open space lots including recreational facilities for the residents. The site is triangular in shape with three existing rock outcroppings. A concrete foundation remains within the project area from a past water tank and buried water pipes are also present on-site from this past use.

According to a preliminary geotechnical engineering report by Holdrege & Kull dated July 19, 2005, the majority of the project site is underlain by soil/rock classified as the Andregg-Rock outcrop complex on 5 to 30 percent slopes. Andregg coarse sandy loams on 2 to 9 percent slopes occur on the northwest to west central portion of the site, along Penryn Road. Both of these soil series consist of moderately deep, well-drained soil underlain by weathered granitic rock. Runoff is rapid to very rapid, with low erosion hazard due to the presence of significant rock. The geotechnical investigation included excavation of six exploratory trenches and the coring of existing pavement on Penryn Road. The exploratory trenches revealed similar conditions throughout the site, consisting of brown, dry, moderately dense silty fine sand from the surface to a depth of 6 inches, dark red, damp, very dense, silty sand from 6 inches to 5.5 feet, and reddish brown silty coarse sand with trace clay at depths greater than 5.5 feet. Resistant rock, which may affect excavatability, is present throughout the site.

The grading disturbance of approximately 50%, or 69,000 square feet, of the project site will be sensitive to the site's natural and man-made resources to the extent feasible. Grading activities are associated with the establishment of building pads and for roadway and parking improvements. Stem walls and other engineering methods will be used to minimize cut/fill and grading impacts. All resulting finished grades are proposed to be no steeper than 2:1 at locations identified on the preliminary grading plan. The project grading is estimated at approximately 5,000 cubic yards of cut and 2,000 cubic yards of fill. Grading activities are intended to balance on-site through use of berms and other landscape features. In the event that on-site balancing is not possible, the excess cut would be hauled off-site and the deposit site, haulage route, and dust and erosion control measures will be specified as part of the project improvement plans.

The proposed project's impacts associated with unstable earth conditions, soil disruptions, displacements, compaction of the soil, and change in topography and ground surface relief features will be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures:

**Mitigation Measures- Items VI-1,2,3:**

MM VI.1 The applicant will prepare and submit Improvement Plans, specifications and cost estimates (per the requirements of Section II of the Land Development Manual (LDM) that are in effect at the time of submittal) to the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD) for review and approval. The plans shall show all conditions for the project as well as pertinent topographical features both on- and off-site. All existing and proposed utilities and easements, on-site and adjacent to the project, which may be affected by planned construction, shall be shown on the plans. All landscaping and irrigation facilities within the public right-of-way (or public easements), or landscaping within sight distance areas at intersections, shall be included in the Improvement Plans. The applicant will pay plan check and inspection fees. Prior to plan approval, all applicable recording and reproduction costs shall be paid. The cost of the above-noted landscape and irrigation facilities shall be included in the estimates used to determine these fees. It is the applicant's responsibility to obtain all required agency signatures on the plans and to secure department approvals. If the Design/Site Review process and/or DRC review is required as a condition of approval for the project, said review process shall be completed prior to submittal of Improvement Plans. Record drawings shall be prepared and signed by a California Registered Civil Engineer at the applicant's expense and shall be submitted to the ESD in both electronic and hard copy versions in a format to be approved by the ESD prior to acceptance by the County of site improvements.

MM VI.2 All proposed grading, drainage improvements, vegetation, tree impacts and tree removal shall be shown on the Improvement Plans and all work shall conform to provisions of the County Grading Ordinance (Section 15.48).

Placer County Code) and the Placer County Flood Control District's Stormwater Management Manual. The applicant shall pay plan check fees and inspection fees. No grading, clearing, or tree disturbance shall occur until the Improvement Plans are approved and any required temporary construction fencing has been installed and inspected by a member of the DRC. All cut/fill slopes shall be at 2:1 (horizontal/vertical) unless a soils report supports a steeper slope and the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD) concurs with said recommendation.

All facilities and/or easements dedicated or offered for dedication to Placer County or to other public agencies which encroach on the project site or within any area to be disturbed by the project construction shall be accurately located on the Improvement Plans. The intent of this requirement is to allow review by concerned agencies of any work that may affect their facilities.

The applicant shall revegetate all disturbed areas. Revegetation undertaken from April 1 to October 1 shall include regular watering to ensure adequate growth. A winterization plan shall be provided with project Improvement Plans. It is the applicant's responsibility to assure proper installation and maintenance of erosion control/winterization during project construction. Provide for erosion control where roadside drainage is off of the pavement, to the satisfaction of the ESD.

Submit to the ESD a letter of credit or cash deposit in the amount of 110% of an approved engineer's estimate for winterization and permanent erosion control work prior to Improvement Plan approval to guarantee protection against erosion and improper grading practices. Upon the County's acceptance of improvements, and satisfactory completion of a one-year maintenance period, unused portions of said deposit shall be refunded to the project applicant or authorized agent.

If, at any time during construction, a field review by County personnel indicates a significant deviation from the proposed grading shown on the Improvement Plans, specifically with regard to slope heights, slope ratios, erosion control, winterization, tree disturbance, and/or pad elevations and configurations, the plans shall be reviewed by the DRC/ESD for a determination of substantial conformance to the project approvals prior to any further work proceeding. Failure of the DRC/ESD to make a determination of substantial conformance may serve as grounds for the revocation/modification of the project approval by the appropriate hearing body.

Any work affecting facilities maintained by, or easements dedicated or offered for dedication, to Placer County or other public agency may require the submittal and review of appropriate Improvement Plans by ESD or the other agency.

**MM VI.3** Submit to the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD), for review and approval, a geotechnical engineering report produced by a California Registered Civil Engineer or Geotechnical Engineer. The report shall address and make recommendations on the following.

- Road, pavement, and parking area design
- Structural foundations, including retaining wall design (if applicable)
- Grading practices
- Erosion/winterization
- Special problems discovered on-site, (i.e., groundwater, expansive/unstable soils, etc.)
- Slope stability

Once approved by the ESD, two copies of the final report shall be provided to the ESD and one copy to the Building Department for their use. If the soils report indicates the presence of critically expansive or other soils problems which, if not corrected, could lead to structural defects, a certification of completion of the requirements of the soils report will be required for subdivisions, prior to issuance of Building Permits. This certification may be completed on a Lot by Lot basis or on a Tract basis. This shall be so noted in the CC&Rs and on the Informational Sheet filed with the Final Map(s). It is the responsibility of the developer to provide for engineering inspection and certification that earthwork has been performed in conformity with recommendations contained in the report.

**MM VI.4** Staging Areas: Stockpiling and/or vehicle staging areas shall be identified on the Improvement Plans and located as far as practical from existing dwellings and protected resources in the area.

**MM VI.5** If blasting is required for the installation of site improvements, the developer will comply with applicable County Ordinances that relate to blasting and use only State licensed contractors to conduct these operations.

**Discussion- Item VI-4:**

Based on the preliminary geotechnical report by Holdrege & Kull dated July 19, 2005, there are no identified unique geologic or physical features at the site that will be destroyed, covered, or modified by this project.

**Discussion- Items VI-5,6:**

This project proposal would result in the construction of 23 single family attached units (townhomes), associated parking areas, and Penryn Road frontage improvements and disturb approximately 1.6 acres of the 3.2 acre site. The disruption of soils on this primarily undeveloped property increases the risk of erosion and creates a potential

for contamination of stormwater runoff with disturbed soils or other pollutants introduced through typical grading practices. The construction phase will create significant potential for erosion as disturbed soil may come in contact with wind or precipitation that could transport sediment to the air and/or adjacent waterways. Discharge of concentrated runoff in the post-development condition could also contribute to the erosion potential impact in the long-term. Erosion potential and water quality impacts are always present and occur when protective vegetative cover is removed and soils are disturbed. It is primarily the shaping of building pads, grading for parking areas, and trenching for utilities that are responsible for accelerating erosion and degrading water quality. This disruption of soils on the site has the potential to result in significant increases in erosion of soils both on- and off-site. The proposed project's impacts associated with soil erosion will be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures:

**Mitigation Measures - Items VI-5,6:**

- Refer to text in MM VI.1
- Refer to text in MM VI.2
- Refer to text in MM VI.3
- Refer to text in MM VI.4

MM VI.6 Water quality Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall be designed according to the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks for Construction, for New Development / Redevelopment, and/or for Industrial and Commercial, (and/or other similar source as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD)).

Construction (temporary) BMPs for the project include, but are not limited to: Fiber Rolls (SE-5), Hydroseeding (EC-4), Stabilized Construction Entrance (LOM Plate C-4), Storm Drain Inlet Protection (SE-10), Silt Fence (SE-1), revegetation techniques, gravel bags, diversion swales, dust control measures, limit the soil disturbance, and concrete washout areas.

MM VI.7 Projects with ground disturbance exceeding one-acre that are subject to construction stormwater quality permit requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program shall obtain such permit from the State Regional Water Quality Control Board and shall provide to the Engineering and Surveying Department evidence of a state-issued WDID number or filing of a Notice of Intent and fees prior to start of construction.

**Discussion- Items VI-7,8:**

The preliminary geotechnical report by Holdrege & Kull dated July 19, 2005 states that the site is located within Seismic Zone 3 on the California Building Code (CBC) Seismic Zone Map. The site may experience moderate ground shaking caused by earthquakes occurring along offsite faults. If structures are constructed according to the current edition of the California Building Code, the likelihood of severe damage due to ground shaking should be minimal. There is no landsliding or slope instability related to the project site. The exposure of people or property to seismic impacts related to this 23 unit townhome project is considered to be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion- Item VI-9:**

According to the preliminary geotechnical report by Holdrege & Kull dated July 19, 2005, based on the granular, non-cohesive nature of the soil encountered in the exploratory trenches, performing Atterberg limits of expansion index testing was not necessary, as this type of soil would not exhibit the characteristics of expansive soils.

**VII. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project.**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine handling, transport, use, or disposal of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials? (EHS)			X	
2. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (EHS)			X	

3. Emit hazardous emissions, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (APCD)				X
4. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (EHS)		X		
5. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (PLN)				X
6. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing in the project area? (PLN)				X
7. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? (PLN)				X
8. Create any health hazard or potential health hazard? (EHS)		X		
9. Expose people to existing sources of potential health hazards? (EHS)		X		

**Discussion- Items VII-1,2:**

The use of hazardous substances during normal construction activities is expected to be limited in nature, and will be subject to standard handling and storage requirements. Accordingly, impacts related to the release of hazardous substances are considered less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion- Item VII-3:**

Based upon the project description, the project is not expected to emit hazardous emissions.

**Discussion- Item VII-4:**

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Phase I ESA), dated April 21, 2005, was prepared for the project site by MG Nelson, Ph.D. An additional Environmental Assessment and Soil Sampling report, dated December 13, 2006, was prepared for the project site by Nelson Environmental. The Phase I ESA and Environmental Assessment report that the project site is not currently included on a list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. However, historical aerial photographs document that the property and surrounding areas were used as orchards until at least 1938. Based on the history of orchard use, soil sampling was conducted, results of soil sampling are documented in the Environmental Assessment and Soil Sampling report dated December 13, 2006. Chlorinated pesticides were present in all soil samples taken from the project site, indicating that environmentally persistent agricultural chemicals were applied to the property. The use of the property as an orchard until at least 1938 and the presence of chlorinated pesticides, arsenic and lead in soil at the property could create a significant hazard to the public. This is a potentially significant impact which will be reduced with the following mitigation measures:

**Mitigation Measures- Item VII-4:**

**MM VII.1** In order to mitigate potential impacts from the past use of chlorinated pesticides and the suspected use of arsenical lead pesticides at the property, a Preliminary Endangerment Assessment (PEA), or equivalent "no further action" letter, and any associated remediation, will be required from state DTSC. The PEA must be submitted to EHS prior to submittal of Improvement Plans and any remedial action or no further action letter from DTSC must be submitted to EHS prior to final map recordation.

**Discussion- Item VII-5:**

The project is not located within an airport land use plan area or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, and therefore would not result in an airport safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

**Discussion- Item VII-6:**

The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, and therefore would not in a safety hazard for people residing in the project area.

**Discussion- Item VII-7:**

The proposed project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, as the proposed project site is easily accessible via a major Interstate which will allow for unimpeded emergency vehicle access, the project site is not located on or near any heavily vegetated steep slopes, and properties within the general vicinity of the proposed project are largely developed rather than wildland areas that contain large amounts of vegetation/fire fuel

**Discussion- Item VII-8:**

This planned residential development will include a stormwater detention system. Stormwater detention basins, unless properly designed and managed, have the potential to create a significant health hazard by providing an environment conducive to breeding mosquito disease vectors.

**Mitigation Measures- Item VII-8:**

MM VII 2 In order to minimize potential health hazards related to mosquito breeding, develop a Mosquito Management Plan with the Placer Mosquito Abatement District (PMAD). As detailed by the PMAD, this plan shall include "weekly monitoring of the drain during slow water flow times, where there might be stagnation as well as a routine drain area cleaning to assure that the drain does not clog up with debris from soil, leaves, or trash. Additionally, if such stagnation condition exists where the drain is not sufficiently draining to avoid stagnation and thereby creating a mosquito breeding habitat, then the responsible party should kill the mosquito larvae by appropriately removing the stagnant water or by utilizing other approved methods" The Mosquito Management Plan shall be incorporated into the management plan of the Homeowners Association. Additionally, the project will be conditioned to allow the Mosquito Abatement District to review the Mosquito Management Plan and the Improvement Plans. As a condition of this project, it is recommended that drip irrigation be used for landscaping areas

**Discussion- Item VII-9:**

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Phase I ESA), dated April 21, 2005 was prepared for the project site by MG Nelson, Ph.D. An additional Environmental Assessment and Soil Sampling report, dated December 13, 2005, was prepared for the project site by Nelson Environmental. As discussed in section VII.4., the historical use of the property as an orchard and the presence of chlorinated pesticides, arsenic and lead in soil at the property could expose people to existing sources of potential health hazards. This is a potentially significant impact.

Two gasoline service stations are located in the vicinity of the property, unauthorized subsurface releases are reported for one of the service stations. The underground plume is being monitored; the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) is the lead oversight agency. Quarterly monitoring reports are submitted to the RWQCB and Environmental Health Services. The plume is migrating in a generally southeast direction, away from the project site. Based on local geology and groundwater gradients, it is not likely that flow direction of the contaminant plume will change. Therefore, the potential for this project to expose people to existing sources of potential health hazards related to the adjacent gasoline service stations is considered to be less than significant

**Mitigation Measures- Item VII-9:**

Refer to text in MM VII.1

**VIII. HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Violate any potable water quality standards? (EHS)				X

Initial Study & Checklist continued

2. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lessening of local groundwater supplies (i.e. the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? (EHS)			X	
3. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area? (ESD)		X		
4. Increase the rate or amount of surface runoff? (ESD)		X		
5. Create or contribute runoff water which would include substantial additional sources of polluted water? (ESD)		X		
6. Otherwise substantially degrade surface water quality?(ESD)		X		
7. Otherwise substantially degrade ground water quality? (EHS)		X		
8. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? (ESD)				X
9. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area improvements which would impede or redirect flood flows? (ESD)				X
10. Expose 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? (ESD)				X
11. Alter the direction or rate of flow of groundwater? (EHS)				X
12. Impact the watershed of important surface water resources, including but not limited to Lake Tahoe, Folsom Lake, Heil Hole Reservoir, Rock Creek Reservoir, Sugar Pine Reservoir, French Meadows Reservoir, Combie Lake, and Rollins Lake? (EHS, ESD)				X

**Discussion- Item VIII-1:**

This project will not rely on groundwater wells as a potable water source. Potable water for this project will be treated water from Placer County Water Agency. Therefore, the project will not violate water quality standards with respect to potable water.

**Discussion- Item VIII-2:**

This project will not utilize groundwater, and is not located in an area where soils are conducive to groundwater recharge. Therefore, the project will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion- Items VIII-3,4:**

This project will create new impervious surfaces on a property that is currently undeveloped and thus increase the rate and amount of surface runoff from the site. A preliminary drainage report was prepared by Uborra Engineering & Planning dated September 2006. The project currently drains towards Penryn Road. Onsite drainage will be collected via a network of gutters along the internal private road into storm drainage inlets located at the project entrance and conveyed into on-site underground storm drainage pipes which outflow into the surface gutter system within Penryn Parkway. Project storm detention will be provided via underground oversized pipe storage. The project's detention basin is proposed to mitigate peak flows to at or below existing flows and to discharge the peak flows back to their existing locations in order to maintain downstream conditions. The depth of flow anticipated in the gutter during the 100-year storm event is 0.36 feet. No overtopping of the 0.5 foot curb is anticipated. The applicant has demonstrated in the preliminary drainage report that the travel lanes on Penryn Road will not be impeded by flows encroaching during the 100-year storm event. A final drainage report will be required with submittal of the improvement plans for County review and approval to substantiate the preliminary report drainage calculations.

The property proposed for development is within the Dry Creek Watershed Flood Control Plan area. Flooding along Dry Creek and its tributaries (this property is in the Secret Ravine watershed) is well documented. Cumulative downstream impacts were studied in the Dry Creek Watershed Flood Control Plan in order to plan for flood control projects and set flood control policies. Mitigation measures for development in this area include local, on-site detention to reduce post-development flows from the 2- through 100-year storms to pre-development levels and flood control development fees to fund regional detention basins to reduce flooding on major streams in the Dry Creek watershed. If fees are not collected on a project by project basis to fund regional detention facilities, these types of capital improvements may not be realized and flooding impacts to properties within the Dry Creek Watershed area will persist. Staff considers these cumulative flood control impacts to be potentially significant impacts.

The proposed project's impacts associated with increase in rate or amount of surface runoff can be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures.

**Mitigation Measures- Items VIII-3,4:**

Refer to text in MM VI 1

Refer to text in MM VI 2

MM VIII 1 Prepare and submit with the project Improvement Plans, a drainage report in conformance with the requirements of Section 5 of the LDM and the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal, to the Engineering and Surveying Department for review and approval. The report shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and shall, at a minimum, include: A written text addressing existing conditions, the effects of the improvements, all appropriate calculations, a watershed map, increases in downstream flows, proposed on- and off-site improvements and drainage easements to accommodate flows from this project. The report shall identify water quality protection features and methods to be used both during construction and for long-term post-construction water quality protection. "Best Management Practice" (BMP) measures shall be provided to reduce erosion, water quality degradation, and prevent the discharge of pollutants to stormwater to the maximum extent practicable.

MM VIII 2 Storm water run-off shall be reduced to pre-project conditions through the installation of detention facilities. Detention facilities shall be designed in accordance with the requirements of the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal, and to the satisfaction of the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD). The ESD may, after review of the project drainage report, delete this requirement if it is determined that drainage conditions do not warrant installation of this type of facility. In the event on-site detention requirements are waived, this project may be subject to payment of any in-lieu fees prescribed by County Ordinance. No retention/detention facility construction shall be permitted within any identified wetlands area, floodplain, or right-of-way, except as authorized by project approvals.

MM VIII 3 Drainage facilities, for purposes of collecting runoff on individual lots, shall be designed in accordance with the requirements of the County Storm Water Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal, and shall be in compliance with applicable stormwater quality standards, to the satisfaction of the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD). These facilities shall be constructed with subdivision improvements and easements provided as required by ESD. Maintenance of these facilities shall be provided by the property owners' association.

MM VIII 4 This project is subject to the one-time payment of drainage improvement and flood control fees pursuant to the "Dry Creek Watershed Interim Drainage Improvement Ordinance" (Ref. Article 15.32, formerly Chapter 4, Subchapter 20, Placer County Code). The current estimated development fee is \$169 per single family residence, or \$3,887 total for 23 townhomes, payable to the Engineering and Surveying Department prior to each Building Permit issuance. When and if additional entitlements or Building Permits are sought for each parcel that property will become subject to this Ordinance requirement. The fees to be paid shall be based on the fee program in effect at the time that the application is deemed complete.

MM VIII 5 This project is subject to payment of annual drainage improvement and flood control fees pursuant to the "Dry Creek Watershed Interim Drainage Improvement Ordinance" (Ref. Article 15.32, formerly Chapter 4, Subchapter 20, Placer County Code). Prior to Building Permit issuance, each applicant shall cause each subject parcel to become a participant in the existing Dry Creek Watershed County Service Area for purposes of collecting these annual assessments. The current estimated annual fee is \$29 per single family residence.

**Discussion- Items VIII-5,6:**

Approximately half of the 3.2 acre site will be covered with impervious surfaces including structures and pavement. Potential water quality impacts are present both during project construction and post-project development.

Construction activities will disturb soils and cause potential introduction of sediment into stormwater during rain events. Through the implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) for minimizing contact with potential stormwater pollutants at the source and erosion control methods, this potentially significant impact can be reduced to less than significant levels. In the post-development condition, the project could potentially introduce contaminants such as oil and grease, sediment, nutrients, metals, organics, pesticides, and trash from activities such as parking lot runoff, outdoor storage, landscape fertilizing and maintenance, and refuse collection. According to the preliminary drainage report dated September 2006 by Uhora Engineering & Planning, Inc., drainage from the project will be captured on-site and treated with a stormwater quality treatment structure prior to being discharged into the underground detention storage pipes. Since there is no downstream underground storm drainage system near the project, post-development flows after detention will be returned to surface flows at the Penryn Road back of curb on the project's private property. This outlet structure, or "bubble-up" feature, will have an open bottom and infiltrator pipe surrounded by drain rock to encourage infiltration of treated stormwater. During large storm events, stormwater will bubble-up and exit the drain inlet in the on-site landscaping. This water will flow over the curb and gutter and continue to flow on the surface of Penryn Road in a southerly direction towards the Caltrans right-of-way which is similar to how drainage flows today. Runoff continues to flow towards Secret Ravine, on the south side of I-80. A final drainage report will be required with submittal of the improvement plans for County review and approval to substantiate the preliminary report drainage and BMP sizing calculations. The proposed project's impacts associated with water quality degradation will be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures:

**Mitigation Measures- Items VIII-5,6:**

Refer to text in MM VI.1

Refer to text in MM VI.2

Refer to text in MM VI.4

Refer to text in MM VI.6

Refer to text in MM VI.7

Refer to text in MM VIII.1

MM VIII.6 Water quality Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall be designed according to the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks for Construction, for New Development, Redevelopment, and/or for Industrial and Commercial, (and/or other similar source as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD))

Storm drainage from on- and off-site impervious surfaces (including roads) shall be collected and routed through specially designed catch basins, vegetated swales, vaults, infiltration basins, water quality basins, filters, etc. for entrapment of sediment, debris and oils/greases or other identified pollutants, as approved by the ESD. BMPs shall be designed at a minimum in accordance with the Placer County Guidance Document for Volume and Flow-Based Sizing of Permanent Post-Construction Best Management Practices for Stormwater Quality Protection. Post-development (permanent) BMPs for the project include, but are not limited to: water quality treatment structure similar to a Stormceptor or equivalent. No water quality facility construction shall be permitted within any identified wetlands area, floodplain, or right-of-way, except as authorized by project approvals.

All BMPs shall be maintained as required to insure effectiveness. The applicant shall provide for the establishment of vegetation, where specified, by means of proper irrigation. Proof of on-going maintenance, such as contractual evidence, shall be provided to ESD upon request. Maintenance of these facilities shall be provided by the project owners/permittees unless, and until, a County Service Area is created and said facilities are accepted by the County for maintenance. Prior to Improvement Plan or Final Map approval, easements shall be created and offered for dedication to the County for maintenance and access to these facilities in anticipation of possible County maintenance.

MM VIII.7 This project is located within the area covered by Placer County's municipal stormwater quality permit, pursuant to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Phase II program. Project-related stormwater discharges are subject to all applicable requirements of said permit. BMPs shall be designed to mitigate (minimize, infiltrate, filter, or treat) stormwater runoff in accordance with "Attachment 4" of Placer County's NPDES Municipal Stormwater Permit (State Water Resources Control Board NPDES General Permit No. CAS000004).

MM VIII.8 Provide an Irrevocable Offer of Dedication on the Improvement Plans and Final Map to the satisfaction of the ESD and DRC for easements as required for access to, and protection and maintenance of, storm drainage retention/detention facilities, as well as post-construction water quality enhancement facilities (BMPs). Said facilities shall be privately maintained until such time as the Board of Supervisors accepts the offer of dedication.

MM VIII.9 Maintenance of detention facilities by the homeowners' association will be required.

**Discussion- Item VIII-7:**

The project could result in urban stormwater runoff. Standard Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be used and as such, the potential for this project to violate any water quality standards is considered to be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures- Item VIII-7:**

In order to minimize potential water quality issues resulting from increased urban stormwater runoff, Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be utilized and maintained

**Discussion- Items VIII-8,9,10:**

The project site is not within a 100-year flood hazard area as defined and mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). No improvements are proposed within a 100-year flood hazard area and no flood flows would be impeded or redirected. The project location is elevated well above areas that are subject to flooding, and therefore, there are no impacts due to exposing people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death, including flooding as a result of failure of a levee or dam.

**Discussion- Item VIII-11:**

The project will not alter the direction or rate of flow of groundwater.

**Discussion- Item VIII-12:**

The project is not located in proximity to any important surface water resources, and will not impact the watershed of important surface water resources

**IX. LAND USE & PLANNING – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Physically divide an established community? (PLN)				X
2. Conflict with General Plan/Community Plan/Specific Plan designations or zoning, or Plan policies? (EHS, ESD, PLN)				X
3. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan or other County policies, plans, or regulations adopted for purposes of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects? (PLN)			X	
4. Result in the development of incompatible uses and/or the creation of land use conflicts? (PLN)				X
5. Affect agricultural and timber resources or operations (i.e. impacts to soils or farmlands and timber harvest plans, or impacts from incompatible land uses)? (PLN)				X
6. Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)? (PLN)				X
7. Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area? (PLN)				X
8. Cause economic or social changes that would result in significant adverse physical changes to the environment such as urban decay or deterioration? (PLN)				X

**Discussion- Item IX-1:**

The proposed project will not physically divide an established community as it is proposed for construction on a currently undeveloped parcel that is largely surrounded by undeveloped parcels.

**Discussion- Item IX-2:**

The proposed project will not conflict with General or Community Plan designations nor will it conflict with existing zoning and requirements set forth in the Placer County Zoning Ordinance. The project site is designated as Penryn Parkway in the Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan and is zoned C1-UP-DC (Neighborhood commercial combining Use Permit combining Design Scenic Corridor). The proposed project is compatible with requirements set forth in the Community Plan and zone district.

**Discussion- Item IX-3:**

The proposed project could potentially conflict with the Placer County Tree Preservation Ordinance, as it requires the removal of protected native oak trees, however impacts resulting from conflicts with the Tree Preservation Ordinance are considered less than significant as impacts to protected trees will be mitigated by requirements set forth in the Tree Preservation Ordinance, which would then bring the project into compliance with the Tree Preservation Ordinance. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion- Item IX-4:**

The project will not result in the development of incompatible uses and/or the creation of land use conflicts. The proposed project consists of the construction of 23 townhomes adjacent to small-scale retail uses and proposed similar residential subdivisions. The proposed project is compatible with existing and proposed land uses in the area.

**Discussion- Item IX-5:**

The proposed project will not affect agricultural and timber resources or operations as there are no agricultural or timber resource operations on the site. There is an existing plant nursery to the north, however this is a commercial operation that will not be negatively affected by the construction of the project.

**Discussion- Item IX-6:**

The proposed project will not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community as it is surrounded by a mix of undeveloped land and commercial uses.

**Discussion- Item IX-7:**

The project will not result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area, as it is in compliance with the planned uses for this area as set forth in the Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan and the Placer County Zoning Ordinance.

**Discussion- Item IX-8:**

The proposed project will not cause economic or social changes that would result in significant adverse physical changes to the environment such as urban decay or deterioration. The proposed project includes the construction of 23 townhomes on a previously undeveloped parcel in an area surrounded by existing and proposed commercial and residential developments.

**X. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project result in:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. The loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (PLN)				X
2. The loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? (PLN)				X

**Discussion- Item X-1:**

The proposed project will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state as there are no such known mineral resources on the site.

**Discussion- Item X-2:**

The proposed project will not result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan as there are no such mineral resources on the site.

**XI. NOISE – Would the project result in:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local General Plan, Community Plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (EHS)		X		
2. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (EHS)		X		
3. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (EHS)			X	
4. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (EHS)				X
5. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (EHS)				X

**Discussion- Items XI-1,2:**

An environmental noise analysis (ENA), dated December 5, 2006, was conducted for this project by J.C. Brennan & Associates. The ENA reports that traffic noise from Interstate 80 exceeds Placer County noise level standards. These noise impacts are potentially significant and will be reduced with the following mitigation measures:

**Mitigation Measures- Items XI-1,2:**

**MM XI.1** In order to ensure that traffic noise impacts from Interstate 80 are adequately mitigated for this project, soundwalls shall be constructed as specified in the ENA dated December 5, 2006. The soundwalls shall be constructed as specified in the ENA with respect to dimensions, locations, and construction materials. General construction requirements, consistent with the uniform building code, will typically provide interior noise reduction, provided that air conditioning is included with each unit. Therefore, in order to adequately mitigate interior noise levels, air conditioning will be included for each residential unit so that doors and windows may be closed for additional interior noise reduction.

**Discussion- Item XI-3:**

Noise from construction activities may noticeably increase noise levels above existing ambient noise levels. Construction noise emanating from any construction activities for which a building permit or grading permit is required is subject to noise level standards as detailed in the Placer County General Plan, the Granite Bay Community Plan, and shall comply with Placer County Code Article 9.36. Impacts related to construction noise are considered less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion- Item XI-4:**

The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport.

**Discussion- Item XI-5:**

The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

**XII. POPULATION & HOUSING –** Would the project

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (i.e. by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (i.e. through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (PLN)				X
2. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (PLN)				X

**Discussion- Item XII-1:**

The proposed project will not induce substantial population growth either directly or indirectly as the subject parcel is an undeveloped parcel surrounded by commercial development, similar residential projects that are currently under construction, and single family residential uses to the north. All road, water, sewer, and electrical infrastructure required to serve the proposed project is existing.

**Discussion- Item XII-2:**

The proposed project will not displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere as the project site is an undeveloped parcel surrounded by undeveloped parcels and commercial developments.

**XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES –** Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental services and/or facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services?

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Fire protection? (EHS, ESD, PLN)				X
2. Sheriff protection? (EHS, ESD, PLN)				X
3. Schools? (EHS, ESD, PLN)				X
4. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads? (EHS, ESD, PLN)				X
5. Other governmental services? (EHS, ESD, PLN)				X

**Discussion- All Items:**

The project will not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental services or facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for fire, sheriff, schools, public facilities, or other governmental services, as these public services are currently provided to the area from existing facilities. No expansion or construction of governmental or public services are required as a result of this project. The project will have no impact on this item.

**XIV. RECREATION – Would the project result in:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? (PLN)				X
2. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? (PLN)				X

**Discussion- Item XIV-1:**

The proposed project will not likely result in the increased use of an existing neighborhood park such that substantial deterioration would occur as the proposed project includes the construction of recreational open space with passive recreational facilities on-site.

**Discussion- Item XIV-2:**

The proposed project includes the construction of a recreational open space area that includes passive recreational facilities. This open space area will allow for the preservation multiple native oak trees on-site and will not have an adverse physical effect on the environments.

**XV. TRANSPORTATION & TRAFFIC – Would the project result in:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. An increase in traffic which may be substantial in relation to the existing and/or planned future year traffic load and capacity of the roadway system (i.e. result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? (ESD)		X		
2. Exceeding, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County General Plan and/or Community Plan for roads affected by project traffic? (ESD)		X		
3. Increased impacts to vehicle safety due to roadway design features (i.e. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (ESD)		X		
4. Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses? (ESD)		X		
5. Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site? (ESD, PLN)				X
6. Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists? (ESD)				X
7. Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (i.e. bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? (ESD)				X
8. Change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? (ESD)				X

**Discussion- Items XV-1,2:**

This project proposal will result in the construction of 23 residential townhomes with associated parking and drive aisles on currently vacant property. The proposed project will generate approximately 218 average daily trips, with approximately 17 AM and 23 PM peak hour trips. The proposed project creates site-specific impacts on local transportation systems that are considered less than significant when analyzed against the existing baseline traffic conditions and roadway segment / intersection existing LOS, however, the cumulative effect of an increase in traffic has the potential to create significant impacts to the area's transportation system. Article 15.28.010 of the Placer County Code establishes a road network Capital Improvement Program (CIP). This project is subject to this code and, therefore, required to pay traffic impact fees to fund the CIP for area roadway improvements.

The Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan June 28, 2005 update includes the policy that the level of service (LOS) on major roadways and intersections shall be at a Level "C" or better, except within one half mile of a State Highway, in which case the LOS standard shall be "D". Penryn Road at this location currently operates at a LOS "A" and the addition of this 23 unit townhome project will not cause significant negative impacts to the LOS. However, the project does contribute towards cumulative impacts for the level of service standard. The project is required to pay into the CIP for local roadway infrastructure improvements in order to alleviate traffic impacts for the buildout of the Community Plan area. With the payment of traffic mitigation fees for the ultimate construction of the CIP improvements, the traffic impacts are considered less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures - Items XV-1,2:**

MM XV.1 This project will be subject to the payment of traffic impact fees that are in effect in this area (Newcastle/Horseshoe Bar Fee District), pursuant to applicable Ordinances and Resolutions. The applicant is notified that the following traffic mitigation fee(s) will be required and shall be paid to Placer County DPW prior to issuance of any Building Permits for the project.

- County Wide Traffic Limitation Zone Article 15.28.010, Placer County Code
- South Placer Regional Transportation Authority (SPRTA)
- Placer County / City of Roseville JPA (PC/CR)

The current estimated fee is \$95,509.52, or \$4,152.59 per townhouse. 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.

**Discussion- Item XV-3:**

Access for the 3.2 acre property is challenging, due to sight distance issues related to the alignment of Penryn Road and the speed of traffic on this section of Penryn Road. The site has about 480 feet of frontage beginning at a point about 250 feet north of the I-80 westbound off-ramp intersection. Hope Way, a private road, intersects Penryn Road opposite the project site at a location about 325 feet north of the southern property boundary line. The posted speed limit in the area is 45 mph. The horizontal alignment of the Penryn Road is straight, however, the vertical alignment includes a crest vertical curve in the area of the project. The crest of this curve limits sight distance at various locations along the project frontage. The applicant provided an Access Study prepared by KD Anderson Transportation Engineers, dated July 20, 2005. This study concluded that a 125 foot sight distance "window" existed where the view in each direction is relatively unobstructed. The project is proposing an access directly opposite Hope Way. A southbound left turn lane with some off-site widening to the north for lane transition and tapers will be constructed with the project at this entrance. The proposed project's impacts associated with vehicle safety due to roadway design features will be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures.

**Mitigation Measures- Item XV-3:**

MM XV.2 Construct a public road entrance onto Penryn Road meeting the sight distance requirements for a Plate R-17 Major, LDM standard. The improvements shall begin at the outside edge of any future lane(s) as directed by the DPW and the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD). An Encroachment Permit shall be obtained by the applicant or authorized agent from DPW. The design speed of Penryn Road shall be 45 mph, unless an alternate design speed is approved by the DPW. The structural section within the main roadway right-of-way shall be designed for a Traffic Index of 7.5, but said section shall not be less than 3" AC/8" Class 2 AB unless otherwise approved by the ESD.

MM XV.3 Construct a two-way left turn lane on Penryn Road from the project entrance to conform to the existing center turn lane south of the project site. 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 45 mph, unless an alternative is approved by DPW.

116

**Discussion - Item XV-4:** The servicing fire district, the Penryn Fire Protection District, has reviewed the proposed project and determined that the access driveway width shall be a minimum of 20 feet on each side of the raised median, and the median shall not obstruct a clear view of the roadway. All roadways within the project shall be a minimum width of 25 feet and shall be designated no parking to ensure access and passing of fire apparatus. An emergency vehicle access road is required, capable of supporting a 40,000 pound emergency vehicle under all weather conditions, since only one access driveway to Penryn Road is proposed. The proposed project's impacts associated with emergency vehicle access will be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures.

**Mitigation Measures - Item XV-4:**

MM XV.4 Construct a 20-foot wide all-weather emergency vehicle access road capable of supporting a 40,000 pound emergency vehicle from the northern edge of the on-site circulation drive aisle (immediately east of Lot 2, as shown on the approved Tentative Map) to the existing driveway on the adjacent property to the north. Off-site pavement reconstruction may be necessary in order to meet the vehicle loading criteria for the existing driveway connection back to Penryn Road.

MM XV.5 Parking in front of driveways and parallel parking along the internal loop road is prohibited. "No parking" signs shall be provided along the on-site internal loop road.

**Discussion - Item XV-5:** The proposed project will not result in insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site as the project meets the minimum parking standards set forth for multi-family residential Planned Developments as set forth in the Placer County Zoning Ordinance.

**Discussion - Item XV-6:** The proposed project will not cause hazards or barriers to pedestrians or bicyclists. There is no impact.

**Discussion - Item XV-7:** The project will not conflict with any existing or preclude anticipated future policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

**Discussion - Item XV-8:** This project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks.

**XVI. UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS -** Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (ESD)				X
2. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater delivery, collection or treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (EHS, ESD)				X
3. Require or result in the construction of new on-site sewage systems? (EHS)				X
4. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities; the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (ESD)				X
5. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (EHS)			X	
6. Require sewer service that may not be available by the area's waste water treatment provider? (EHS, ESD)			X	

7. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs in compliance with all applicable laws? (EHS)				X
---	--	--	--	---

**Discussion- Items XVI-1,4:**

An 8-inch sewer line exists along the southern boundary of the existing Penryn Parkway Business Park located adjacent to the southern boundary of the project site. The project will construct a new line within Penryn Road to tie into this sewer line. The South Placer Municipal Utility District (SPMUD) is the service provider for sewer facilities in this area. A letter dated October 23, 2006 from SPMUD indicated that the project was eligible for sewer service. The type of wastewater expected to be produced by this development is typical of wastewater already collected and treated within SPMUD. The project is required to design and construct all on- and off-site sewer facilities conforming to the SPMUD Standard Specifications and submit improvement plans to SPMUD for review and approval. Connection of this proposed 23 townhome project to public sewer would not cause significant environmental effects.

**Discussion- Item XVI-2:**

The project will not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater delivery, collection or treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities.

**Discussion- Item XVI-3:**

The project will be served by public sewer and will not require or result in the construction of a new septic system.

**Discussion- Item XVI-4:**

The project proposes storm drainage collection and conveyance facilities on-site with a "bubble-up" outlet within the site landscaping to return flows back to Penryn Road over the concrete curb and gutter. The applicant has demonstrated through a preliminary drainage report prepared by Uhora Engineering and Planning, Inc. dated September 2006, that the construction of the on-site stormwater conveyance system is not expected to cause significant environmental effects.

**Discussion- Items XVI-5,6:**

The agencies charged with providing treated water, sewer services, and refuse disposal have indicated their requirements to serve the project. These requirements are routine in nature and do not represent significant impacts. Typical project conditions of approval require submission of "will-serve" letters from each agency. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion- Item XVI-7:**

The project will be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.

**E. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:**

Environmental Issue	Yes	No
1. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		X
2. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)		X

3 Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X
---	--	---

**F. OTHER RESPONSIBLE AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES** whose approval is required:

<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Fish and Game	<input type="checkbox"/> Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Forestry	<input type="checkbox"/> National Marine Fisheries Service
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Health Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Toxic Substances	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Army Corp of Engineers
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
<input type="checkbox"/> California Integrated Waste Management Board	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> California Regional Water Quality Control Board	<input type="checkbox"/>

**G. DETERMINATION** – The Environmental Review Committee finds that:

Although the proposed project **COULD** have a significant effect on the environment, there **WILL NOT** be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described herein have been added to the project. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

**H. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE** (Persons/Departments consulted):

Planning Department, Leah Rosasco, Chairperson  
 Engineering and Surveying Department, Rebecca Taber, P.E.  
 Engineering and Surveying Department, Wastewater, Ed Wydra  
 Department of Public Works, Transportation  
 Environmental Health Services, Jill Kearney  
 Air Pollution Control District, Brent Backus  
 Flood Control Districts, Andrew Darrow  
 Facility Services, Parks, Vance Kimbrell  
 Placer County Fire / CDF, Bob Eicholtz

Signature *Gina Langford* Date May 30, 2007  
 Gina Langford, Environmental Coordinator

**I. SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:** The following public documents were utilized and site-specific studies prepared to evaluate in detail the effects or impacts associated with the project. This information is available for public review, Monday through Friday, 8am to 5pm, at the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency; Environmental Coordination Services, 3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190, Auburn, CA 95603. For Tahoe projects, the document will also be available in our Tahoe Division office, 565 West Lake Blvd, Tahoe City, CA 96145.

<b>County Documents</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community Plan
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environmental Review Ordinance
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Plan
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grading Ordinance
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Development Manual
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Division Ordinance
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stormwater Management Manual
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tree Ordinance

	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Trustee Agency Documents	<input type="checkbox"/>	Department of Toxic Substances Control
	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Site-Specific Studies	Planning Department	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Study
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources Pedestrian Survey
		<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources Records Search
		<input type="checkbox"/> Lighting & Photometric Plan
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Paleontological Survey
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tree Survey & Arborist Report
		<input type="checkbox"/> Visual Impact Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Wetland Delineation
		<input type="checkbox"/>
	Engineering & Surveying Department, Flood Control District	<input type="checkbox"/> Phasing Plan
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Grading Plan
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Geotechnical Report
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Drainage Report
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stormwater & Surface Water Quality BMP Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Traffic Study
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sewer Pipeline Capacity Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Placer County Commercial/Industrial Waste Survey (where public sewer is available)
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sewer Master Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Utility Plan
	Environmental Health Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Contamination Report
		<input type="checkbox"/> Hydro-Geological Study
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Acoustical Analysis
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Soils Screening
		<input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Endangerment Assessment
	Air Pollution Control District	<input type="checkbox"/> CALINE4 Carbon Monoxide Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Construction emission & Dust Control Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Geotechnical Report (for naturally occurring asbestos)
<input type="checkbox"/> Health Risk Assessment		
<input type="checkbox"/> URBEMIS Model Output		
<input type="checkbox"/>		
Fire Department	<input type="checkbox"/> Emergency Response and/or Evacuation Plan	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Traffic & Circulation Plan	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	

	Mosquito Abatement District	<input type="checkbox"/> Guidelines and Standards for Vector Prevention in Proposed Developments <input type="checkbox"/>
--	-----------------------------	--