

**Impact 9-18** Additional transit patrons will not be accommodated by existing transit service. This impact is considered *Potentially Significant*.

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation:**

The Specific Plan would generate a demand for new transit services. If transit services are not provided to the Specific plan area, an "unmet transit need" would likely be identified prior to buildout of the Specific Plan. To meet a potential unmet transit need, Placer County would need to provide a reasonable amount of transit service to the Specific Plan area. The proposed project would construct bus stops on northbound Watt Avenue north of PFE Road, westbound PFE Road along the Commercial property and westbound PFE Road east of Watt Avenue. Bus stops would be constructed along with roadway frontage improvements on PFE Road and Watt Avenue.

A Community Service Area (CSA) to cover transit service to the proposed Project may be formed and/or the Applicant may seek annexation to the proposed Placer Vineyards project CSA west of the Plan Area. The County may consider implementing one CSA boundary to cover both of these proposed project sites. The proposed project shall create a CSA to fund the cost of transit services and any related capital costs for buses, passenger amenities, and facilities. If a CSA is implemented, this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. If not, this impact would remain significant

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 9-18a: Create a Community Service Area to cover Transit Service**

The proposed project shall create a Community Service Area (CSA), and should apply to create one to cover the Plan Area, to fund the cost of transit services and any related capital costs for buses, passenger amenities, and facilities.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Less than Significant

**Impact 9-19** Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road open, the proposed project would cause PFE Road east of Watt Avenue to operate at LOS E. Walerga Road south of PFE Road and Baseline Road west of Locust Road would have an increased volume to capacity ratio of more than 1 percent at an already substandard LOS. This impact is considered *Significant*.

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with this impact. No mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects (or some of the effects) therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

**Explanation:**

As described in the EIR, full development of the Specific Plan under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road open would cause LOS to degrade on the following segments: (1) Walerga Road south of PFE Road would

operate at LOS F and the volume to capacity ratio would increase by 2 percent; (2) Baseline Road west of Locust Road would operate at LOS D and the volume to capacity ratio would increase by 1 percent; and (3) PFE Road from Watt Avenue to Walerga Road would degrade from LOS C to LOS E.

The widening of PFE Road to four lanes is included in the County CIP, as is the widening of Walerga Road (to four lanes) and Watt Avenue (to six lanes) between Baseline Road and the Sacramento County line. Development within the Specific Plan will construct one westbound lane on PFE Road as part of required frontage improvements. Fair share funding for additional lane improvements will be made through developer participation in the CIP program. However, due to the uncertainty as to whether sufficient funds can be obtained to actually build this improvement prior to full demand from cumulative development, and that further widening of Walerga Road to six lanes or Baseline Road to eight lanes is not feasible, this impact is considered potentially significant.

#### **Mitigation Measures:**

#### **Mitigation Measure 9-19a: Contribute a fair share to widen PFE Road to four lanes from Watt Avenue to Walerga Road.**

The proposed project shall contribute its fair share toward the widening of PFE Road to four lanes from Watt Avenue to Walerga Road. With implementation of this mitigation measure, this roadway segment would operate at LOS A.

#### **Significance after Mitigation:**

Significant and Unavoidable

**Impact 9-20** Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road open, the proposed project would cause the intersection of Watt Avenue at PFE Road to operate at LOS D, and the following intersections to have an increase in the volume to capacity ratio of more than 1 percent at a substandard LOS: Watt Avenue at Baseline Road, Fiddymont Road/Walerga Road at Baseline Road, Walerga Road at PFE Road, and Cook-Riolo Road at PFE Road. This impact is considered *Significant*.

#### **Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with this impact. No mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects (or some of the effects) therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

#### **Explanation:**

The analysis in the EIR indicates that development of the Specific Plan under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road open would cause the LOS to degrade at the following intersections: (1) Watt Avenue and Baseline Road; (2) Fiddymont Road/Walerga Road and Baseline Road; (3) Walerga Road and PFE Road; (4) Cook-Riolo Road and PFE Road; (5) "West" Road and PFE Road; and (6) "East" Road and PFE Road. Intersection improvements are included in the City/County CIP and resulting impact fees, or are addressed in the Development Agreement. Developer participation in these fee programs through a fair share payment, together with similar fair share payments from other projects, will facilitate the following improvements. Certain improvements will be constructed by Specific Plan-area developers, for fee credit and/or reimbursement. There would be a significant and unavoidable impact in the short term until the following improvements are constructed. In the long term, with the construction of the following improvements identified in Mitigation Measure 9-20a, the impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

The EIR concluded that there is no feasible mitigation measure for the intersection of Watt Avenue and Baseline Road and the intersection of Fiddymment Road/Walerga Road and Baseline Road. Moreover, the EIR concluded that there is no feasible mitigation measure for the intersection of "West" Road and PFE Road (a traffic signal is not warranted).

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 9-20a: Contribute a fair share to widening the intersection of Walerga Road and PFE Road, signalizing the intersection of Cook Riolo Road and PFE Road, and signalizing the intersection of "East" Road and PFE Road.**

The proposed project shall contribute its fair share toward the following improvements:

- i. Construct a third through lane on the northbound and southbound approaches; a second through lane to the eastbound and westbound approaches; and a second left-turn lane to the northbound, eastbound, and westbound approaches to improve the intersection of Walerga Road and PFE Road. With implementation of this mitigation measure, this intersection would operate at LOS E.
- ii. Construct a traffic signal and left turn lanes on all approaches to improve the intersection of Cook- Riolo Road and PFE Road to LOS C in the a.m. peak hour and LOS E in the p.m. peak hour.
- iii. Construct a traffic signal to improve the intersection of "East" Road and PFE Road to LOS A in the a.m. peak hour and LOS A in the p.m. peak hour.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Significant and Unavoidable

**Impact 9-21 Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road open, the proposed project would increase traffic volumes at City of Roseville intersections. This impact is considered *Less than Significant*.**

**Findings:**

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

**Explanation:**

This analysis in the EIR indicates that development of the proposed project under Cumulative Plus Project with PFE Road open conditions would not cause significant impacts on City of Roseville intersections.

**Mitigation Measures:**

No mitigation measures are required.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

This Impact is less than significant without mitigation.

**Impact 9-22** Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road open, the proposed project would increase traffic volumes on Sacramento County roadways. This impact is considered *Less than Significant*.

**Findings:**

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

**Explanation:**

This analysis in the EIR indicates that development of the proposed project under Cumulative Plus Project with PFE Road open conditions would not cause significant impacts on Sacramento County roadways.

**Mitigation Measures:**

No mitigation measures are required.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

This Impact is less than significant without mitigation.

**Impact 9-23** Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road open, the proposed project would increase traffic volumes at Sacramento County intersections. This impact is considered *Less than Significant*.

**Findings:**

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

**Explanation:**

This analysis in the EIR indicates that development of the proposed project under Cumulative Plus Project with PFE Road open conditions would not cause significant impacts on Sacramento County intersections.

**Mitigation Measures:**

No mitigation measures are required.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

This Impact is less than significant without mitigation.

**Impact 9-24** Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road open, the proposed project would increase traffic volumes on Sutter County roadway segments. This impact is considered *Less than Significant*.

**Findings:**

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

**Explanation:**

This analysis in the EIR indicates that development of the proposed project under Cumulative Plus Project with PFE Road open conditions would not cause significant impacts on Sutter County roadways.

**Mitigation Measures:**

No mitigation measures are required.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

This Impact is less than significant without mitigation.

**Impact 9-25** Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road open, the proposed project would contribute traffic to the freeway segment between Riego Road and Elkhorn Boulevard on SR 70/99 and between Watt Avenue and Eureka Road on I-80, which would be operating at LOS F under Cumulative No Project conditions. This impact is considered *Significant*.

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with this impact. No mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects (or some of the effects) therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

**Explanation:**

The analysis in the EIR indicates that development of the proposed Specific Plan under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road open would cause significant impacts at the following State Highway segments: (1) SR 70/99 from Riego Road to I-5, that would operate at a substandard LOS without the project; and (2) I-80 from Watt Avenue to Eureka Road, that would operate at a substandard LOS F without the project. Future improvements that would mitigate the impact to state highways are not identified as an element of any existing fee program and inclusion of these improvements in a future fee program is not proposed or contemplated. Moreover, the widening of I-80 from Watt Avenue to Eureka Road, beyond the eight-lane widening from Riverside Avenue to SR 65, is not included in the MTP, and may not be feasible. Therefore these impacts would be significant and unavoidable unless and until improvements are ultimately completed.

**Mitigation Measures:**

No feasible mitigation is available

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Significant and Unavoidable

**Impact 9-26** Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road open, the proposed project would increase traffic volumes at state highway intersections. This impact is considered *Less than Significant*.

**Findings:**

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code,

**Explanation:**

Development of the proposed Specific Plan under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road open would not cause impacts at state highway intersections.

**Mitigation Measures:**

No mitigation measures are required.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

This Impact is less than significant without mitigation.

**Impact 9-27** Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road closed, the proposed project would cause Watt Avenue south of Baseline Road and PFE Road east of Watt to operate at LOS E. Walerga Road south of PFE Road and Baseline Road from Watt Avenue to Walerga Road would have an increased volume to capacity ratio of more than 1 percent at a substandard LOS. This impact is considered *Significant*.

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with this impact. No mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects (or some of the effects) therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

**Explanation:**

As described in the EIR, full development of the Specific Plan under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road closed would cause LOS to degrade on the following segments: (1) Watt Avenue from Baseline Road to Dyer Lane would degrade from LOS C to LOS D; (2) Walerga Road south of PFE Road would operate at LOS F and the volume to capacity ratio would increase by 4 percent; (3) Baseline Road from Watt Avenue to Walerga Road would operate at LOS E and the volume to capacity ratio would increase by 1 percent. PFE Road from Watt Avenue to Walerga Road would degrade from LOS D to LOS E.

The widening of PFE Road to four lanes is included in the County CIP, as is the widening of Walerga Road (to four lanes) and Watt Avenue (to six lanes) between Baseline Road and the Sacramento County line. Development within the Specific Plan will construct one westbound lane on PFE Road as part of required frontage improvements. Fair share funding for additional lane improvements will be made through developer participation in the CIP program. However, due to the uncertainty as to whether sufficient matching funds can be obtained to actually build this improvement prior to full demand from cumulative development, and that further widening of Walerga Road to six lanes or Baseline Road to eight lanes is not feasible, this impact is considered potentially significant.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 9-27a: Implement Mitigation Measure 9-19a (Contribute a fair share to widen PFE Road to four lanes from Watt Avenue to Walerga Road)**

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Significant and Unavoidable

305

**Impact 9-28** Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road closed, the proposed project would cause the intersection of Watt Avenue at PFE Road to operate at LOS D, and the following intersections to have an increase in the volume to capacity ratio of more than 1 percent at a substandard LOS: Watt Avenue with Baseline Road, Walerga Road with PFE Road, and Cook-Riolo Road with PFE Road. This impact is considered *Significant*.

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with this impact. No mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects (or some of the effects) therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

**Explanation:**

The analysis in the EIR indicates that development of the Specific Plan under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road closed would cause the LOS to degrade at the following intersections: (1) Watt Avenue and Baseline Road; (2) Watt Avenue and PFE Road; (3) Walerga Road and PFE Road; (4) Cook-Riolo Road and PFE Road; (5) Watt Avenue and "Riolo" Road; (6) "West" Road and PFE Road; (7) "East" Road and PFE Road; and (8) Walerga Road and "Riolo" Road. Construction of the improvements identified in Mitigation Measure 9-20a would reduce the impact to the intersections of Walerga Road with PFE Road, Cook-Riolo Road with PFE Road and "East" Road with PFE Road to a less-than-significant level. Similar to Mitigation Measure 9-20a, due to the uncertainty as to whether sufficient funds can be obtained to actually build all of these improvements at the time needed; this impact is considered potentially significant.

No mitigation is identified for the intersection of Watt Avenue with Baseline Road or Watt Avenue with PFE Road. These intersections cannot be mitigated because Placer County does not allow eight-lane roads or triple left-turn lanes. This impact would be significant. No mitigation is identified for the intersection of Watt Avenue with "Riolo" Road, "West" Road with PFE Road or Walerga Road with "Riolo" Road. These intersections cannot be mitigated because a traffic signal is not warranted. Left turns are already prohibited at the intersections of Watt Avenue with "Riolo" Road and Walerga Road with "Riolo" Road.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 9-28a: Implement Mitigation Measure 9-20a (Contribute a fair share to widening the intersection of Walerga Road and PFE Road, signaling the intersection of Cook Riolo Road and PFE Road, and signaling the intersection of "East" Road and PFE Road)**

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Significant and Unavoidable

**Impact 9-29** Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road closed, the proposed project would cause the intersection of Galleria Boulevard and Antelope Creek Drive to operate beyond acceptable LOS thresholds. This impact is considered *Significant*.

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with this impact. No mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects (or some of the effects) therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

**Explanation:**

Under the Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road closed, LOS at the intersection of Galleria Boulevard with Antelope Creek Drive would degrade from LOS C to LOS D. There is no feasible mitigation measure for the intersection of Galleria Boulevard and Antelope Creek Drive. The City of Roseville has indicated that the intersection of Galleria Boulevard and Antelope Creek Drive alternates between LOS C and D, depending on the scenario. The City's LOS policy allows the City Council to take an action to accept degradation in the LOS of one or more of its signalized intersections from the levels identified in the 2020 CIP as long as 70 percent or more of the total signalized intersections in the City would operate at LOS C or better. Without a recommended intersection mitigation measure, more than 70 percent of the City's signalized intersections would operate at LOS C or better under Cumulative Plus Project condition with PFE Road closed. However, since no feasible improvements were identified to mitigate significant impacts on LOS at the intersection of Galleria Boulevard and Antelope Creek Drive, the proposed project would have a significant impact.

**Mitigation Measures:**

No feasible mitigation is available

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Significant and Unavoidable

**Impact 9-30** Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road closed, the proposed project would increase traffic volumes on Sacramento County roadways. This impact is considered *Less than Significant*.

**Findings:**

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

**Explanation:**

Development of the proposed project under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road closed would not cause significant impacts on Sacramento County roadway segments.

**Mitigation Measures:**

No mitigation measures are required.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

This Impact is less than significant without mitigation.

**Impact 9-31** Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road closed, the proposed project would increase traffic volumes on Sacramento County intersections. This impact is considered *Less than Significant*.

**Findings:**

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

**Explanation:**

Development of the proposed project under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road closed would not cause significant impacts at intersections in Sacramento County.

**Mitigation Measures:**

No mitigation measures are required.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

This Impact is less than significant without mitigation.

**Impact 9-32** Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road closed, the proposed project would increase traffic volumes on Sutter County roadway segments. This impact is considered *Less than Significant*.

**Findings:**

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

**Explanation:**

Development of the proposed Specific Plan under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road closed would not cause significant impacts on the Sutter County roadway segments within the transportation analysis study area

**Mitigation Measures:**

No mitigation measures are required.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

This Impact is less than significant without mitigation.

**Impact 9-33** Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road closed, the proposed project would cause the freeway segment of SR 70/99 between Riego Road and Elkhorn Boulevard, SR 65 between Blue Oaks Boulevard and I-80, and I-80 between Watt Avenue and Eureka Road to operate beyond acceptable LOS thresholds. This impact is considered *Significant*.

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with this impact. No mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects (or some of the effects) therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

**Explanation:**

The analysis in the EIR indicates that development of the proposed Specific Plan under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road closed would cause significant impacts at the following State Highway segments: (1) SR 70/99 from Riego Road to I-5, that would operate at a substandard LOS without the project; and (2) I-80 from Watt

Avenue to Eureka Road, that would operate at a substandard LOS F without the project. Future improvements that would mitigate the impact to state highways are not identified as an element of any existing fee program and inclusion of these improvements in a future fee program is not proposed or contemplated. Moreover, the widening of I-80 from Watt Avenue to Eureka Road, beyond the eight-lane widening from Riverside Avenue to SR 65, is not included in the MTP, and may not be feasible. Therefore these impacts would be significant and unavoidable unless and until improvements are ultimately completed.

**Mitigation Measures:**

No feasible mitigation is available

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Significant and Unavoidable

**Impact 9-34** Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with PFE Road closed, the proposed project would not increase traffic volumes on state highway intersections. This impact is considered *Less than Significant*.

**Findings:**

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

**Explanation:**

Development of the proposed project under Cumulative conditions with PFE Road closed would not cause impacts at state highway intersections.

**Mitigation Measures:**

No mitigation measures are required.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

This Impact is less than significant without mitigation.

## G. AIR QUALITY

**Impact 10-1** Construction activities would increase short-term criteria air pollutant emissions. This impact is considered *Significant in the short term*, and *Less than Significant in the long-term*.

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with this impact in the short term. No mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects (or some of the effects) therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

**Explanation:**

The maximum unmitigated construction emissions of ROG, NOX, CO, and PM10 are expected to exceed the

significance threshold. Therefore, without mitigation measures, the construction emissions would be considered to have a short-term significant impact. Sulfur oxide emissions were also calculated but were not presented because these emissions are expected to be relatively low (less than 0.1 pound per day), and sulfur oxide concentrations have historically been well below regional standards. Mitigation measures would be implemented to reduce the emissions from construction, but not to below the significance thresholds for ROG, NOX, and CO. Therefore, exhaust emissions of ROG, NOX, and CO from construction activities would have a significant, short-term impact on air quality.

#### **Mitigation Measures:**

##### **Mitigation Measure 10-1a: Prepare and implement emission control/dust control measures**

The Applicant shall submit to the PCAPCD and receive approval of a Construction Emission/Dust Control Plan prior to groundbreaking. This plan must address the minimum Administrative Requirements found in Sections 300 and 400 of District Rule 228, Fugitive Dust.

The Applicant shall have a pre-construction meeting for grading activities for 20 or more acres to discuss the construction emission/dust control plan with employees and/or contractors and the District is to be invited.

The Applicant shall suspend all grading operations when fugitive dust exceeds District Rule 228 fugitive dust limitations. An Applicant representative, CARB-certified to perform Visible Emissions Evaluations (VEE), shall routinely evaluate compliance with Rule 228. This requirement for a VEE is for projects grading 20 or more acres in size regardless in how many acres are to be disturbed daily. It is to be noted that fugitive dust is not to exceed 40 percent opacity and not to go beyond the property boundary at any time. If lime or other drying agents are used to dry out wet grading areas, they shall be controlled so as not to exceed District Rule 228 fugitive dust limitations.

##### **Mitigation Measure 10-1b: Provide PCAPCD with a list of construction equipment and anticipated construction timeline**

The PCAPCD shall be provided with a list of construction equipment and anticipated construction timeline for each project. The prime contractor for each construction project shall submit to the PCAPCD a comprehensive inventory (i.e., make, model, year, emission rating) of all the heavy-duty off-road equipment (50 horsepower or greater) that will be used an aggregate of 40 or more hours for the construction project. The PCAPCD shall be provided with the anticipated construction timeline for each project including start date, and name and phone number of the project manager and onsite foreman. A plan for each project shall be submitted for approval by the PCAPCD demonstrating that the heavy-duty (> 50 horsepower) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased and subcontractor vehicles, will achieve a project wide fleet-average 20 percent NOX reduction and 45 percent particulate reduction compared to the most recent CARB fleet average. The PCAPCD should be contacted for average fleet emission data. Acceptable options for reducing emissions may include use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, aftertreatment products, and/or other options as they become available. During smog season (May through October), the construction period shall be lengthened so as to minimize the number of vehicles and equipment operating at the same time. Contractors can access the Sacramento Metropolitan AQMD's web site to determine if their off-road fleet meets the requirements listed in this measure

##### **Mitigation Measure 10-1c: Maintain construction equipment and vehicles**

Construction equipment and vehicles shall be maintained for each project. Construction equipment exhaust emissions shall not exceed PCAPCD Rule 202 Visible Emission limitations. Operators of vehicles and equipment found to exceed opacity limits are to be immediately notified and the equipment must be repaired within 72 hours. An Applicant/ developer representative (CARB-certified to perform visible emissions

evaluations) shall routinely evaluate project related off-road and heavy-duty on-road equipment emissions for compliance with this requirement for projects grading more than 20 acres in size regardless of how many acres are to be disturbed daily.

**Mitigation Measure 10-1d: Minimize idling time for diesel-powered equipment**

Idling time for all diesel-powered equipment shall be minimized to 5 minutes.

**Mitigation Measure 10-1e: No open burning of removed vegetation**

For each project, the contract language shall stipulate that contractors shall not engage in open burning of removed vegetation. Vegetative material shall be chipped, delivered to waste to energy facilities, or disposed at an appropriate disposal site.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Significant and Unavoidable in the short term; less than significant in the long term.

**Impact 10-2** Increased regional criteria pollutant emissions. This impact is considered *Significant* in the short term, and *Less than Significant* in the long-term.

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with this impact in the short term. No mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects (or some of the effects) therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

**Explanation:**

The proposed project would result in additional criteria pollutant emissions from vehicle exhaust and area sources. The maximum daily emissions for SO<sub>2</sub> would be below the significance thresholds and not considered to have a significant impact on air quality. However, the maximum daily PM<sub>10</sub>, CO, ROG, and NOX emissions associated with the proposed project development are estimated to exceed the significance threshold. Therefore, unmitigated, operational emissions of ROG, NOX, CO, and PM<sub>10</sub> would have a significant impact on air quality. Mitigation measures would reduce the operational emissions of ROG, NOX, CO, and PM<sub>10</sub>. However, the effectiveness of these mitigation measures cannot be reliably quantified. Therefore, it is assumed by the EIR that mitigated ROG, NOX, CO, and PM<sub>10</sub> emissions would also have a potentially significant, long-term impact on air quality.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 10-2a: Implement measures to reduce energy consumption**

The Riolo Vineyard Specific Plan shall incorporate and implement the following measures, or equally effective measures, to reduce energy consumption:

- Install low-NOX hot water heaters per PCAPCD Rule 246.
- Encourage landscape maintenance companies to use battery-powered or electric equipment for nonresidential maintenance activities, where feasible.
- Provide natural gas lines or electrical outlets to all backyards to encourage natural gas or electric barbecues, as well as electric lawn equipment.
- Install Class I bicycle lockers along with bike racks in commercial sites.
- Encourage landscaping with drought-resistant species, and the use of groundcovers rather than

pavement to reduce heat reflection.

- Include Energy Star efficient appliances, such as dishwashers, refrigerators, and clothes washers.
- Include energy-efficient SunCoat Max window glazings, which have a solar heat gain of 0.27.
- Include high-efficiency heating and efficient ventilation methods on all new residential units. Furnaces to be low-NOx with an AFUE of 80 percent.
- Incorporate solar heaters and panels in proposed project residences as feasible.
- Include high-efficiency water heaters. The external insulation used should have an R-value of 16 and an efficiency value of 0.62.
- Include high efficiency insulation with the following ratings: Ceilings: R-38, 2°—6 Walls, 2°—4 Walls: R-19, and Ducts: R-6.4.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 10-2a will also help reduce atmospheric and greenhouse gas emissions from the Riolo Vineyard project and/or reduce energy consumption, and thus may reduce the project's contribution to the impact of global climate change.

#### **Mitigation Measure 10-2b: Prohibit open burning**

Open burning of any kind shall be prohibited in the residential, commercial, and recreational parcels of the Riolo Vineyards Specific Plan Area. Open burning will be allowed on the Agricultural, Agriculture-10, and Rural Residential parcels in accordance with PCAPCD Regulation 3, which requires a burn permit to be issued by the PCAPCD. Open burning creates substantial pollutant emissions of ozone precursors, CO, and PM. Any company employed to maintain landscapes within the Plan Area will be prohibited from open burning of vegetative refuse anywhere in the SVAB. The incorporation of this mitigation measure as part of the by-laws of a homeowners association (e.g., covenants, conditions, and restrictions) would ensure compliance with this future rule, which will be enforced by PCAPCD as a requirement for the County to comply with the ambient air quality standard for PM<sub>2.5</sub> pollutants. The Applicant proposes additional open-burning restrictions, which state that burning activities shall be limited to vegetation materials (green waste) and conducted within 200 feet of a public street, trail, or park facility. Additionally, open-burning activities shall require a burn permit from the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) and shall be in compliance with APCD Regulation 3.

#### **Mitigation Measure 10-2c: Allow only gas-fired fireplace appliances**

Only gas-fired fireplace appliances shall be permitted in the Specific Plan Area. This condition shall be incorporated into any contracts, covenants, and restrictions that are established.

#### **Mitigation Measure 10-2d: Implement offsite mitigation programs or pay an in-lieu amount into the Placer County Air Pollution Control District's Air Quality Mitigation Program**

Each project shall implement an offsite mitigation program, coordinated through the PCAPCD, to offset the project's long-term ozone precursor emissions. The project offsite mitigation program must be approved by the PCAPCD. The project's offsite mitigation program provides monetary incentives to sources of air pollution within the project's air basin that are not required by law to reduce their emissions. Therefore, the emission reductions are real, quantifiable and implement provisions of the 1994 State Implementation Plan. The offsite mitigation program reduces emissions within the air basin that would not otherwise be eliminated. In lieu of each project implementing its own offsite mitigation program, the Applicant can choose to participate in the PCAPCD Offsite Mitigation Program by paying an equivalent amount of money into the District program. Based on the URBEMIS results in Appendix G2, the per house unit fee is \$323 and the multi family per unit fee is \$232. This is a one time fee that would be payable at the time of the final map recording.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Significant and Unavoidable in the short term; less than significant in the long term.

**Impact 10-3** Increase in ambient concentrations of CO at nearby intersections. This impact is considered *Less than Significant*.

**Findings:**

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

**Explanation:**

As identified in the EIR, modeled concentrations of CO under post-development conditions would be below regulatory thresholds, and thus less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:**

No mitigation measures are required.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

This Impact is less than significant without mitigation.

**Impact 10-4** Exposure of nearby sensitive receptors to odor. This impact is considered *Less than Significant*.

**Findings:**

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

**Explanation:**

As concluded by the EIR, development projects of the proposed nature are not likely to expose sensitive receptors to sources of odors, nor is the Plan Area located within a mile of sources that are likely to emit objectionable odors. Therefore, the odor impacts from the proposed project would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:**

No mitigation measures are required.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

This Impact is less than significant without mitigation.

**Impact 10-5** Exposure of nearby sensitive receptors to Toxic Air Contaminants. This impact is considered *Less than Significant*.

**Findings:**

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

**Explanation:**

Based on the short-term nature of the construction emissions and the regulations intended to reduce diesel particulate emissions, it is expected that the diesel particulate emissions from the construction activities would not have a significant impact on air quality. Mitigation measures identified for other construction impacts in the EIR would also help reduce the diesel particulate emissions from construction equipment. Moreover, the EIR concludes that impacts from diesel traffic to nearby sensitive receptors would also be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:**

No mitigation measures are required.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

This Impact is less than significant without mitigation.

**Impact 10-6** Inconsistencies with the *Placer County Air Quality Attainment Plan*. This impact is considered *Significant*.

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with this impact. No mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects (or some of the effects) therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

**Explanation:**

Fugitive dust and exhaust emissions from short-term construction activities are projected to exceed the PCAPCD's significance thresholds for PM<sub>10</sub>, NOX, ROG, and CO, based on conservative assumptions made in the air quality analysis. With mitigation measures, the impacts from construction-related PM<sub>10</sub> emissions are predicted to be less than significant. However, the short-term impacts for the other three pollutants would still remain significant during peak construction activities. Regional emissions of ROG from new trips generated during operations and area sources (such as architectural coatings, landscaping, and consumer products) are also expected to exceed the threshold based on conservative assumptions. By exceeding the PCAPCD's significance thresholds, the proposed project may add emissions that were not taken into account in the *Placer County Air Quality Attainment Plan*. Therefore, the proposed project would potentially be inconsistent with the goals of the *Placer County Air Quality Plan*; this would be a significant impact.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 10-6a:** Implement the following mitigation measures:

- Mitigation Measure 10-1a (Prepare and implement emission control/dust control measures);
- Mitigation Measure 10-1b (Provide PCAPCD with a list of construction equipment and anticipated construction timeline);
- Mitigation Measure 10-1c (Maintain construction equipment and vehicles);
- Mitigation Measure 10-1d (Minimize idling time for diesel-power equipment);
- Mitigation Measure 10-1e (No open burning of removed vegetation);
- Mitigation Measure 10-2a (Implement measures to reduce energy consumption);
- Mitigation Measure 10-2b (Prohibit open burning);
- Mitigation 10-2c (Allow only gas-fired fireplace appliances); and

- Mitigation Measure 10-2d (Implement offsite mitigation programs or pay an in-lieu amount into the Placer County Air Pollution Control District's Air Quality Mitigation Program)

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Significant and Unavoidable

**Impact 10-7 Emissions of greenhouse gases potentially contributing to global warming. This impact is considered *Significant*.**

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with this impact. No mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects (or some of the effects) therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

**Explanation:**

The Specific Plan will implement numerous measures to reduce Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions compared to a base-case scenario, as described in the EIR. However, even with implementation of the identified measures, however, the Specific Plan project will likely result in a substantial amount of GHG emissions. Because it cannot be determined to a reasonable degree of certainty that the project will not result in a cumulatively considerable incremental contribution to the significant cumulative impact of global climate change, the impacts of the proposed project on global climate change are considered significant and unavoidable.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 10-7a: Implement the following mitigation measures:**

- Mitigation Measure 10-1c (Maintain construction equipment and vehicles);
- Mitigation Measure 10-1d (Minimize idling time for diesel-powered equipment);
- Mitigation Measure 10-2a (Implement measures to reduce energy consumption);
- Mitigation Measure 10-2d (Implement offsite mitigation programs or pay an in-lieu amount into the Placer County Air Pollution Control District's Air Quality Mitigation Program);
- Mitigation Measure 9-1a: Prepare and implement a Construction Traffic Management Plan;
- Mitigation Measure 9-2a: Pay an in lieu fee and construct Walerga Road frontage improvements from the Dry Creek Bridge to the Placer County line;
- Mitigation Measure 9-2b: Contribute a fair share to widen Walerga Road from the Dry Creek Bridge to Baseline Road;
- Mitigation Measure 9-3a: Contribute a fair share to widen the intersections of Locust Road and Baseline Road, Watt Avenue and Baseline Road, and Walerga Road and Baseline Road;
- Mitigation Measure 9-8a: Contribute a fair share to widen SR 65 from Blue Oaks Boulevard to SR 65;
- Mitigation Measure 9-9a: Contribute a fair share to construct an interchange to replace the SR 70/99 and Riego Road intersection;
- Mitigation Measure 9-11a: Contribute a fair share to widen the intersections of Locust Road and Baseline Road, and Walerga Road and Baseline Road;
- Mitigation Measure 9-16a: Contribute a fair share to widen SR 65 to six lanes from Blue Oaks Boulevard to I-80;
- Mitigation Measure 9-17a: Contribute a fair share to constructing an interchange at the intersection of SR 70/99 with Riego Road;
- Mitigation Measure 9-18a: Create a Community Service Area to cover Transit Service;

- Mitigation Measure 9-19a: Contribute a fair share to widen PFE Road to four lanes from Watt Avenue to Walerga Road; and
- Mitigation Measure 9-20a: Contribute a fair share to widening the intersection of Walerga Road and PFE Road, signaling the intersection of Cook Riolo Road and PFE Road, and signaling the intersection of "East" Road and PFE Road.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Significant and Unavoidable

**H. NOISE**

**Impact 11-1 Construction equipment would generate short-term noise level increases at noise-sensitive locations. This impact is considered *Significant*.**

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with this impact in the short term. No mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects (or some of the effects) therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

**Explanation:**

The proposed project would be constructed in several phases. The highest noise levels would occur during the mass-grading phase of the proposed construction, which would be concentrated near areas where the greatest changes in elevation are needed to accommodate the proposed pad elevations. Noise-sensitive receptors are within a screening distance from the proposed activity such that the hourly average threshold of 70 dBA could be exceeded. Also, as project phases are built out, new residences would be subject to short-term noise impacts associated with nearby building of a subsequent phase. This would be a short-term, significant impact of project construction. Mitigation is identified to reduce impacts through preparation and implementation of a noise abatement program. This mitigation measure will reduce noise levels but may not achieve 70 dBA or below for receivers described above that are within or in close proximity to the Plan Area. Given the types and amount of construction equipment expected to be used, offsite impacts related to construction noise would be a short-term, significant impact.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 11-1a: Develop and implement a construction noise abatement program**

Prior to construction plan approval, the Department of Public Works (DPW) will develop and implement a construction noise abatement program acceptable to Placer County Division of Environmental Health (DEH) and conforming to Minute Order 98-08. The plan shall require that:

- All construction vehicles or equipment, fixed or mobile, shall be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers;
- Stockpiling and/or vehicle staging areas shall be identified on the improvement plans and shall be located as far as is practical from existing occupied dwellings;
- Construction noise emanating from any construction activities for which a Grading or Building Permit is required is prohibited on Sundays and federal holidays, and shall only occur during the following times:
  - Monday through Friday, 6:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. (during daylight savings)
  - Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. (during standard time)

– Saturdays, 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

These parameters are standard construction times set by the County's Planning Commission.

- Specific noise-control measures shall be identified that will reduce the hourly noise level to 70 dBA or lower at all schools during periods when schools are in session;
- Specific noise-control measures shall be identified that will reduce the hourly average noise level to 70 dBA or lower at other noise-sensitive receptors where feasible. The construction contractor shall consider implementation of the following measures in the construction noise control plan:
  1. Select equipment capable of performing the necessary tasks with the lowest noise-emission level and the lowest possible height for the acoustic center of noise emissions.
  2. Noise barriers may be required to block the line of sight from noise sources to noise-sensitive receivers of concern or to further reduce noise levels beyond that provided by line-of-sight breaks afforded by topographical features. The noise barriers could be constructed using either plywood sheets or other solid material that provides sufficient mass per unit surface area (perhaps approaching 4 pounds per square foot) and has minimal openings between the top of barrier and ground surface (perhaps as little as 1 percent). Noise barriers of a given height are generally most effective when placed as close as possible to either the source or receiver, and perhaps at two such separate locations. The least desirable location is generally at a middle distance between sources and receptors. The plan shall identify the proper height, location, and effectiveness of a noise barrier in terms of the expected hourly average noise level due to construction activity at noise-sensitive receivers of concern, with the objective of reducing contributions from construction activity to an hourly average of 70 dBA or less.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Significant and Unavoidable

**Impact 11-2** Transportation noise sources in excess of an Ldn of 60 dBA externally at the property line and in excess of 45 dBA internally at second floor elevations under existing conditions (2005). This impact is considered *Significant*.

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with this impact. No mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects (or some of the effects) therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

**Explanation:**

With certain identified exceptions, noise levels under Existing Plus Project conditions would not exceed the exterior noise criterion of 60 dBA or the interior noise criterion of 45 dBA. In most cases, as identified in the EIR, mitigation is available to reduce impacts to a less-than significant level. In a single instance (the existing Lund residence), noise levels under existing plus project conditions would exceed acceptable levels. Since this an existing structure, mitigation by setback or noise barrier is not feasible. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable for as long as this residence remains at this location.

## Mitigation Measures:

### Mitigation Measure 11-2a: Construct masonry walls of 6 feet elevation above pad

Masonry noise barriers of 6 feet elevation above pad height are proposed by the Applicant (see Figure 11-4 of the EIR). Masonry noise barriers may be required to be greater than 6 feet in order to achieve mitigation in some areas. The top-of-barrier elevation shall be such that the masonry wall is at least 6 feet above the pad elevation and the relative elevations of the top of barrier above roadways are not reduced below that analyzed for this EIR.

### Mitigation Measure 11-2b: Conduct noise analyses and measurements according to County standards and requirements

The Applicant will submit a tentative map for the Riolo Vineyard Specific Plan for the County to review and approve. The locations of noise attenuation features will be shown on the tentative map. Changes to this tentative map and submissions of tentative maps by other landholders in the specific plan area may require additional noise analysis to be completed according to County's standards and requirements, as to be determined by County staff.

The Applicant would be required to implement a setback and/or submit a sound barrier design that has been reviewed and approved by a noise consultant to attenuate potential noise impacts along PFE Road at the property line of the sensitive receptors. The noise consultants' analysis and subsequent report of the proposed mitigation shall meet the requirements of Table 9-2 of the Placer County Noise Element and shall be submitted to the County for review and approval. If noise cannot be adequately attenuated at the property line, per the General Plan, additional conditions could be implemented upon approval by the County. Such conditions could include implementing feasible mitigation to reduce noise impacts and property owner notification.

Even with the mitigation measures identified, the proposed project's contribution to 2025 traffic noise impacts would be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, the proposed project's 2025 impact on noise would be significant and unavoidable.

## Significance after Mitigation:

Significant and Unavoidable

**Impact 11-3** Transportation noise sources in excess of an Ldn of 60 dBA externally at the property line and in excess of 45 dBA internally at second floor elevations under future conditions (2025). This impact is considered *Significant*.

## Findings:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that substantially lessen, but do not avoid, the potentially significant environmental effect associated with this impact. No mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects (or some of the effects) therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

## Explanation:

With certain identified exceptions, noise levels under future (cumulative) conditions would not exceed the exterior noise criterion of 60 dBA or the interior noise criterion of 45 dBA. In most cases, as identified in the EIR, mitigation is available to reduce impacts to a less-than significant level. In certain instances, as identified in the

EIR, noise levels under future conditions would exceed acceptable levels. In the event that mitigation cannot be applied at a particular location to reduce noise to an acceptable level, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable as described in the EIR.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 11-3a: Implement Mitigation Measure 11-2a (Construct masonry walls of 6 feet elevation above pad)**

**Mitigation Measure 11-3b: Implement Mitigation Measure 11-2b (Conduct noise analyses and measurements according to County standards and requirements)**

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Significant and Unavoidable.

**Impact 11-4** Stationary noise sources within Plan Area could produce excessive noise levels at noise-sensitive locations during project operations. This impact is considered *Potentially Significant*.

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation:**

There are at least two locations within the Plan Area, one in the center of the Plan Area and another designated as being part of the Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) in the southeastern corner, where stationary sources such as pumps and/or electrical transformers are in proximity to residential units. The significance criterion is defined by Placer County for stationary noise sources. Specifically, Table 9-1 of the noise element of the Placer County General Plan requires non-transportation noise compliance with 50 dB Ldn at the property lines of residential land uses. It is anticipated that all potentially significant impacts due to stationary noise sources such as pumps and electrical transformers can be adequately mitigated to below an exterior Ldn of 50 dBA through mitigation, such as design of appropriate shielding, and equipment selection to reduce noise emissions. SMUD would be responsible for the substation's design and environmental clearance. It is recommended that SMUD consider design features that would mitigate noise impacts from the construction and operation of the substation.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 11-4a: Design shielding of stationary noise sources to prohibit a day-night noise level Ldn above 50 dBA**

Prior to approval of improvement plans, it shall be demonstrated to the satisfaction of Placer County DEH that stationary sources such as pumps within the Plan Area will not result in an Ldn in excess of 50 dBA at property lines for residences within the Plan Area. The mitigation specified shall also reduce noise levels for receivers outside of the Plan Area. Mitigation Measure 11-4a is intended to ensure that noise levels due to stationary equipment do not exceed applicable standards by controlling source noise emissions and providing enclosures and/or barriers as needed during final design. In the case of the electrical substation,

SMUD shall consider a facility design that would reduce noise impacts to less-than-significant levels. In the case of "impulsive" or "simple tone" noise sources, the criterion for exterior use areas shall be reduced, as per the provisions of the Placer County Noise Ordinance, to an Ldn of 45 dBA. An example of a "simple tone" noise source is an electrical transformer. An example of an "impulsive" noise source is an abrupt air

release from a pressure release valve associated with the mechanical systems of an air, water or sewage system. An example of an electrical noise source that would be located in the Specific Plan Area is the electrical pump station for the wastewater system. Other potential electrical noise sources could be rooftop HVAC units located in the Commercial parcel. It is anticipated that all potentially significant impacts due to stationary noise sources such as pumps and electrical transformers can be adequately mitigated through specification of a combination of the following:

- Restrict noise emissions of sources.
- Provide enclosures with adequate acoustical features.
- Maximize the separation distance between the noise source and sensitive receptors.
- Orient structures such that required openings are oriented away from receptors of concern.
- Orient receptors such that doors and operable windows are oriented away from noise stationary sources.
- Construct noise barriers.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Less than Significant

**I. SOILS, GEOLOGY AND SEISMICITY**

**Impact 12-1** Topographic alteration resulting from earth grading. This impact is considered *Potentially Significant*.

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation:**

Grading for building pads, recreational facilities, roads, and public facilities and services would alter site topography. Placer County's Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD) has the authority to review and approve all Improvement Plans for future construction within the Plan Area. This review would allow any identification and avoidance of any significant site-specific impacts to topography. Additionally, adhering to Placer County ordinances for grading, drainage, and construction, and implementing a grading and erosion control plan would reduce the effects of topographic alteration to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 12-1a: Submit Improvement Plans**

For future construction projects within the Plan Area, Improvement Plans, specifications, and cost estimates (per the requirements of Section II of the Land Development Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal) will be prepared and submitted to the Placer County ESD for review and approval of each new development project. The plans shall show the following:

- All conditions for the project as well as pertinent topographical features both on site and off site;
- All existing and proposed utilities and easements, on site and adjacent to the Plan Area, that may be affected by planned construction; and
- All proposed landscaping and irrigation facilities within the public right-of-way (or public easements), or landscaping within sight distance areas at intersections.

The Applicant shall prepare and submit Improvement Plans, specifications, and cost estimates (per the

requirements of Section II of the Land Development Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal) to the ESD for review and approval of each project phase. 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 shall 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 will be 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 Design Review Committee (DRC) review is required as a condition of approval for the project, this 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 prior to acceptance by the County of site improvements (Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, 2006).

#### **Mitigation Measure 12-1b: Comply with the County Grading Ordinance**

All proposed grading, drainage improvements, vegetation, and tree removal shall be shown on the proposed project's Improvement Plans, and all work shall conform to provisions of the County Grading Ordinance (Ref. Article 15.48, Placer County Code) that is in effect at the time of submittal. No grading, clearing, or tree disturbance shall occur until the Improvement Plans are approved and all temporary construction fencing has been installed and inspected by a member of the DRC. All cut/fill slopes shall be at a maximum of 2:1 (horizontal:vertical) unless a soils report supports a steeper slope and the ESD concurs with said recommendation.

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 will be the Applicant's responsibility to ensure proper installation and maintenance of erosion control/winterization during project construction. Where soil stockpiling or borrow areas are to remain for more than one construction season, proper erosion control measures shall be applied as specified in the Improvement Plans/Grading Plans. Where roadside drainage is off of the pavement, erosion control shall be provided for to the satisfaction of the ESD.

The Applicant shall submit to the ESD a letter of credit or cash deposit in the amount of 110 percent 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 this deposit will be refunded to the 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 (Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, 2006).

The project's erosion control plan shall indicate that proper control of siltation, sedimentation, and other pollutants will be implemented in accordance with National Pollutant Discharge and Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements and County ordinance standards. The plan shall propose best management practices (BMPs) to reduce erosion and water quality degradation during construction to the maximum extent practicable.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Less than Significant

**Impact 12-2 Potential for seismic activity. This impact is considered *Less than Significant*.**

**Findings:**

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

**Explanation:**

The zoned active fault closest to the Plan Area is located 70 kilometers to the north-northwest. No active fault traces are found beneath the study area. Therefore, the probability of surface ground rupture is negligible, and the possibility of strong ground motion is low. Impacts associated with the potential for seismic activity would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:**

No mitigation measures are required.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

This Impact is less than significant without mitigation.

**Impact 12-3 Potential for increased erosion during and after construction. This impact is considered *Potentially Significant*.**

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation:**

Clearing, grading, and excavation activities would remove vegetative cover from the soils and expose soils to the effects of wind, rain, and surface flow as a result of construction activities. The onsite soils are not classified as having a high erosion potential and there are no areas with steep slopes on the site. Compliance with Section 5 of Placer County's *Land Development Manual* and the Placer County *Storm Water Management Manual* would reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 12-3a: Identify stockpiling and vehicle staging areas on Improvement Plans**

For each construction phase within the Plan Area, stockpiling and/or vehicle staging areas shall be identified on the Improvement Plans. These areas shall be located as far as practical from existing dwellings and protected resources in the area.

**Mitigation Measure 12-3b: Comply with NPDES requirements for construction**

This project is subject to construction-related stormwater permit requirements of the federal Clean Water Act NPDES program. Each applicant/developer for future construction projects within the Plan Area shall implement Mitigation Measure 12-3b, which requires an applicant to submit a Notice of Intent (NOI) to comply with the NPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharges associated with Construction Activities to the State Regional Water Quality Control Board if the specific project would disturb 1 acre of land or more. The project applicant/developer shall provide to the ESD evidence of a state-issued Waste Discharge Identification (WDID) number or filing of a NOI and fees prior to start of construction, as required by the County's Sample Conditions and Improvement Plans, paragraph 15 (Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, 2006).

**Mitigation Measure 12-3c: Comply with NPDES Phase II requirements**

Development within the Plan Area must comply with the NPDES Phase II General Permit for the Discharge of Stormwater from small municipal separate storm sewer systems. Placer County is operating under the NPDES Phase II Rule permit, and as such, new development within the County must comply with the permit requirements. New development is subject to Attachment 4 Design Standards of the State Water Resource Control Board NPDES Phase II General Permit. These standards require that new development must be designed so as to minimize, to the maximum extent practicable, the introduction of pollutants of concern that may result in significant impacts, generated from site runoff of directly connected impervious areas, to the stormwater conveyance system as approved by the building official.

**Mitigation Measure 12-3d: Prepare and implement stormwater pollution prevention plan for construction**

For all construction activities that will disturb 1 or more acre of land, a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) for the construction phase must be prepared and implemented. The SWPPP will include development of site-specific structural and operational BMPs to prevent and control impacts to runoff quality, measures to be implemented before each storm event, inspection and maintenance of BMPs, and monitoring of runoff quality by visual and/or analytical means. The contents of the SWPPP are set forth in detail in the permit application package. BMPs shall be designed according to the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater *Best Management Practice Handbooks* for Construction (or other similar source as approved by the DPW). BMPs for the proposed project include, but are not limited to, silt fencing (Sediment Control SE-1), straw bale barriers (Sediment Control SE-9), fiber rolls (Sediment Control SE-5), storm drain inlet protection (Sediment Control SE-10), hydraulic mulch (Erosion Control EC-3), and stabilized construction entrance (Tracking Control TR-1). The SWPPP shall also include erosion control measures, to be implemented during construction, that conform to the NPDES, Storm Drain Standards, and local standards.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Less than Significant

**Impact 12-4** Loss of availability of important mineral resources. This impact is considered *Less than Significant*.

**Findings:**

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

**Explanation:**

It is unlikely that the study area represents a source of known mineral reserves, and no mineral resources of value are known to exist in the Plan Area. Therefore, loss of accessibility to mineral resources on the site as a result of proposed project construction would be a less-than-significant impact.

**Mitigation Measures:**

No mitigation measures are required.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

This Impact is less than significant without mitigation.

**Impact 12-5** Safety risk related to soil stability. This impact is considered *Potentially Significant*.

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation:**

The Plan Area is suitable for the planned construction if designed and constructed in accordance with generally accepted geotechnical principles, provided that detailed, site-specific investigations are conducted at appropriate times and the recommendations of each investigation are followed. The potential of expansive soils occurring within the Plan Area is considered to be moderate.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 12-5a: Prepare a geotechnical report for all elements of proposed development**

For each development phase or construction project within the Plan Area, a geotechnical engineering report produced by a California Registered Civil Engineer or Geotechnical Engineer shall be submitted to the ESD for review and approval. 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.); and
- Slope stability.

When 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 soils 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 and other entitlements, prior to issuance of building permits. This certification may be completed on a lot by lot basis or on a tract basis, or other defined project basis. This shall be so noted in the Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions 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.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Less than Significant

**J. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

**Impact 13-1** **Reduced stormwater quality during construction. This impact is considered *Potentially Significant*.**

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation:**

Project grading would decrease vegetative cover and increase the potential for soil erosion, and thereby could cause an increase in suspended solids in runoff and local receiving waters. Additional impacts to runoff water quality during construction could potentially result from leaks or spills of fuel or hydraulic fluid used in construction equipment; outdoor storage of construction materials; or spills of paints, solvents, or other potentially hazardous materials commonly used in construction. As each future construction project within the Plan Area is proposed, grading and erosion control measures would be included on the project's improvement plans and submitted to the Placer County Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD) for review and approval. The BMPs to be implemented during construction to minimize discharge of sediments or pollutants off site would be included on the improvement plans.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 13-1a: Implement Mitigation Measure 12-1b (Comply with County Grading Ordinance)**

**Mitigation Measure 13-1b: Implement Mitigation Measure 12-3b (Comply with NPDES requirements for construction)**

**Mitigation Measure 13-1c: Implement Mitigation Measure 12-3d (Prepare and implement stormwater pollution prevention plan for construction)**

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Less than Significant

**Impact 13-2** **Increase in runoff rate downstream of the site. This impact is considered *Potentially Significant*.**

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation:**

Development of the Plan Area would result in an increase in impervious surfaces due to the construction of buildings, parking lots, and roads; therefore, peak flow rates would increase during storm events. Currently the site

325

is undeveloped with the exception of a few houses and roads. The proposed project would incorporate low impact design elements, particularly in regards to stormwater management and site drainage applications. BMPs that promote overland flow of stormwater runoff and infiltration, such as bioswales, would reduce flow velocities, increase flow paths, and reduce peak flow rates. Aesthetically enhanced stormwater collection channels, detention areas, and bioswales are encouraged. Parks and greenways would be included throughout the Plan Area and provide opportunities for stormwater detention. Although the in situ soils are fine-grained and would likely not provide for sufficient infiltration, fill material and/or subsurface drains could provide an opportunity to incorporate infiltration-type BMPs such as pervious pavement and percolation trenches.

During detailed design of each construction phase within the Plan Area, project-specific peak flow calculations and evaluation would be necessary. The evaluation would assess whether detaining peak flows would exacerbate downstream flooding by allowing downstream peak flows to combine contemporaneously and would be used to ensure that facilities are sized to achieve the required reduction in flows in accordance with the County's Stormwater Management Manual. To support the design of each construction phase, a project-specific drainage report, including drainage calculations, shall be prepared for review and approval by Placer County ESD.

#### **Mitigation Measures:**

#### **Mitigation Measure 13-2a: Prepare and submit project-specific drainage report**

Each applicant/developer for future construction projects within the Plan Area shall prepare and submit with their project Improvement Plans a project-specific drainage report in conformance with the requirements of Section 5 of the Land Development Manual and the Placer County Stormwater Management Manual (SWMM) that are in effect at the time of submittal, to the Placer County ESD for review and approval. The project-specific drainage reports shall be consistent with the Drainage Master Plan and Development Standards for Plan Area. The report shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and shall, at a minimum, include:

- Written text describing existing conditions and proposed improvements,
- The effects of the improvements,
- All appropriate calculations,
- A watershed map,
- Increases in downstream flows, and
- Proposed onsite and offsite improvements and drainage easements to accommodate flows from the 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. No construction shall be permitted within any identified wetlands area, floodplain, or right-of-way, except as authorized by project approvals. The project-specific drainage report shall demonstrate compliance with all relevant mitigation measures included in this Draft EIR.

#### **Mitigation Measure 13-2b: Evaluate downstream offsite drainage facilities**

The project-specific drainage reports prepared for each future construction project within the Plan Area shall evaluate offsite drainage facilities for conditions and capacity and shall be upgraded, replaced, or mitigated as specified by the Placer County ESD. Each future construction project shall upgrade or replace drainage facilities, or mitigate drainage impacts in other ways as needed and as specified by Placer County ESD. This includes any existing drainage facilities located immediately downstream of the project that would receive drainage and would be changed by the proposed project. The analysis must include any existing roadside ditches and/or culverts along Walerga Road, PFE Road, and Watt Avenue. While the Plan Area is within the

Dry Creek watershed and as such onsite detention is not required to reduce peak flow rates due to development, onsite detention may be required in order to comply with the County's requirements regarding road encroachments. In accordance with the SWMM, all travel lanes of Watt Avenue, PFE Road, and Walerga Road may be required to remain clear of stormwater flow for all storm events, including the 100-year event. In addition, the Applicant will be required to mitigate peak flow rates to pre-development levels for 10- and 100-year storm events (per the Placer County Stormwater Management Manual) for only the portion of the Riolo Vineyard Plan Area that drains south towards PFE Road.

**Mitigation Measure 13-2c: Submit one-time Dry Creek watershed drainage improvement fee**

New development in the Plan Area shall be subject to the one-time payment of drainage improvement and flood control fees pursuant to the Dry Creek Watershed Interim Drainage Improvements Ordinance (Ref. Article 15.32, formerly Chapter 4, Subchapter 20, Placer County Code). This fee is used to fund installation and maintenance of roadway drainage and stormwater drainage improvements within the watershed. The actual fees to be paid will be those in effect at the time the payment occurs and are assessed on the amount of development area. Each developer will be responsible for submitting the appropriate fee for the specific land development project to the Placer County ESD. The one-time fee shall be paid prior to issuance of the building permit or approval of improvement plans.

**Mitigation Measure 13-2d: Submit annual Dry Creek watershed drainage improvement fee**

New development in the Plan Area shall be subject to payment of annual drainage improvement and flood control fees pursuant to the Dry Creek Watershed Interim Drainage Improvements Ordinance (Ref. Article 15.32, formerly Chapter 4, Subchapter 20, Placer County Code). These fees are used to fund installation and maintenance of roadway drainage and stormwater drainage improvements within the watershed. The Applicant will be required to form a County Service Area zone, if one currently does not cover the Plan Area, for collecting the annual special assessment. The actual fees to be paid will be those in effect at the time the payment occurs and are assessed on the basis of the new development acreage. The annual fee is a yearly charge and will be included on a parcel's property tax bill.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Less than Significant

**Impact 13-3 Increase in runoff volume downstream of the site. This impact is considered *Potentially Significant*.**

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation:**

Development of roads, buildings, and other paved and impermeable surfaces would reduce the amount of stormwater that infiltrates into the ground, and would increase the amount of water that runs off of the site. A project-specific drainage report, including drainage calculations, shall be prepared for review and approval by Placer County ESD. The proposed project must comply with the Placer County's Dry Creek Watershed Drainage Improvement Ordinance. Increase in runoff quantity associated with development of the site is considered a potentially significant impact; however, the proposed mitigation measures would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 13-3a: Implement Mitigation Measure 13-2a (Prepare and submit project specific drainage report)**

**Mitigation Measure 13-3b: Implement Mitigation Measure 13-2c (Submit one-time Dry Creek watershed drainage improvement fee)**

**Mitigation Measure 13-3c: Implement Mitigation Measure 13-2d (Submit annual Dry Creek watershed drainage improvement fee)**

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Less than Significant

**Impact 13-4** Reduced water quality during operation. This impact is considered *Potentially Significant*.

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation:**

The proposed project would increase the overall amount of impervious surface, thereby increasing runoff from most of the site. Following construction of the proposed project, stormwater runoff quality would be expected to decline as more potential pollutants would be generated by human activities. Additionally, pollutants would tend to be flushed from impervious surfaces where they accumulate (e.g., paving and roofs) into drainage conveyances. Stormwater runoff from streets and the parking area would be expected to contain oils, grease, and debris. The goal of the proposed project is to integrate BMPs throughout the project development to provide source control and water quality treatment of runoff from paved and other developed areas prior to discharge into the swales and streams that ultimately discharge into Dry Creek. In accordance with NPDES II requirements, the proposed project design would be required to incorporate BMPs to reduce the discharge of stormwater pollution to the maximum extent practicable. Potential significant impacts to water quality during operations would be mitigated to a less than significant level by designing the proposed project to include appropriate and effective BMPs, including LID measures.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 13-4a: Implement Mitigation Measure 12-3c (Comply with NPDES Phase II requirements)**

**Mitigation Measure 13-4b: Prepare site-specific BMP plan**

Each applicant/developer for each construction phase within the Plan Area shall submit a project-specific BMP Plan with the project improvement plans showing the onsite locations and effectiveness of the BMP facilities proposed for long-term water quality impact reduction during the Subsequent Conformity Review process and prior to Improvement Plan approval. The plan shall include a method for financing the long-term maintenance of the proposed project-specific facilities.

All BMPs for water quality protection, source control, and treatment control shall be developed in accordance with the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater *Best Management Practice Handbook* for New Development/Redevelopment (or other similar source approved by the Engineering and

Surveying Division) for the applicable type of development and/or improvement. BMPs shall be designed to mitigate (minimize, infiltrate, filter, or treat) stormwater runoff. Flow or volume based postconstruction 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. Provisions shall be included for long-term maintenance of BMPs. BMPs shall reflect improvements in techniques and opportunities made available over time and shall reflect site-specific limitations. The County shall make the final determinations as to the appropriateness of the BMPs proposed for each project.

Source control BMPs should be incorporated into the design of each future construction project within the Plan Area. These BMPs emphasize reducing or eliminating pollutant in stormwater runoff at their source through runoff reduction and by segregating pollutants from stormwater runoff. Examples of source control BMPs that should be evaluated during design and could be incorporated into the project-specific BMP Plan as feasible include the following:

- Incorporate landscaping into the design, including planting of native and drought-tolerant plants to maximize natural water storage and infiltration opportunities and protect slopes and channels (Source Control SD-10);
- Direct roof runoff to grassy areas and away from paved areas or storm drains to promote overland flow of stormwater runoff and reduce velocities and peak flow rates (Source Control SD-11);
- Incorporate pervious pavement to promote infiltration and reduce runoff (Source Control SD-20)
- Provide enclosed commercial trash areas to avoid contact with stormwater runoff (Source Control SD-32);
- Design parking lots to direct storm water to storm drain inlets and away from garbage disposal areas (Source Control SD-32);
- Perform street and parking lot cleaning to remove potential debris and pollutants that could be picked up and conveyed by storm water;
- Where practical, install drip and low-flow irrigation systems to provide efficient irrigation and minimize runoff of excess irrigation water (Source Control SD-12); and
- Select building materials that do not introduce sources of pollutants (Source Control SD-21).

In addition, storm drainage from onsite and offsite impervious surfaces (including roads) shall be collected and routed through specially designed water quality treatment facilities (i.e., treatment control BMPs) for removal of pollutants of concern (i.e., sediment, oil/grease, etc.), as approved by the County's Engineering and Surveying Division. Treatment control BMPs should be integrated into and throughout the site to enhance the removal of pollutants that have entered the stormwater runoff. Examples of treatment control BMPs that should be evaluated during design include the following:

- Provide vegetative swale or buffer areas, which could be incorporated into landscaped areas, to slow down runoff velocities and allow sediments and other pollutants to settle (Treatment Control TC-30, TC-31);
- Install water quality inlets (e.g., oil/water separators) to remove "first flush" pollutants, including oil and grease (Treatment Control TC-50); and

- Incorporate biofiltration facilities to capture stormwater runoff from impervious areas and remove pollutants (Source Control TC-32).

With the Improvement Plans, the applicant/developer for the construction project shall verify that proposed BMPs are appropriate to treat the pollutants of concern from the project. The applicant/developer shall provide for the establishment of vegetation, where specified, by means of proper irrigation, for effective performance of BMPs. No water quality facility construction shall be permitted within any identified wetlands area, floodplain, or right-of-way except as authorized by the project approvals or subsequent amendments approved by the County.

**Mitigation Measure 13-4c: Maintain BMPs**

Storm drainage from impervious surfaces proposed with the project shall be collected and routed through specially designed catchbasins, 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 Placer County ESD. The Applicant shall provide for the establishment of vegetation, where specified, by means of proper irrigation, for effective performance of BMPs. Contractual evidence of a monthly parking lot sweeping and vacuuming, and catch basin cleaning program shall be provided to ESD upon request. Failure to do so will be grounds for discretionary permit revocation. Maintenance of BMP facilities shall be provided by the project owners/permittees for each future construction project within the Plan Area unless, and until, a County Service Area is created and said facilities are accepted by the County for maintenance. Prior to approval of improvement plans, final maps shall show easements to be created and offered for dedication to the County for maintenance and access to these facilities in anticipation of possible County maintenance. No water quality facility construction shall be permitted within any identified wetlands area, floodplain, or right-of-way, except as authorized by project approvals or subsequent amendments approved by the County.

**Mitigation Measure 13-4d: Implement Mitigation Measure 14-4a (Design onsite and offsite pipelines to have watertight joints in accordance with Placer County standards)**

**Mitigation Measure 13-4e: Design and construct LID measures that comply with performance measures**

The Applicant's LID strategies would consist primarily of bioswales that would fit into the overall drainage plan. Each major drainage discharge point in the Plan Area would be designed to include bioswales or a similar LID measure. The bioswales would be designed to be integrated with the rest of the drainage structures in the Plan Area and comply with the following performance standards to ensure that constructed grassy swales and other BMP/LID measures perform necessary functions related to protect the Plan Area's water quality:

- Maximum flow rates in the swale should not exceed 1.5 feet per second.
- Swales should be designed so that they are as flat and as wide as possible. In areas where topography prevents this, check dams would be installed to slow water movement. These check dams will periodically need to be cleared of sediment to remain functional. The swales should be constructed so that the side slopes are 3:1 or less to ensure that they do not contribute to sediment loading in the drainage.
- Swales should be designed for a maximum residence time of 24 hours to abate mosquito problems.
- Swale vegetation should consist of species that are native or at a minimum noninvasive. The use of perennial grasses or other plants that are not winter-dormant is recommended.
- The swale vegetation should be mowed at a frequency that maximizes performance. Four times per

year is recommended for some species.

- A single swale can drain up to 4 acres of land (or surface). The proposed bioswales plan will include the maximum drainage area proposed per swale. The County would be responsible for verifying that the Applicant and other landowners in Plan Area have designated sufficient area for the grassy swales.

Preference is given to natural, low-maintenance LID solutions over engineered solutions. Review and approval by the County would be required for each LID plan before it is constructed in the Plan Area.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Less than Significant

**Impact 13-5 Placement of fill or structures in 100-year floodplain. This impact is considered *Potentially Significant*.**

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation:**

The 100-year floodplain associated with Dry Creek exists within the Plan Area. Development of the proposed project would include regrading of the Plan Area, which could alter the floodplain. In general, the majority of the existing floodplain would remain in a natural state within open spaces along the creek. The proposed development would include minor encroachments into the floodplain, mostly to smooth out the edge of the floodplain against the northerly roadway within the Plan Area. Additional encroachments would be associated with several building pads that would be constructed along the same roadway. As such, there would be slight changes to the boundaries of the floodplain compared to the existing FEMA-designated boundaries. The proposed project would provide in-kind compensatory storage to offset the hydraulic impacts due to these encroachments. The analysis described in the EIR shows that with the proposed full development of the Plan Area and with in-kind compensatory storage, the proposed project would not have a significant effect on the base flood elevations along Dry Creek or its tributaries.

No development would occur within the 100-year floodplain; therefore, no people or structures would be exposed to flood hazards. Finished pad elevations and finished floor elevations would be set a minimum of 2 feet and 3 feet above the adjacent 100-year floodplain water surface elevation, respectively. As project-specific land uses and designs are developed, the floodplain analyses would be further refined to ensure that no private development would occur within the floodplain.

Implementation of the proposed mitigation measures would reduce this impact to a less-than significant level by ensuring that development does not occur in the 100-year floodplain, or if small amounts of fill are placed in the floodplain, compensatory in-kind storage would be provided so that there would be no net increase in base flood elevations.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 13-5a: Implement Mitigation Measure 13-2a (Prepare and submit project specific drainage report)**

**Mitigation Measure 13-5b: Delineate post-project floodplain boundary**

The Drainage Master Plan for the Plan Area shows the limits of the future, unmitigated, fully developed 100-year floodplain (post-development) for Dry Creek and its tributaries. Each future construction project within the Plan Area shall delineate the 100-year floodplain in the site-specific drainage report and on the Improvement Plans and shall restrict development in floodplains. Placer County shall require evaluation of potential flood hazards prior to approval of each construction project. The County shall require proponents of new development to submit accurate topographic and flow characteristics information and depiction of the 100-year floodplain boundaries under fully developed, unmitigated runoff.

All development in the 100-year floodplain must comply with the provisions of the Placer County Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance to prevent damage to structures and to limit the effect of development on base flood elevations.

**Mitigation Measure 13-5c: Provide in-kind compensatory storage**

The placement of fill in floodplains should be minimized. In the event that some fill within a floodplain is unavoidable, in-kind compensatory storage should be provided. During design, hydraulic analyses would be required to evaluate the resultant impacts on the floodplain and base flood elevations. While fill may be allowed within the floodplain fringe zone, fill should not be placed within the designated regulatory floodway. The floodway is the portion of the floodplain that must be reserved to convey the base flood without increasing the base flood elevation by more than one foot.

When a development encroaches into a floodplain, the flood storage lost must be compensated by providing in-kind storage. This is defined as excavating the same amount of material at the same elevation as placing fill to provide hydraulically equivalent storage. In addition to providing an offsetting volume of material at the same elevation, the replacement excavation must be located where it will be inundated during a 100-year flood; that is, it cannot be isolated away from the floodplain.

**Mitigation Measure 13-5d: Prepare and submit conditional letter of map revision (CLOMR)**

Prior to any modifications within the existing FEMA mapped 100-year floodplain along Dry Creek and its tributaries, the Applicant will prepare CLOMR Application documents, submit them to Placer County for review, amend as necessary and submit final CLOMR application to the County, with FEMA fees. Upon County signature of the application, the County may request that the Applicant's consultant process the application with FEMA, and provide additional information as requested by FEMA.

**Mitigation Measure 13-5e: Submit Letter of Map Revision (LOMR)**

Each applicant/developer for each construction phase within the Plan Area shall submit an application to FEMA for a LOMR if the development alters the floodplain boundaries and/or the base flood elevations by more than 1 foot. Prior to submitting the LOMR application, data and analyses will be reviewed and approved by the County ESD.

**Mitigation Measure 13-5f: Prohibit grading activities within post-project floodplain**

In order to protect site resources, agricultural practices cannot result in substantial modifications to topography or drainage that would affect the floodplain boundaries or base flood elevations. With the exception of agricultural activities such as plowing or planting, no grading activities may take place in the post-project 100-year floodplain as identified in the Drainage Master Plan except as necessary to construct and maintain drainage improvements.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Less than Significant

Riolo Vineyard Specific Plan  
Findings of Fact and  
Statement of Overriding Consideration

**Impact 13-6 Reduce groundwater recharge. This impact is considered *Less than Significant*.**

**Findings:**

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

**Explanation:**

Development and urbanization of the Specific Plan Area could reduce pervious area, which in turn would limit the percolation process and reduce groundwater recharge. Based on the low value of the Plan Area for recharge (with the exception of the Dry Creek corridor, which would remain in open space), this impact would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:**

No mitigation measures are required.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

This Impact is less than significant without mitigation.

**Impact 13-7 Depletion of groundwater supplies. This impact is considered *Less than Significant*.**

**Findings:**

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

**Explanation:**

Since the proposed project would not use groundwater as a water supply and several of the existing wells would be abandoned, there would be no impact to well production or on groundwater supplies. Future owners of the Agricultural-10 parcels may want to install groundwater wells for irrigation water supply. These wells would be installed in accordance with Placer County and DWR regulations. Historically, the Plan Area was used for agriculture. In the event that these property owners decide to install wells for irrigation of their crops, the amount of land irrigated and the amount of groundwater that would be used by these properties would likely be less than historical groundwater use. Therefore this impact would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:**

No mitigation measures are required.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

This Impact is less than significant without mitigation.

**Impact 13-8 Loss of grassy swales, potentially affecting hydrologic and water quality functions. This impact is considered *Significant*.**

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation:**

Grassy swales are not regulated by the Corps under the federal Clean Water Act. However, these swales receive overflow from irrigation ditches, channelized streams, and perennial seasonal wetlands. The loss of approximately 11 acres of this habitat would be a significant impact because these features provide important water quality and hydrologic functions that are similar to jurisdictional wetlands. These functions include retention of seasonal runoff, stabilization of sediment, nutrient removal, and transformation of captured nutrients into plant material. The proposed project design would incorporate BMPs to reduce the discharge of stormwater pollution to the maximum extent practicable. Potential significant impacts to water quality during operations would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level by designing the proposed project to include appropriate and effective BMPs, including LID measures.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 13-8a: Implement Mitigation Measures 12-3d (Prepare and implement stormwater pollution prevention plan for construction), 13-4b (Prepare site-specific BMP plan), 13-4c (Maintain BMPs), and 14-4a (Design onsite and offsite pipelines to have watertight joints)**

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Less than Significant

**Impact 13-9 Reduced water quality during operation (Program-level). This impact is considered *Potentially Significant*.**

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation:**

Landowners of program-level parcels who apply for development entitlements will need to provide the County with LID plans to ensure water quality for any discharge to Dry Creek. Such plans would be designed to discharge all waters within 72 hours of the completion of runoff from a storm event, so as to comply with the Placer Mosquito Abatement District's requirements.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 13-9a: Implement Mitigation Measure 13-4c (Design and construct LID measures that comply with performance measures)**

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Less than Significant

## K. PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

**Impact 14-1** Increased demand for treated surface water. This impact is considered *Potentially Significant*.

### Findings:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

### Explanation:

Treated water for domestic and commercial use would be supplied to the proposed project by PCWA via the retail supplier (Cal-Am) after annexation into PCWA Zone 1. At present, the total projected water supplies available during normal, single dry, and multiple dry water years, as included in the 20-year projection contained in the Urban Water Management Plan, will meet the projected water demand associated with the proposed project, in addition to the system's existing and planned future uses. PCWA has prepared an analysis regarding available resources to provide water service to the Plan Area to meet the requirements of SB 610. Therefore, sufficient water supplies are available to serve the Plan Area. It is noted that water service is allocated by PCWA on a first-come, first-served basis and water availability must be ascertained prior to any development. Because the Plan Area would be built-out over time, Mitigation Measure 14-1b to limit building permits to coincide with water service allocation is also proposed. With implementation of mitigation measures, impacts would be less than significant.

### Mitigation Measures:

**Mitigation Measure 14-1a: Pay connection fees and construct 16-inch- and 24-inch-diameter transmission line extensions to the Plan Area in accordance with PCWA and Cal-Am standards**

Payment of the connection fees is intended to act to offset future maintenance of the planned water main extensions. Construction of the lines to the appropriate standards is intended to ensure the transmission mains are in a condition suitable for operation and maintenance by Cal-Am in the future, provide a reliable resource to the area, and provide a source of water for adjoining uses not included in the project.

**Mitigation Measure 14-1b: Issue building permits only when sufficient treated water supply exists**

Prior to approval of any small lot tentative subdivision map, the County shall comply with Government Code Section 66473.7 or make a factual showing or impose conditions similar to those required by Section 66473.7, as appropriate to the size of the subdivision. Prior to the recordation of any final subdivision map or prior to County approval or any similar approval or entitlement required for nonresidential uses, the Applicant shall obtain a written certification from the water service provider that either existing services are available or that needed improvements will be in place prior to occupancy.

### Significance after Mitigation:

Less than Significant

**Impact 14-2** The impacts of climate change on water supply could affect future water supply in the Specific Plan Area. This impact is considered *Less than Significant*.

### Findings:

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

**Explanation:**

The impacts of climate change on long-term water supply in California and Placer County is uncertain. However, given current water supply sources and California's ability to adapt to global change, it is reasonable to expect that the proposed project's impact on long-term water supply would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:**

No mitigation measures are required.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

This Impact is less than significant without mitigation.

**Impact 14-3 Potential impacts to CFD facilities if wastewater facilities are shared with Placer Vineyards wastewater flows. This impact is considered *Potentially Significant*.**

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation:**

If the impacts from the proposed project alone are evaluated, impacts to existing sewer facilities would be less than significant. The peak flow rates from the Plan Area (including adjacent offsite areas wastewater flows passing through the proposed project's onsite pump station) are estimated at 560 gallons per minute (gpm), which is well below the design allowance of 1,100 gpm. It is acknowledged that there is an opportunity for the proposed project to share facilities with the proposed Placer Vineyards development to the north and west. If flows from Placer Vineyards were to be combined with flows from the Plan Area, combined peak flow rates to the CFD pump station would be on the order of 1,900 gpm, which is greater than the design capacity allowance of 1,100 gpm allotted to the Plan Area. This flow rate would also exceed the current flow capacity of the existing CFD pumps and associated force main, potentially rendering the pumps unable to overcome the increased head conditions

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 14-3a: Upsize existing CFD pump station pumps and ancillary equipment**

To provide the CFD pump station with the ability to operate simultaneously with the Riolo Vineyard pump station, the existing CFD pump station pumps will be changed to operate at higher head conditions and lower resultant flow rates. Mitigation Measure 14-3a is to be implemented if Mitigation Measure 14-3b is not implemented.

**Mitigation Measure 14-3b: Do not allow sewage conveyance connection from Placer Vineyards to common force main**

To avoid overwhelming the CFD pump station pumps due to high head conditions in the force main, if the wastewater flows from Placer Vineyards were not directed to the CFD force main the CFD pumps would continue to function as they do now. The wastewater flows from the project are below what the existing CFD pump station and associated force main were designed to handle. Mitigation Measure 14-3b is to be implemented if Mitigation Measure 14-3a is not implemented.

## Significance after Mitigation:

Less than Significant

### **Impact 14-4 Potential reduction in water quality resulting from accidental discharge of wastewater into Dry Creek drainage. This impact is considered *Potentially Significant*.**

#### **Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

#### **Explanation:**

As proposed, sewage conveyance facilities for the proposed project would flow to the Dry Creek WWTP. Conveyance infrastructure within the Plan Area would be located adjacent to the Dry Creek channel. Potential pipe leakage affecting Dry Creek can be limited by ensuring compliance with enhanced construction specifications where needed. To address potential impacts from flooding of the pump station and associated collection system manholes, mitigation is proposed to locate these features in areas above the 100-year floodplain, and/or require the use of bolt-down covers on manholes, which would reduce the likelihood of flooding. The Applicant also proposes to construct a sufficiently sized storage tank and an emergency generator with a sufficient volume of properly stored fuel with adequate amount of secondary containment, which would reduce the likelihood of a loss of power to the pump station.

#### **Mitigation Measures:**

##### **Mitigation Measure 14-4a: Design onsite and offsite pipelines to have watertight joints in accordance with Placer County Standards**

To reduce the potential for any of the proposed water or recycled water supply or wastewater transmission pipelines to leak and affect service and environmental conditions of surrounding areas, Placer County standards specify material type; wall thicknesses; connection methods, including coupling information; backfill material type and placement methods; and installation location relative to other utilities. Adhering to these standards will reduce the likelihood that the project pipelines would affect adjacent or sensitive areas. However, in areas where the groundwater table is close to the pipeline, additional measures may be needed to protect groundwater quality, including more robust pipe joint details, use of fusible C-900/905 pipe sections, pipe wrap, or cathodic protection.

##### **Mitigation Measure 14-4b: Locate the pump station system above the 100-year floodplain and use bolt-down covers for sewer manholes which are within the 100-year floodplain**

Since the adjacent Dry Creek has a history of flooding, the gravity collection and transmission portions of the wastewater system should be located outside of the proposed limits of the 100-year floodplain and require the use of bolt-down covers on manholes, to avoid co-mingling of wastewater with Creek flows during periods of flooding. The elevations used for this evaluation should be based on a site-specific hydrologic evaluation to ensure that the most current floodplain elevation is used.

##### **Mitigation Measure 14-4c: Install an emergency generator and fuel storage with adequate spill containment for extended operation**

In the event that the onsite wastewater pump station were to lose electrical power, gravity collection of wastewater would continue to be directed to the pump station, but flows would not be conveyed to Dry Creek WWTP. Under this condition, wastewater flows would back up into the gravity collection system and

could potentially overtop the wastewater pump station wet well and/or associated system manholes. To reduce the potential for this to occur, an emergency generator with sufficient quantities of fuel will be located adjacent to the wastewater pump station to provide dedicated electrical power. The fuel storage will be configured to provide secondary containment in the event of a tank rupture to avoid fuel spills. With implementation of these mitigation measures, impacts on groundwater and surface water quality resulting from accidental wastewater discharge would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Less than Significant

**Impact 14-5 Increased demand on wastewater treatment system. This impact is considered *Potentially Significant*.**

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation:**

Sewer treatment would be provided by the City of Roseville and the existing treatment facilities are in compliance with requirements of the RWQCB and should not require expansion as a result of the proposed project. The sewage generated by this project would be typical of residential developments and is not expected to cause the existing facilities to exceed existing NPDES requirements. The Plan Area was included within the 2005 service area boundary for the Dry Creek WWTP, and the service area boundary will only direct 14.8 mgd to the Dry Creek WWTP, which is below the Dry Creek WWTP permitted maximum discharge limit of 18 mgd. Therefore, there is sufficient capacity at the Dry Creek WWTP to serve the Plan Area.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 14-5a: All new development in the Specific Plan area shall comply with General Plan Policy 4.D.2, which requires written certification from the service provider that either existing services are available or needed improvements will be made prior to occupancy to meet wastewater demands of the Specific Plan.**

Commitments from the wastewater treatment provider to receive anticipated flows from the specific plan area at the Dry Creek WWTP shall be secured by Placer County prior to County approval of improvement plans for wastewater collection and transmission infrastructure.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Less than Significant

**Impact 14-6 Increased demand for recycled water for nonpotable water use. This impact is considered *Potentially Significant*.**

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation:**

Although it is estimated that there would be adequate recycled water supply from the Dry Creek WWTP to meet both average annual and peak day demand, the maximum amount of water available to the Plan Area potentially would be limited to the amount of effluent delivered to the Dry Creek WWTP. This amount of water is insufficient to meet the irrigation demands of the Plan Area, which would necessitate the use of potable water for irrigation regardless of whether recycled water is made available. It is proposed that recycled water allocable to Riolo Vineyards be transferred to the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan area to assist in meeting that project's recycled water demand. Accordingly, the project does not propose the extension of recycled water conveyance infrastructure within the Plan Area, although such infrastructure has been analyzed in the EIR. In the event that recycled water infrastructure is constructed along the Dry Creek corridor, the following mitigation measure would apply.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 14-6a: Implement Mitigation Measure 14-4a (Design onsite and offsite pipelines to have watertight joints in accordance with Placer County standards)**

Mitigation Measure 14-4a should be implemented if the recycled water line is located along Dry Creek. This mitigation measure applies to the construction of the planned recycled water force main if it is located along Dry Creek rather than along Walerga Road and through the main east/west collector roadway. If the pipeline carrying recycled water is located along Dry Creek, and a line break were to occur, the potential for discharge of recycled water into Dry Creek would be higher due to the proximity of the line to Dry Creek.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Less than Significant

**Impact 14-7 Increased demand for electrical supply. This impact is considered *Less than Significant*.**

**Findings:**

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

**Explanation:**

Electric service would be provided by SMUD. The projected electric energy use for the proposed project at buildout is estimated to be 7,077 MWH/yr. At present, SMUD does not anticipate any supply issues that would impact this level of service.

**Mitigation Measures:**

No mitigation measures are required.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

This Impact is less than significant without mitigation.

**Impact 14-8 Increased demand on the electrical distribution network. This impact is considered *Less than Significant*.**

**Findings:**

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code,

**Explanation:**

In general, SMUD has sufficient regional electric facilities to serve the project. SMUD has indicated that the initial development within the Plan Area could be served by existing supply infrastructure. Full development of the proposed project would require development of a new substation by SMUD. The Applicant proposes to provide to SMUD a half-acre site with the Plan Area to accommodate the new SMUD substation. As a result, the capacity to handle increased demand on the electrical distribution network from the proposed project would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:**

No mitigation measures are required.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

This Impact is less than significant without mitigation.

**Impact 14-9 Increased demand for natural gas supply. This impact is considered *Less than Significant*.**

**Findings:**

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

**Explanation:**

Natural gas service would be provided by PG&E. The estimated natural gas demand at buildout for the proposed project is 56,754 cubic feet per hour. At this time PG&E does not anticipate any supply issues that would impact this level of service. As a result, the impact of increased demand for natural gas supply would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:**

No mitigation measures are required.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

This Impact is less than significant without mitigation.

**Impact 14-10 Increased demand on the natural gas distribution network. This impact is considered *Less than Significant*.**

**Findings:**

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

**Explanation:**

Since two medium-sized pipelines exist adjacent to the project, no offsite gas extensions are anticipated. As a result, the impacts of increased demand on the natural gas distribution pipeline would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:**

No mitigation measures are required.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

This Impact is less than significant without mitigation.

**Impact 14-11 Increased demand for existing public parks and recreational facilities for new residents in project-level parcels. This impact is considered *Less than Significant*.**

**Findings:**

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

**Explanation:**

Policy 5.A.3 of the *Placer County General Plan* requires the provision of 5 acres of parkland and 5 acres of open space per 1,000 residents. Upon agreement between the County and Specific Plan developers, in-lieu fees may be stipulated for a portion of this requirement. As identified in the EIR, the proposed project would meet the County's requirements for park facilities. All recreational facilities included in the proposed project would be open to the public and create recreational opportunities for nearby communities. Therefore, the proposed project's impacts to recreational facilities would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:**

No mitigation measures are required.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

This Impact is less than significant without mitigation.

**Impact 14-12 Increased demand for public schools. This impact is considered *Significant*.**

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation:**

The Plan Area is located within the jurisdiction of Center Unified School District. Since the passage of state legislation on developer fees (i.e., SB 50 and Proposition 1A), mitigation is limited by state law to the statutory developer fee procedures, so no additional mitigation is identified. This impact would be considered less than significant, provided that the developer pay the statutorily required school impact fees.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 14-12a: Pay statutory school impact fees**

The statutory school impact fee shall be paid to help fund new school facilities for students who would live in the Plan Area.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Less than Significant

**Impact 14-13 Increased demand for fire protection services for project-level parcels. This impact is considered *Potentially Significant*.**

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation:**

The addition of new residents in both project- and program-level parcels would increase the need for additional fire protection resources. Development within the Specific Plan proposes to fund these additional positions. With implementation of this mitigation, impacts related to fire protection on project-level parcels would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 14-13a: Fund additional fire protection staff to maintain required staffing ratios**

The staffing ratios contained in Table 14-14 of the EIR shall be maintained for the Specific Plan area, concurrent with demand, during all phases of development. The Applicant shall be required to establish a special benefit assessment district or other funding mechanism to assure adequate funding for the ongoing maintenance and operation of fire protection and related services, with funding responsibilities imposed on residential and commercial properties within the Specific Plan area, including the costs for services required to satisfy Placer County Fire Department staffing requirements set forth above. The funding mechanism shall be subject to the prior review and approval of Placer County, and shall be approved by the affected landowners prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map. It shall be maintained until such time as the County determines that property tax revenues are adequate to maintain the required staffing.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Less than Significant

**Impact 14-14 Increased demand for police protection services and law enforcement facilities resulting from increased population, which could cause or contribute to safety issues and crime. This impact is considered *Significant*.**

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant

environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation:**

Development of the Specific Plan would necessitate additional staffing and equipment for the Placer County Sheriff's Department to serve the proposed project. Without the additional personnel, equipment and resources, appropriate law enforcement service may be impaired. Implementation of proposed mitigation measures would reduce impacts on police protection services and law enforcement facilities required to protect public safety in the Plan Area and vicinity to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 14-14a: Provide funding for additional law enforcement personnel and equipment to serve the Plan Area**

The staffing ratios contained in Table 14-15 of the EIR, or ratios as otherwise approved by the Board of Supervisors, shall be maintained for the Specific Plan area. The Applicant shall be required to establish a special benefit assessment district or other funding mechanism to assure adequate funding for the ongoing maintenance and operation of law enforcement services, with funding responsibilities imposed on residential and commercial properties within the Specific Plan area, including the costs for services required to satisfy the staffing standards set forth above and General Plan standards now in existence or as later amended. The funding mechanism shall be subject to the prior review and approval of Placer County.

**Mitigation Measure 14-14b: Implement Crime Prevention through Environmental Design in cooperation with the Placer County Sheriff's Department**

Potential crime problems dealing with circulation systems and structures may be reduced by utilizing the concepts of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design. Development design shall consider the effect on features that could encourage criminal activity and work to eliminate such features. Coordination with the Sheriff's Department shall be required during design stages of all development within the Plan Area. Approval of final subdivision maps shall require Sheriff's Department review, including written approval, relating to safety in design

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Less than Significant

**Impact 14-15 Increased demand for solid waste hauling and disposal. This impact is considered *Less than Significant*.**

**Findings:**

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

**Explanation:**

The Western Regional Sanitary Landfill, operated by the Western Placer Waste Management Authority, would provide residential and commercial garbage service, debris box service, and bluebag recycling to residents and businesses in the proposed Plan Area. Adequate landfill capacity exists to serve the Plan Area.

**Mitigation Measures:**

No mitigation measures are required.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

This Impact is less than significant without mitigation.

**Impact 14-16 Increased need for additional library services. This impact is considered *Less than Significant*.**

**Findings:**

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

**Explanation:**

No libraries are proposed as part of the proposed project. A 25,500-square-foot library is planned to be constructed within the nearby Placer Vineyards, which is located west of the proposed Plan Area. The Plan Area will provide funding for library services and facilities.

**Mitigation Measures:**

No mitigation measures are required.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

This Impact is less than significant without mitigation.

**Impact 14-17 Increased demand for existing public parks and recreational facilities for new residents in program-level parcels. This impact is considered *Potentially Significant*.**

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation:**

Development applications for each program-level parcel would be required to include parkland acreage in accordance with County standards. At the County's discretion, in-lieu fees may be stipulated. In this event, the in-lieu fees would be used for park improvements within the *Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan* area. With implementation of either of these options, impacts on parks and recreation resulting from development of program-level parcels would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 14-17a: Dedicate parklands for program-level parcels in accordance with County requirements**

Each development application for program-level parcels proposed for residential development shall include parkland acreage in accordance with County standards. Currently, only the Frisvold and Lund parcels would be expected to propose residential development requiring implementation of this mitigation measure. At the

County's discretion, in-lieu fees may be stipulated. In this event, the in-lieu fees would be used for park improvements within the *Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan* area.

Although it cannot be guaranteed that project residents will not use facilities in Roseville and Sacramento County, the proposed Specific Plan includes 10 acres of parkland and 123.9 acres of open space dedicated for active and passive recreation, which meets or exceeds the County's standard. Between recreational facilities within the Specific Plan Area and the County's facilities, such as the nearby Dry Creek Regional Park, the Specific Plan Area's residents would be adequately served by the open space, park land, and recreational facilities and would make it more likely that the residents would not overuse existing park facilities in surrounding areas and cause physical deterioration. In addition, sharing of facilities is viewed as desirable in some respects, and is the reason trail networks in Sacramento County, Placer County, and Roseville are to be connected.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Less than Significant

**I. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

**Impact 15-1 Accidental releases of hazardous materials or hazardous waste during construction due to presence of construction-related hazardous materials. This impact is considered *Potentially Significant*.**

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation:**

Hazardous materials could be used and stored in the Plan Area during construction. Local and state requirements for interim storage of hazardous and flammable materials have been adopted to ensure proper use, storage, and handling of these materials. Ensuring compliance with these regulations would reduce potential impacts from accidental releases. With implementation of the specified mitigation measures, impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 15-1a: Comply with Placer County EHS and Fire Department requirements**

Each phase of construction within the Riolo Vineyard specific plan area shall comply with Placer County EHS and Fire Department requirements for temporary storage of combustible/flammable liquids at construction sites. These requirements include inspection to verify maintenance of a vegetation break and identification of emergency shutoff valves and switches. If electrical connections are provided to these facilities, the County will additionally require permitting through the County Building Department.

**Mitigation Measure 15-1b: Comply with Placer County EHS requirements regarding releases of hazardous materials**

Each future construction project within the Riolo Vineyard specific plan area shall comply with Placer County EHS requirements for reporting releases of hazardous materials. If a release of hazardous materials should occur, it will be contained and immediately reported to the County EHS. Impacted soil shall be excavated and disposed as required by the agency with regulatory jurisdiction.

345

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Less than Significant

**Impact 15-2** Release of hazardous materials or hazardous waste during construction due to existing site conditions on project-related parcels. This impact is considered *Potentially Significant*.

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation:**

Disturbance of on-site soils during construction could result in exposure to workers and the environment to potentially contaminated soil. However, implementation of mitigation measures would reduce the impacts to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 15-2a: Remediate contaminated properties in accordance with applicable regulations**

Contamination found during construction is reported to EHS, which in turn confers with state oversight agencies as necessary for removal. If near surface soil sampling and testing is conducted, a letter documenting the sampling program and test results shall be submitted to the DTSC, and no construction activities shall be initiated at the site until the DTSC issues a letter authorizing such activities, which should be based upon a risk assessment. Prior to Grading or Improvement Plan approval, the Applicant shall complete a risk assessment with DTSC and submit the results to EHS. The risk assessment shall address future use as open space as well as removal of fill materials proposed for areas with past vineyard, orchard, or soil stockpile use.

As discussed in Section 15.1.2 and presented in Tables 15-1 and 15-2, some preliminary removal of contaminated materials of project-level parcels has already occurred and been documented. Additionally, an evaluation of possible pesticide contamination associated with past agricultural uses has been conducted (Ramcon, 2007a, 2007b).

The potential for worker contact with hazardous materials and hazardous release of waste or materials at the project-level parcels during construction activities would be subject to a risk assessment and appropriate remediation, if necessary, or if not already completed. Prior to Final Map approval, the Applicant shall complete and certify any remedial action required by DTSC. Remediation, if required, may include a range of activities, including restrictions on use, soil excavation, disposal off the site, or encapsulation in appropriate areas away from sensitive receptors.

**Mitigation Measure 15-2b: Remove debris and report possible contamination to DTSC**

Partial removal of debris has already occurred on certain parcels (Ramcon, 2004a and 2005b). During future construction, projects within the Riolo Vineyard specific plan area shall include removal of debris and reporting of any possible contamination to DTSC in their construction contracts.

Prior to initiating construction, all abandoned refuse on the site shall be removed and disposed of appropriately. Construction contract specifications shall require that during the course of construction of any individual project within the boundaries of the Riolo Vineyard Specific Plan, if evidence of soil and/or

groundwater contamination with hazardous material (i.e., soil staining, unusual odors) is encountered, the Applicant shall stop work and immediately contact the DTSC and/or RWQCB. If such a condition is identified, then (1) the condition shall be resolved (i.e., through soil excavation, remediation, covering, or other method) to the satisfaction of DTSC and/or the RWQCB, and (2) construction activities shall not commence until the DTSC and/or RWQCB issue a letter of authorizing such activities.

**Mitigation Measure 15-2c: Implement Preliminary Endangerment Assessment in accordance with DTSC protocols**

A Preliminary Endangerment Assessment (PEA) will be conducted in accordance with DTSC protocols prior to grading or other earth-moving activities to address the potentially significant health and environmental risks associated with the current concentrations of arsenic detected in the soils assessments conducted for the project site that are above the most recently developed PRGs. DTSC will evaluate the PEA as part of the Voluntary Cleanup Agreement and provide additional project-specific requirements.

**Mitigation Measure 15-2d: Obtain "No Further Action" letter from DTSC**

Prior to grading and other earth-moving activities, the Applicant shall obtain notice from DTSC that the property in question does not require further investigation and action.

**Mitigation Measure 15-2e: Implement Mitigation Measure 15-2a (Remediate contaminated properties in accordance with applicable regulations)**

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Less than Significant

**Impact 15-3** Potential hazards associated with unused wells. This impact is considered *Potentially Significant*.

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation:**

All wells within the project-level parcels will be abandoned according to applicable standards. Proper closure of these older wells of unknown construction according to local and state regulations would eliminate this impact.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 15-3a: Abandon onsite wells in accordance with local and state regulations**

The Applicant shall ensure that unused wells on the site are closed in accordance with local and state regulations prior to initiating any construction activities. A permit for well destruction shall be obtained from the Placer County EHS and a licensed contractor shall perform the work, as required. The abandonment of the onsite wells would need to occur prior to occupancy of development within the project phase containing the well site in question.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Less than Significant

**Impact 15-4 Accidental releases of hazardous materials or hazardous waste during project operation. This impact is considered *Potentially Significant*.**

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation:**

Accidental releases of hazardous materials and hazardous waste after construction could occur from onsite or offsite sources. During the storage and/or use of chemical products, the risk of an accidental release exists. However, based on the types and quantities of hazardous substances anticipated to be used, the risk of a release of a significant quantity of hazardous substances on the Plan Area is considered minimal. By following local and state requirements for the management of hazardous materials, the risk of a release of hazardous substances on the Plan Area would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 15-4a: Comply with requirements for filing of emergency response and hazardous materials storage/containment plans**

Comply with Placer County EHS requirements for preparation and filing of Emergency Response Plans and Hazardous Materials Storage and Containment Plans.

All future development within the boundaries of the Riolo Vineyard specific plan area will comply with EHS requirements for preparation and filing of Emergency Response Plans and Hazardous Materials Storage and Containment Plans. These requirements apply to any commercial business that stores an acutely hazardous substance or 55 gallons and/or 50 pounds of a hazardous substance or 200 cubic feet of combustible gas. These plans would be prepared under Article 80 of the Uniform Fire Code. Copies of these documents must be provided to the Placer County Division of Environmental Health as the CUPA.

**Mitigation Measure 15-4b: Comply with underground storage tank and aboveground storage tank regulations of Placer County EHS and the RWQCB**

Comply with underground and aboveground storage tank regulations of the County EHS.

Any commercial businesses located within the boundaries of the Riolo Vineyard specific plan area that have underground storage tanks and/or aboveground storage tanks shall comply with the underground storage tank regulations of Placer County and the aboveground storage tank regulations of the RWQCB.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Less than Significant

**Impact 15-5 Potential health hazard caused by mosquitoes and other vectors. This impact is considered *Potentially Significant*.**

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation:**

The Plan Area includes wetland, park, agricultural, and open space areas that have the potential to become locations for mosquito breeding. If not managed properly, residents and businesses may be exposed to diseases transmitted by vectors such as mosquitoes. This is considered a potentially significant impact. The Placer Mosquito Abatement and Vector Control District would be allowed to perform vector control in all common areas of the proposed project in perpetuity. These measures would reduce the resulting impacts to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 15-5a: Avoid occurrence of standing water during construction (Proposed)**

During construction, all grading shall be performed in a manner to prevent the occurrence of standing water or other areas suitable for breeding of mosquitoes and other disease vectors. Direct pumping and/or ditching will be used to reduce to the amount of standing water or reduce the length of time water can stand in low areas following rainfall events. The target holding period is 72 hours, which is consistent with guidelines being developed by the Placer County Mosquito Abatement and Vector Control District (Scott, 2007).

**Mitigation Measure 15-5b: Grant access to Placer Mosquito Abatement and Vector Control District for vector control**

The Placer Mosquito Abatement and Vector Control District shall be granted access to perform vector control in all common areas including drainage, open space corridor, and park areas in perpetuity. Such access shall be a condition of approval of all tentative maps approved within the specific plan area.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Less than Significant

**Impact 15-6 Potential health and safety hazard caused by abandoned septic systems on project-level parcels. This impact is considered *Potentially Significant*.**

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation:**

All existing septic systems on project-level parcels would be abandoned and existing and future residents would be provided sewer service. The presence of existing and probable abandoned septic systems in the specific plan area is considered a potentially significant impact. Mitigation includes appropriate site-specific evaluations of possible septic systems conducted in accordance with County policy and the destruction of septic facilities in accordance with state and Placer County regulations. This mitigation measure would reduce the impacts associated with onsite septic systems on project-level parcels to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 15-6a: Destroy existing septic systems in accordance with Placer County EHS criteria**

Site-specific evaluation shall be conducted in accordance with County policy at each identified existing and former dwelling area to identify surface indications and locations of septic tanks or cesspools prior to

demolition of existing residences. Identified septic tanks shall be destroyed according to Placer County EHS criteria prior to recordation of final small lot subdivision map for the affected property. The locations of existing septic systems shall be shown on the final small lot subdivision map to ensure that the septic system remains with the associated parcel.

Surface conditions shall be evaluated by Placer County EHS when the dwellings are vacated, and prior to demolition of the structures regarding the possibility of previous site uses that may have included hazardous materials that could have been disposed of in onsite wastewater disposal systems.

Tank or cesspool destruction shall be performed under permit with Placer County EHS. Any required remediation work shall be completed in accordance with state and Placer County regulations prior to recordation of a final small lot subdivision map for the affected property.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Less than Significant

**Impact 15-7** Potential health hazard caused by asbestos in older structures to be demolished. This impact is considered *Potentially Significant*.

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation:**

The possible presence of asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) in the Plan Area is considered a potentially significant impact. If ACMs are identified, mitigation of the potential hazards associated with ACMs would include pre-demolition surveys performed by a Certified Asbestos Consultant followed by proper removal and disposal accomplished by a California licensed asbestos abatement contractor. Implementation of this mitigation would reduce the impacts associated with ACMs to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 15-7a: Evaluate and abate ACMs in accordance with regulations**

Surveys of structures that are planned for demolition during Specific Plan development shall be conducted by a Certified Asbestos Consultant licensed with the California Department of Occupational Safety and Health to determine if friable Regulated ACMs or non-friable ACMs are present within the structure demolition areas. This is required in order to obtain a demolition permit from the Placer County Building Department. The Placer County Air Pollution Control District does not have delegation for Asbestos National Emission Standard for Hazardous Air Pollutants enforcement. Accordingly, asbestos notifications will be sent to the U.S. EPA Region IX and the California Air Resources Board. (Nishikawa, 2007). Any regulated ACMs found in the investigated areas shall be removed and disposed of by a California licensed asbestos abatement contractor. All removal of ACMs shall be completed prior to recordation of final maps for the affected property.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Less than Significant

**Impact 15-8** Release of hazardous materials or hazardous waste during construction due to existing site conditions on program-level parcels. This impact is considered *Potentially Significant*.

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation:**

Program-level parcels have not been subjected to Phase I ESAs. Phase I ESAs would be required prior to approval of development on program-level parcels, and all appropriate remediation performed, if necessary. Additionally, mitigation measures identified for release of hazardous materials or hazardous waste during construction due to existing site conditions on project-level parcels would be required for program-level parcels. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 15-8a: Conduct Phase I Environmental Site Assessments on program-level parcels proposed for development, and comply with Placer County requirements for remediation, if required**

For each program-level parcel proposed for development, properties not previously evaluated with a current Phase I ESA may be required to complete an ESA determined by Environmental Health Services. If past uses are disclosed that could have resulted in persistent contamination, then soil sampling shall be conducted within appropriate areas according to guidelines developed by the DTSC Phase II Environmental Site Assessment and/or equivalent protocol.

The site investigation including sampling shall be conducted by a California registered environmental professional, performed with oversight from Placer County Environmental Health Services, in accordance with applicable permits. As a result of soil investigation, a limited and restricted area of contamination may be identified and judged suitable for simple removal. If this is the case, remediation will be required to meet state and County regulations. If a result of soil investigation, widespread residual concentrations of chemicals or other contaminants maybe identified at levels where they individually or in combination meet or exceed U.S. EPA, California EPA Preliminary Remediation Goals, or equivalent screening levels, a risk assessment will be required. Risk assessments shall include a DTSC Preliminary Endangerment Assessment or no further action determination, or equivalent.

Any remedial action indicated by a risk assessment shall be completed and certified. Remediation shall include a DTSC Remedial Action Workplan, or equivalent, and involve a range of activities, including deed restrictions, soil excavation and offsite disposal, or encapsulation away from sensitive receptors in the Specific Plan Area.

**Mitigation Measure 15-8b: Implement Mitigation Measure 15-2a (Remediate contaminated properties in accordance with applicable regulations)**

**Mitigation Measure 15-8c: Implement Mitigation Measure 15-2b (Remove debris and report possible contamination to Placer County EHS)**

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Less than Significant

**Impact 15-9** Potential health and safety hazard caused by abandoned septic systems on program-level parcels. This impact is considered *Potentially Significant*.

## Findings:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

## Explanation:

All existing septic systems on program-level would be abandoned as landowners apply for development permits. Future residents of these parcels would be provided sewer service. The presence of existing and probable abandoned septic systems in the specific plan area is considered a potentially significant impact. Mitigation includes appropriate site-specific evaluations of possible septic systems conducted by a qualified professional and the destruction of septic facilities in accordance with state and Placer County regulations. This mitigation measure would reduce the impacts associated with onsite septic systems to a less-than-significant level.

## Mitigation Measures:

**Mitigation Measure 15-9a: Destroy existing septic systems in accordance with Placer County EHS criteria on program-level parcels when these lots receive development entitlements**

## Significance after Mitigation:

Less than Significant

## X. GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS

The CEQA Guidelines require an EIR to evaluate indirect or secondary effects of a project, which may include growth-inducing effects. Section 15126(d) of the CEQA Guidelines states that a project could be considered growth inducing if it could “foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment.” A development project may have growth-inducing potential if, for example, it extends infrastructure (e.g., water, sewer, roads) to undeveloped areas or increases the capacity of existing infrastructure; promotes similar development to occur on adjacent parcels; increases the area’s housing supply; or introduces new employment to an area.

In the absence of other favorable conditions, however, it is unlikely that any one of these components could induce significant growth. A mix of economic, political, physical, and social factors ultimately determines the magnitude, location, and timing of growth. Variables, including regional economic trends, housing demand, land availability and cost, quality of infrastructure and public services, proximity to employment centers, and regulatory considerations, affect the way in which growth occurs.

### **Growth Anticipated in the *Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan***

The *Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan* provides for development of land within the Riolo Vineyard Specific Plan area and within the Community Plan area. The development visions for the specific plan area expressed in the Community Plan include low-density residential development and two commercial centers, located along PFE Road with its intersections with Watt Avenue and Walerga Road. The proposed project would provide for a level of growth beyond that anticipated in the Community Plan by allowing up to 933 dwelling units, as opposed to the approximately 650 units envisioned in the Community Plan. This would introduce an unanticipated increase in population of approximately 670 persons within the proposed project area.

Small parcels of undeveloped or vacant land lie south of PFE Road, west of Watt Avenue, and within the Dry Creek floodplain. The lands surrounding the proposed Plan Area are currently undergoing rapid development. Except for areas within the 100-year floodplain of Dry Creek, surrounding lands are identified for low-density residential

development. The largest component of envisioned development identified for the immediately surrounding area in the Community Plan is the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan area. As approved, Placer Vineyards will change the character of the western portion of the Community Plan area from rural to urban.

### **Current Constraints to Growth**

As discussed in the EIR, there are few principal constraints to substantial new growth in the vicinity of the study area. Surrounding parcels are designated for Low-Density Development or other urban uses. Such land use designations anticipate growth; they do not provide a constraint to growth. Portions of the surrounding area rely on individual septic systems. Water and sewer pipelines serve portions of the Community Plan area from the west, up to Walerga Road. Additional growth would require extensions of these services, including (depending on location) annexation into PCWA's Zone 1 and into the West Dry Creek (Basin 5A) service area of the Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant. These are modest constraints, as are the existing two-lane roadways in the Community Plan area that cannot adequately support a substantial increase in traffic. Therefore, the present lack of infrastructure is not considered a substantial constraint to growth.

### **Removal of Growth Constraints**

If the Applicant constructs the necessary infrastructure to extend water, sewer, gas and electricity to support the specific plan area, the modest constraint to growth afforded by lack of water and sewer service would be removed. More substantively, if planned improvements to roadways surrounding the Plan Area are constructed, the additional capacity of improved roadways would remove a constraint to growth.

## **XI. PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**

These findings address whether the various alternatives lessen or avoid any of the significant unavoidable impacts associated with the project and consider the feasibility of each alternative. Under CEQA, "'(f)feasible' means capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors." (CEQA Guidelines § 15364.) The concept of feasibility permits agency decisionmakers to consider the extent to which an alternative is able to meet some or all of a project's objectives. In addition, the definition of feasibility encompasses desirability to the extent that an agency's determination of infeasibility represents a reasonable balancing of competing economic, environmental, social, and technological factors.

As stated in Section 15126.6(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, the primary intent of the alternatives evaluation in an EIR is to:

"...describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives."

The feasibility of an alternative may be determined based on a variety of factors including, but not limited to, site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, General Plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and site accessibility and control (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)(1)).

The Board of Supervisors has considered the Project Alternatives presented and analyzed in the EIR and presented during the comment period and public hearing process. Some of these Alternatives have the potential to avoid or reduce certain significant or potentially significant environmental impacts, as set forth below. The Board of Supervisors finds, based on specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, that these Alternatives are infeasible and/or would not satisfy project objectives (either in whole or significant part). Each Alternative and the facts supporting the finding of infeasibility of each Alternative are set forth below.

## A. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND DISMISSED FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION

Consistent with CEQA, primary consideration was given to alternatives that would reduce significant impacts while still meeting most of the project objectives. Those alternatives that would have impacts identical to or more severe than the project, or that would not meet most of the project objectives (either in whole or in significant part), were rejected from further consideration. Alternatives exceeding the significance thresholds for the aforementioned issue areas would not substantially lessen any significant environmental impacts identified in the EIR and were rejected from further analysis.

### 1. Onsite Alternatives

The significant impacts of the proposed project are associated with a change in land use and associated changes in the visual character of the Plan Area, fill in the floodplain, increased traffic and an associated decrease in air quality and increase in noise, and current lack of adequate school capacity to meet the needs of projected residents.

The County worked to identify onsite alternatives that would avoid or substantially lessen any of these significant effects. The efforts centered on reducing the project footprint, avoiding fill in the floodplain, and decreasing the density within the Plan Area. A reduction in density of 50 percent of the proposed project was considered, but eliminated because it would not be likely to produce enough revenue to construct the required water, sewer, recycled water and roadway infrastructure, or provide sufficient revenue for the maintenance of public open-space areas and park facilities, infrastructure, and public services. Given that the Plan Area lies between two roadways destined to become major arterials, Watt Avenue and Walerga Road, the Plan Area is a good candidate for more dense development in accordance with the Sacramento Area Council of Government's *Blueprint for Regional Growth*, and a substantially reduced density alternative beyond those analyzed in the EIR would not be consistent with those principles.

### 2. Offsite Alternatives

The *West Placer/Dry Creek Community Plan* identifies the Plan Area for future residential and commercial uses, and requires that a Specific Plan be prepared prior to approving development. There are no remaining areas within the Community Plan area that could feasibly accommodate a project of this size. One of the objectives identified in the *Riolo Vineyards Specific Plan* is to conform to the *Placer County General Plan* and *Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan*, which designate the proposed project area for urban development. Development outside of the Community Plan area would not achieve the goals and policies of the Community Plan, and would instead amount to a reconsideration of the long range planning decision the Community Plan represents.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)(2)(A) states that the key question and first step in analysis is whether any of the significant effects of the project would be avoided or substantially lessened by putting the project in another location. Only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project need be considered for inclusion in the EIR. Development of the project at an alternative site would include the same uses and, therefore, many of same effects would still occur. An alternative location would generally displace, but not necessarily eliminate, the impacts identified for the Project.

The significant and unavoidable environmental impacts of the project on air quality and loss of agricultural land would not be avoided if the project were located at an alternative location. The Plan Area is located in an area served by existing regional infrastructure and arterial roadways, and is located adjacent to existing urban development in Sacramento County, as well as existing and planned urban areas within Placer County. Development of the proposed project at an alternative location within Placer County would require the extension of additional infrastructure and public services compared to the project site, and would not represent an efficient use of existing public investments. In addition, an offsite alternative would require an expansion of urban uses to areas within Placer County that are designated under the General Plan for agricultural use or to areas unsuitable for development compared to the project site due to environmental or habitat constraints. For these reasons, an offsite

alternative was not identified in this Draft EIR.

## B. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN THE EIR

The EIR provides a comparative analysis of the merits of alternatives to the proposed project pursuant to Section 15126.6 of the state CEQA Guidelines, as amended. The purpose of the alternatives analysis is to explain potentially feasible ways to avoid or minimize significant effects of the project. According to the CEQA Guidelines, the EIR need only examine in detail those alternatives that could feasibly meet most of the basic objectives of the project. When addressing feasibility, the CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 states that "among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the applicant can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to alternative sites." The CEQA Guidelines also specify that the alternatives discussion should not be remote or speculative, and need not be presented in the same level of detail as the assessment of the proposed project.

Therefore, based on the CEQA Guidelines, several factors need to be considered in determining the range of alternatives to be analyzed in an EIR and the level of analytical detail that should be provided for each alternative. These factors include: (1) the nature of the significant impacts of the proposed project; (2) the ability of alternatives to avoid or lessen the significant impacts associated with the project; (3) the ability of the alternatives to meet the objectives of the project; and (4) the feasibility of the alternatives. These factors would be unique for each project. These considerations narrowed the alternatives for analysis in the EIR to those described below. This analysis primarily evaluates alternatives for their ability to eliminate or substantially reduce residual (post-mitigation) impacts or effects attributed to the proposed project and the impacts of mitigation measures.

The No Project Alternative is comprised of two sub-alternatives:

- Alternative 1A: No Development Alternative
- Alternative 1B: Community Plan Development Alternative

Three additional project alternatives, described below, were selected to represent the range of project options for purposes of evaluating environmental impacts. In addition to the No Project Alternatives, project alternatives include the following:

- Alternative 2: Floodplain Encroachment Avoidance Alternative
- Alternative 3: Reduced Density Alternative
- Alternative 4: Clustered Development Alternative

Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 analyzed in the EIR were considered as potentially feasible scenarios for different development at the site. Together with the two No Project sub-alternatives, the analyses capture a reasonable range of site alternatives, from continuation of the existing conditions to other development that might reasonably occur.

### 1. Alternative 1A - No Development Alternative

#### Description

CEQA requires the evaluation of the comparative impacts of the "No Project" alternative. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(1)). The No Development Alternative describes an alternative in which no development would occur on the project site and the uses on the site would remain the same as under existing conditions. Under the No Development Alternative, the project site would likely continue to be used for agricultural production and open space. The site-specific impacts of the No Development alternative are best described by the existing conditions presented in the environmental setting sections of the EIR.

## Analysis of the Alternative's Ability to Reduce Significant Unavoidable Project Impacts

The No Development alternative would produce no changes on the project site, effectively eliminating those project impacts discussed in the EIR. Because the site would remain in its current condition, there would be no environmental impacts associated with introducing buildings and people into an area that is currently undeveloped. There would be no proposed cancellation of a Williamson Act contract. Under the No Development Alternative, there would be no change in the existing visual environment. No light sources would be created and there would be no change to the existing visual character of the project site. There would be no increase in air pollutants associated with project construction nor an increase in pollutants associated with more vehicles accessing the area. The loss of productive agricultural land would not occur. There would be no increase in noise associated with project construction and/or any noise impacts associated with future operational activities. Greenhouse gas emissions that could contribute to global warming would remain the same. Under this alternative, the number of vehicles accessing the site would not change; therefore, there would be no operational impacts to the surrounding roadway network or freeway.

### **2: Alternative 1B - Community Plan Development Alternative**

#### Description

Section 15126(e) of the CEQA Guidelines also refers to analysis of "what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project was not approved based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services." As a result of the existing *Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan* land use designations applicable to the project site, it is anticipated that development on the project site would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the proposed project were not approved.

Under this alternative, the Plan Area would be built out under the permitted conditions described in the Community Plan. The Community Plan designates portions of the project site as Low Density Residential (LDR), Open Space, and Commercial, and notes the need for cemetery expansion. It identifies about 230 upland acres for LDR uses. This alternative assumes that 650 LDR lots could be developed on approximately 230 upland acres within the Plan Area under the existing Community Plan. This alternative assumes that the minimum lot size standards and the density transfer provisions of the Community Plan (see Community Plan pages 41 and 46) would be applied to development on the project site.

#### Analysis of the Alternative's Ability to Reduce Significant Unavoidable Project Impacts

This alternative is environmentally superior to the proposed project in most respects. It would, by definition, meet the project objectives related to implementing the County's *General Plan* and *Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan*. It would meet many but not all of the Applicant's objectives as well. It would not fully meet the following objectives: preservation of agricultural uses, enhancement of trail connectivity, enhancement of smart growth principles and the Sacramento Area Council of Government's *Blueprint for Regional Growth*, and providing a full range of housing densities and product choices, including medium and high density residential development.

This Alternative would convert existing land use designated Open Space to urban land uses, in a similar but less intense manner than the proposed project. The alternative would devote less acreage for residential units (230 acres) and more acreage for commercial uses (26.1 acres) than the proposed project (265.6 acres for residential units and 7.5 for acres for commercial uses). The combined acreage of both residential and commercial uses for the Community Plan Development Alternative would be 256.1 acres, which is 7.5 acres less than the combined acreage of residential and commercial uses for the proposed project (273.1 acres). Impacts related to conversion of land use from agricultural and open space to urban uses would be less than significant under this alternative, although Alternative 1B would not incorporate Agricultural-10 parcels where agricultural uses would be continued, as would the proposed project.

Under this Alternative, temporary and long-term visual impacts due to construction would be similar but likely not last as long as under the proposed project, since the number of dwelling units under this Alternative would be reduced by approximately 30 percent. View obstruction and change to landscape character for motorists on adjacent roadways as well as visual intrusion and adverse change in visual character due to new residences in views from Roseville Cemetery would also be similar.

This Alternative would generate approximately 837 fewer weekday daily trips than the proposed project. Overall, the impacts to transportation would be less than the proposed project. However, even with mitigation similar to that identified for the proposed project, impacts to transportation and circulation under this Alternative would still likely be significant.

Construction of this Alternative would be expected to generate fewer emissions over the full duration of the construction activities and would be expected to generate the same or fewer emissions during the peak day of construction. Similar to the proposed project, short-term construction impacts would likely be significant. During operations, this Alternative would generate 837 fewer trips than the proposed project because, although there would be approximately 30 percent fewer lots, the increase in commercial land use would provide additional trips as compared to the commercial trips generated by the proposed project. This Alternative would generate approximately 8 percent fewer criteria pollutant emissions. Assuming these reductions in emission sources, the operational emissions of NOX, ROG, and CO would still be significant.

Alternative 1B would generate 837 fewer trips than the proposed project. Therefore, noise levels due to the trips to/from the Plan Area can reasonably be expected to be less than for the proposed project. Mitigation measures identified for the proposed project would be applicable to Alternative 1B. Noise impacts would be less than significant, unlike the proposed project. With respect to noise, Alternative 1B would result in a lesser degree of impact than the proposed project.

### 3. Alternative 2 - Floodplain Encroachment Avoidance Alternative

#### Description

Under Alternative 2, development would not encroach into the floodplain. The six Agricultural Residential parcels under the proposed project would not be developed, and thus this alternative would not provide for management of this portion of the project site for agricultural use. With the exception of the loss of these 6 proposed units and the Dry Creek Class 1 trail system proposed under the project, the level of development would remain the same under Alternative 2, resulting in a land plan with a greater density of development on a per-acre basis than under the proposed project. In addition, Alternative 2 would limit internal site connectivity by omitting the proposed crossing of the Southern Tributary of Dry Creek.

#### Analysis of the Alternative's Ability to Reduce Significant Unavoidable Project Impacts

Alternative 2 would convert existing land use designated Open Space to urban land uses, in a similar but less intense manner than the proposed project. Compared to the proposed project, this alternative would construct the same number of dwelling units on 30 percent fewer acres, resulting in higher density. Alternative 2 would create 58.5 acres of agricultural land use, as compared to 91.1 acres of agriculture and Agricultural-10 land uses under the proposed project, and would provide a 83 percent increase in land devoted to open space and recreation purposes. (Landscape corridor acreages are not calculated in open space and recreation uses for the proposed project.) This alternative would be similar to the proposed project with respect to compatibility of the Plan Area with adjacent uses and would better implement the vision of the *West Placer/Dry Creek Community Plan* with respect to allowing no development in the floodplain, but would not preserve most existing agriculture nor would it provide as much opportunities for agriculture as the proposed project. Permanent loss of farmland, and the Williamson Act Contract cancellation, would be significant and unavoidable impacts of Alternative 2 (similar to the proposed project). With respect to land use, Alternative 2 would result in a greater degree of impact than the proposed project.

Under Alternative 2, temporary and long-term visual impacts due to construction would be similar to the proposed project. View obstruction and change to landscape character for motorists on adjacent roadways as well as visual intrusion and adverse change in visual character due to new residences in views from Roseville Cemetery would also be similar, assuming that new public access to open space comparable to that identified under the proposed project would be provided.

Alternative 2 would generate approximately 72 fewer weekday daily trips than the proposed project. Due to the change in connectivity internal to this alternative, there would be approximately 700 more trips using the middle half of PFE Road between Watt Avenue and Walerga Road. Some of these trips would be additional turning movements at the Watt Avenue/PFE Road intersection. At the Watt Avenue end of PFE Road, there would be approximately 900 more trips, because vehicles traveling north on Watt Avenue would travel along PFE Road to enter the site, rather than using a Watt Avenue entrance to get to internal connector roads. Approximately 200 of these trips are included in the 700 trips on PFE Road described above, and the rest would be entering the western portion of the site from PFE Road. Other roadway and intersection impacts during project operation would be nearly the same as for the proposed project. Overall, the impacts to transportation would be similar. Even with mitigation similar to that identified for the proposed project, impacts to transportation and circulation under this alternative would still be significant, especially under cumulative conditions, similar to the proposed project.

Under Alternative 2, the level of construction activity would likely be similar to the proposed project, since the same number of units would be constructed. Therefore construction of this alternative would be expected to generate similar emissions over the full duration of the construction activities. Similar to the proposed project, short-term construction impacts would likely be significant. During operations, Alternative 2 would generate 72 fewer trips than the proposed project. This is not substantially different from the proposed project (less than 1 percent). Since the number of dwelling units, new vehicle trips and area sources would all be expected to be similar to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would result in similar emissions as the proposed project during project operation.

Alternative 2 would generate 72 fewer trips than the proposed project. Therefore, noise levels due to the trips to/from the Plan Area can reasonably be expected to be similar. Mitigation measures identified on the proposed project would be applicable to Alternative 2. Noise impacts would be significant, similar to the proposed project.

#### **4. Alternative 3 – Reduced Density Alternative**

##### **Description**

Alternative 3 assumes that residential land uses would be reduced in density as compared to the proposed project, but that development would occur within the same land area as proposed under the project. Residential land uses would be 62 percent of the proposed project within approximately the same footprint. This alternative was formulated to lessen or avoid the significant traffic impacts of the proposed project by reducing the amount of development. It would also reduce several of the project impacts related to air quality and noise. All residential products would be single-family housing except for the high-density residential area in the southwest corner of the Plan Area, which would satisfy the County's affordable housing requirements. The six Agricultural-10 parcels proposed under the proposed project would not be allowed, and thus would not be managed for agricultural use. Other features of the proposed project would remain under Alternative 3, although the acreage of improved park facilities within the project site would be reduced as a result of the reduction in population under this alternative.

##### **Analysis of the Alternative's Ability to Reduce Significant Unavoidable Project Impacts**

Alternative 3 would convert existing land use designated Open Space to urban uses, in a similar but less intense and less dense manner than the proposed project. The alternative would result in slightly more land developed for residential units due to a reduction in park acreage and landscape corridors, as compared to the proposed project. Impacts related to permanent loss of farmland, and the Williamson Act Contract cancellation would remain significant under this alternative, and would be more severe than under the proposed project because of the

proposed Agricultural-10 parcels under the proposed project.

Under Alternative 3, temporary and long-term visual impacts due to construction would be similar but likely not last as long as under the proposed project, since the number of dwelling units under this alternative would be reduced by approximately 30 percent. View obstruction and change to landscape character for motorists on adjacent roadways as well as visual intrusion and adverse change in visual character due to new residences in views from Roseville Cemetery would also be similar, assuming comparable open space access, landscape setbacks on adjoining roads, preservation of onsite open space, and other similar features of the proposed project.

Alternative 3 would generate approximately 2,515 fewer trips than the proposed project. Construction traffic impacts would be less because there would be less development under this alternative. With approximately 20 percent fewer trips than the proposed project, roadway and intersection impacts during project operation would be less severe than the proposed project. Overall, the impacts to transportation would be less than the proposed project. However, even with mitigation similar to that identified for the proposed project, impacts to transportation and circulation under this alternative would still be significant, especially under cumulative conditions. With respect to transportation and circulation, Alternative 3 would result in a lesser degree of impact than the proposed project. With fewer dwelling units, it would contribute less to the traffic CIP to make transportation improvements that are needed on a cumulative basis with or without the proposed project.

Under Alternative 3, the length of construction activity would likely be less than for the proposed project. This is because fewer units would be constructed. The peak construction period could have the same level of activity or less than the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, short-term construction impacts would likely be significant. During operations, Alternative 3 would generate 2,515 fewer trips than the proposed project. Alternative 3 would generate approximately 20 percent fewer criteria pollutant emissions. Since this alternative would include 30 percent fewer dwelling units, there would be a 30 percent reduction in the sources of non-transportation-related operational emissions. Assuming these reductions in emission sources, the operational emissions of NOX, ROG, and CO would still be significant. The PM<sub>10</sub> operational emissions would be less than significant.

Alternative 3 would generate 2,515 fewer trips than the proposed project. Therefore, noise levels due to the trips to/from the Plan Area can reasonably be expected to be less than for the proposed project. Mitigation measures identified for the proposed project would be applicable to Alternative 3. Noise impacts would be significant at one location along Walerga Road and potentially at some locations along PFE Road, as is the case with the proposed project.

## 5. Alternative 4 – Clustered Development Alternative

### Description

Alternative 4 would include the same number of residential units as the proposed project, resulting in higher development densities within a reduced development footprint, resulting in more open space. Compared to the proposed project, this alternative would provide increased number of medium- and high density residential units, while reducing the level of low-density, single-family residences within the project site. This alternative would include affordable housing in accordance with County requirements and a trail system similar to the proposed project, as well as a commercial land use in the southeastern corner of the site. This alternative would provide for the expansion of the cemetery. The six Agricultural-10 parcels proposed under the proposed project would not be allowed, and thus would not be managed for agricultural use. The intent of this alternative is to reduce impacts associated with the conversion of open spaces areas within the project site to urban uses.

### Analysis of the Alternative's Ability to Reduce Significant Unavoidable Project Impacts

Alternative 4 would convert existing land use designated Open Space to urban land uses, in a denser manner on substantially fewer acres than the proposed project. The alternative would develop the same number of residential units as the proposed project on nearly half of the acreage identified under the proposed project. Almost all of this

development would be outside of the Dry Creek floodplain. This alternative would reduce land designated for agricultural activities by 27 percent compared to the proposed project. It would include 114 percent more land for open space and recreational uses than the proposed project. Impacts related to permanent loss of farmland would be reduced as compared to the proposed project, but would remain significant under this alternative. This alternative would be different than the proposed project with respect to compatibility of the Plan Area with adjacent uses and implementation of the Community Plan, because while it would preserve substantially more open space and land in agricultural production, it would provide a much more compact, urban feel with a 141 percent increase in density within the area being developed. This would result in reduced compatibility with adjacent land uses as compared to the proposed project.

Under Alternative 4, temporary and long-term visual impacts due to construction would be similar to the proposed project. View obstruction and change to landscape character for motorists on adjacent roadways would be reduced as compared to the proposed project. Because less open space would be converted to development, there is the potential for this alternative to preserve greater scenic resources than the proposed project and thus be visually superior, assuming that comparable public access were provided, and similar site design standards were incorporated.

Alternative 4 would generate approximately 700 fewer weekday daily trips than the proposed project, because higher density development generates fewer trips than low-density development on a per-unit basis. Construction traffic impacts would depend on phasing in this alternative. Concentrating development in a smaller area could reduce construction traffic because more high-density residential uses could be constructed faster than the same number of low-density residential units. With approximately 6 percent fewer trips than the proposed project, roadway and intersection impacts during project operation would be less severe than the proposed project. However, even with mitigation similar to that identified for the proposed project, impacts to transportation and circulation under this alternative would still be significant, especially under cumulative conditions.

Under Alternative 4, the level of construction activity would likely be similar to the proposed project, since the same number of units would be constructed. Therefore construction of this alternative would be expected to generate similar emissions over the full duration of the construction activities. Similar to the proposed project, short-term construction impacts would likely be significant. During operations, Alternative 4 would generate 700 fewer weekday daily trips than the proposed project. Alternative 4 would therefore generate approximately 6 percent fewer criteria pollutant emissions than the proposed project. Assuming these reductions in emission sources, the operational emissions of NOX, ROG, CO, and PM<sub>10</sub> would still be significant. The number of dwelling units would be similar to the proposed project, so area sources, such as consumer products and landscaping, would be expected to be similar to the proposed project.

Alternative 4 would generate approximately 700 fewer trips than the proposed project. Therefore, noise levels due to the trips to/from the Plan Area can reasonably be expected to be less than for the proposed project. Mitigation measures identified on the proposed project would be applicable to Alternative 4. Noise impacts would be significant for one receptor location on Walerga Road and potentially at some locations along PFE Road, similar to the proposed project.

## **6. Comparative Evaluation of the Project and Alternatives to Satisfy Proposed Project Objectives**

This section of the Findings examines whether (or to what extent) each of the Alternatives selected for more detailed analysis meets the proposed project's objectives. As described earlier in these findings, the concept of "feasibility" encompasses the question of whether a particular alternative or mitigation measure promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project. (*Sequoyah Hills Homeowners Assn. v. City of Oakland* (1993) 23 Cal.App.4th 704, 715.) "[F]easibility' under CEQA encompasses 'desirability' to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, and technological factors." (*City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 410, 417.)

1. **Implement the County's General Plan and Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan, which designate the proposed project area for urban development.** Alternative 1A, the no development alternative, would not satisfy this objective. The remaining alternatives involve the development of urban uses on the project site, and would achieve this objective in a comparable manner. It is recognized that with the exception of Alternative 1B, the Community Plan Development alternative, the proposed project and the remaining alternatives would require amendments to the *Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan* to be implemented.
2. **Preserve the scenic Dry Creek riparian corridor and enhance trail connectivity to complement a regional recreation corridor for bicycle, pedestrian, and equestrian users.** Because of the floodplain topography adjacent to Dry Creek, the riparian corridor would be preserved under all of the alternatives. However, under Alternative 1A, the no-development alternative, the objective of a connected recreational trail corridor would not be implemented. A corridor trail does not currently exist along Dry Creek within the project area, and Alternative 1A would maintain the status quo in this regard. It is assumed that a trail facility would be constructed under any of the remaining alternatives, in light of Community Plan requirements for this facility.
3. **Provide a well-designed community with neighborhood identity in close proximity to jobs and services in Placer and Sacramento Counties.** By retaining the project area as undeveloped land, Alternative 1A would not achieve this objective. Alternatives 1B and 3 would achieve this objective to a reduced extent when compared to the proposed project, in that fewer residents would be placed in close proximity to existing jobs and services in Placer and Sacramento Counties. Given the higher population of residents associated with the proposed project, Alternatives 2 and 4 would achieve this objective in a comparable manner. However, Alternatives 2 and 4, by eliminating Agricultural-10 parcels proposed by the project, represent a greater departure from the existing agricultural identity of the area that the project seeks to preserve.
4. **Create a high-quality environment containing a mix of residential, open-space, and recreational land uses in an overall design that advances "smart growth" principles.** By retaining the project area as undeveloped land, Alternative 1A would not achieve this objective. Alternatives 1B and 3 would achieve this objective to a reduced extent when compared to the proposed project. The smaller population associated with these alternatives would result in a reduced opportunity to capitalize on the location of the project area in relation to existing developed areas to reduce sprawl. While Alternative 4 could be said to exemplify "smart growth" principles among the alternatives analyzed, the net effect on a regional level would be the same as the proposed project, in that the number of proposed units would be the same.
5. **Design a project that minimizes encroachment into the existing 100-year floodplain in the plan area while balancing the housing needs and densities of the SACOG Blueprint process and the character of the local community.** The proposed project proposes minor encroachment and fill into the existing 100-year floodplain of Dry Creek. This fill is necessary in order to facilitate the roadway design of the project (including internal connection) and to provide building sites for residences on Agricultural-10 parcels. Alternative 1A would maintain the existing floodplain but would not meet any of the housing needs identified by the County General Plan, the Community Plan, or the SACOG Blueprint. Alternative 1B would avoid fill in the floodplain, allowing for a density transfer, but the realization of only 650 units under this alternative would reduce attainment of housing objectives to a significant degree. Alternative 2 would also avoid fill in floodplain areas but would increase density within developed areas to compensate for the reduction in developed acreage. This increase in development density would result in a greater departure from the character of the local community than the proposed project. Alternative 3 would involve fill in the floodplain to approximately the same extent as the proposed project (excluding the Agricultural-10 building pads), but similar to Alternative 1B would result in a reduced attainment of housing objectives. Alternative 4 would achieve the housing objectives to the same degree as the project but, as a result of the increase in High- and Medium-Density Residential uses, would do so at the expense of community character. Alternatives 1B, 2, 3, and 4 would not provide for Agricultural-10 parcels and would not preserve or maintain historical agricultural use within the Specific Plan, which is a defining characteristic of the local

6. **Provide for increased residential densities in areas presently planned for urban growth and development with accessible infrastructure, consistent with areawide infrastructure plans and growth policies identified in SACOG's Blueprint for Regional Growth.** The project area is currently planned for urban growth and development by the *Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan*. By retaining the project area as undeveloped land, Alternative 1A would not achieve this objective. Alternatives 1B and 3 would achieve this objective to a reduced extent when compared to the proposed project, in that fewer residents would be placed in close proximity to existing jobs and services and existing accessible infrastructure. Given the higher population of residents associated with the proposed project, Alternatives 2 and 4 would achieve this objective in a comparable manner.
7. **Reduce growth pressures on outlying areas of Placer County by efficiently utilizing the project area to accommodate residential growth and development.** The project area is currently planned for urban growth and development by the *Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan*. By retaining the project area as undeveloped land, Alternative 1A would not achieve this objective and would increase growth pressures on land farther from existing urbanized areas in Placer County. Alternatives 1B and 3 would achieve this objective to some extent, but would increase growth pressures on outlying areas when compared to the proposed project. Given the higher population of residents associated with the proposed project, Alternatives 2 and 4 would achieve this objective in a comparable manner.
8. **Incorporate an appropriate level of medium- and high-density residential development to take advantage of the proximity of the proposed project area to region-serving arterials and support opportunities for transit to serve the proposed development.** The project site is located along Watt Avenue, Walerga Road, and PFE Road, which are or will become major arterials as development of west Placer County continues. These arterials are expected to become transit routes. Watt Avenue is planned to provide Bus Rapid Transit lanes in each direction, dedicated exclusively to transit use. Alternative 1A would not provide any development of the site, and would not achieve this objective. Alternative 1B would retain the Commercial designation applicable to the parcel on the northeast corner of Watt and PFE Road, but the size of this parcel (3.2 gross acres) would not generally be suitable for commercial uses that could be served by transit patrons. Instead, it would be expected that commercial uses in this location would be in the form of a service station, fast food restaurant, or other service uses that would be visited by vehicles instead of transit users. As a result, Alternative 1B would not take advantage of future transit opportunities to the same extent as the project. Alternative 2 proposes High-Density Residential development in the same amount and at the same location as the proposed project and would achieve this objective to the same extent. By reducing the level of High-Density Residential development, Alternative 3 would achieve this objective to a reduced extent when compared to the proposed project or Alternative 2. Alternative 4 would provide substantially more High- and Medium-Density Residential development than the proposed project and would achieve this objective to a higher extent, albeit at the expense of achieving other project objectives.
9. **Provide for a cohesive plan of development that maximizes internal connectivity within the project area for pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular travel.** A goal of the proposed project is to reduce vehicle trips on surrounding arterial roadways by creating internal connectivity within the Specific Plan area. Alternative 1A would not provide any development of the site and would not achieve this objective. It is noted that Alternative 1A does not contribute additional trips to arterial roadways because it would preserve existing conditions. Alternatives 1B and 2 would not provide a roadway connection over the Southern Tributary; they would require vehicle trips on PFE Road to connect the east and west development areas on the site, and would not provide internal connectivity to pedestrians. Alternatives 3 and 4 would provide this roadway and sidewalk connection, as does the proposed project, and would achieve this objective to a similar degree.
10. **Provide for a full range of housing densities and product choices affordable to all income levels.** Alternative 1A would not provide for development of additional housing on the project site and would not achieve this objective. Alternative 1B would provide for approximately 650 residential units. However,

under the existing Community Plan, residential development would be exclusively large-lot single family parcels, which would not result in a range of densities or housing affordable to multiple income levels. Alternative 2 would provide for a mix of residential densities similar to the proposed project and would achieve this objective to a similar degree. Alternative 3 would provide a similar mix of densities as the project, but the reduction in the number of total units under this alternative limits the achievement of this objective when compared to the proposed project or Alternative 2. Alternative 4 would significantly increase High- and Medium-Density Residential housing on the site, while reducing Low-Density Residential development. This alternative would increase affordable housing opportunities when compared to other alternatives, at the expense of being a substantive departure from the Community Plan.

11. **Provide a comprehensively planned project that offers maximum feasible protection of sensitive environmental habitat and resources.** As Alternative 1A proposes to maintain existing conditions on the site, this alternative would likely maximize protection and preservation of existing habitat resources. However, it should be noted that this Alternative would not preclude intensification of agricultural operations on the site, including areas of existing sensitive habitat such as wetlands. Depending on the nature of future agricultural operations, the existing foraging value of grassland habitat throughout the site for the Swainson's Hawk could be reduced under Alternative 1A without the need for agency approval or mitigation. The proposed project would convert existing grassland areas above the floodplain elevation to urban use but would preserve extensive areas of grassland in the floodplain area in perpetuity through dedication as open space or through land use restrictions applicable within the Agricultural-10 parcels. Alternative 1B would provide for development of upland areas at a similar extent of acreage, albeit at a reduced density, but would not necessarily provide for the preservation of foraging habitat values within the floodplain area through land use restrictions. Alternatives 2 and 3 would result in a slightly greater level of maintenance of existing habitat conditions within the floodplain area and, in this regard, satisfy this objective to a greater degree than the proposed project. Alternative 4 would maximize the amount of open space area preserved within the site and would achieve this objective to a higher degree than the proposed project, albeit at the expense of achieving other objectives.
12. **Create a community that recognizes, respects, and preserves historic agricultural uses of the project area through active management within Agricultural Residential parcels.** By maintaining existing conditions, Alternative 1A would achieve this objective as a general matter, depending on the level of agricultural activity that occurs in the future. Alternatives 1B, 2, 3, and 4 would not provide for active management of areas within the Specific Plan for agricultural purposes (with the exception of the Singh parcel) and would not achieve this objective.
13. **Provide a planned infrastructure system with all public facilities and services necessary to meet the needs of development with the proposed project area.** By maintaining existing conditions on the project site, Alternative 1A would neither necessitate nor provide for public facilities or services and would not contribute toward the achievement of this objective. Alternatives 1B and 3 would reduce development density and thus would reduce contributions to existing and proposed County fee programs for public facilities identified as needed to serve cumulative development in West Placer County. Alternative 2, by proposing a similar mix and degree of development as the proposed project, would achieve this objective to the same extent as the project. Alternative 4 would provide the same number of units as the proposed project but would be weighted heavily toward Medium- and High-Density Residential units, which typically maintain a lower property value and assessment on a per unit basis than Low-Density units or Agricultural-10 parcels.
14. **Provide a sufficient number of residential units within the project area to support necessary improvements to local and regional public facilities.** By maintaining existing conditions on the project site, Alternative 1A would neither necessitate nor provide for public facilities or services and would not contribute toward the achievement of this objective. Alternatives 1B and 3 would reduce development density and thus would reduce contributions to existing and proposed County fee programs for public facilities identified as needed to serve cumulative development in the West Placer County region. When

compared to the proposed project, the public infrastructure demands of Alternatives 1B or 3 are not significantly reduced, which results in a significantly higher infrastructure cost on a per-unit basis under these alternatives. Alternative 2, by proposing a similar mix and degree of development as the proposed project, would achieve this objective to the same extent as the project. Alternative 4 would provide the same number of units as the proposed project but would be weighted heavily toward Medium and High-Density Residential units, which typically maintain a lower property value and assessment on a per unit basis than Low-Density or Agricultural-10 parcels and a reduced ability to spread facilities and services costs in a feasible manner.

**15. Provide for dedication of land within the project area for the expansion of the Union Cemetery.**

Alternative 1A would perpetuate existing conditions within the Specific Plan area, including the existing area of the Union Cemetery, and would not achieve this objective. Alternative 1B would provide for development under the existing Community Plan, which does not envision nor require that additional land be dedicated for public use at no cost for cemetery purposes. Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 would designate an expansion area for future cemetery purposes, but dedication of the land at no cost to the public by the landowner has not been proposed under these alternatives.

Alternative 1A is impractical and unrealistic, in the sense that the permanent preservation of status quo conditions is not consistent with the General Plan and Community Plan as currently written. Despite the fact that most, if not all, of the significant impacts associated with implementation of the project would be reduced in significance under this Alternative, the implementation of the No Development Alternative would fail to achieve any of the project objectives. The No Development Alternative's desirability is not on balance with the project in terms of its economic, environmental, social and technological elements. The project is the more desirable choice for the community and the region. The Board finds the No Development Alternative to be infeasible for the above reasons and rejects it as a viable alternative to the project.

Alternative 1B would, by definition, meet the project objectives related to implementing the County's *General Plan* and *Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan*. It would not fully meet the following objectives: preservation of agricultural uses, enhancement of trail connectivity, enhancement of smart growth principles and the Sacramento Area Council of Government's *Blueprint for Regional Growth*, and providing a full range of housing densities and product choices, including medium and high density residential development. The smaller population associated with this Alternatives would result in a reduced opportunity to capitalize on the location of the project area in relation to existing developed areas to reduce sprawl. Alternatives 1B would not extend an internal roadway connection through the Plan Area from Watt Avenue to Walerga Road, which is necessary to provide an alternative means of travel between these two roads in the event that PFE Road is not available. Alternative 1B would not avoid or substantially decrease significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed project on visual quality, traffic, and air quality. The desirability of Alternative 1B is not on balance with the project in terms of its economic, environmental, social and technological elements. The project is the more desirable choice for the community and the region. The Board finds the Community Plan Development Alternative to be infeasible for the above reasons and rejects it as a viable alternative to the project.

Alternative 2 would meet and exceed the project objectives related to implementing the County's *General Plan* and *Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan*. Alternative 4 would not meet the objectives of providing enhanced trail connectivity, and preservation of agricultural uses. Avoidance of all fill within the floodplain would eliminate the ability to extend an internal roadway connection through the Plan Area from Watt Avenue to Walerga Road, which is necessary to provide an alternative means of travel between these two roads in the event that PFE Road is not available. Alternative 2 would not avoid or substantially decrease any of the significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed project. The desirability of Alternative 2 is not on balance with the project in terms of its economic, environmental, social and technological elements. The project is the more desirable choice for the community and the region. The Board finds the Floodplain Avoidance Alternative to be infeasible for the above reasons and rejects it as a viable alternative to the project.

Alternative 3 (Reduced Density) would meet most of the project objectives related to implementing the County's

*General Plan and Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan*. It would meet many but not all of the Applicant's objectives as well. It would not fully meet the following objectives: enhancement of trail connectivity, preservation of agricultural uses, enhancement of smart growth principles and the Sacramento Area Council of Government's *Blueprint for Regional Growth*, and providing a full range of housing densities and product choices, specifically medium density residential development. It may not provide enough development to create a fiscally responsible and balanced community, and would provide a reduced contribution to support necessary improvements to local and regional public facilities. In this case, the cost of the public infrastructure and improvements to local and regional public facilities, both new and upgrades to existing facilities, need to be spread among a sufficient number of homes that will be constructed and sold to make the overall project feasible from the economic and marketability standpoint. The total cost burden of backbone infrastructure and impact fees for the Specific Plan site is estimated to be approximately \$67.4 million, or approximately \$72,260 for each of the 933 units proposed under the specific plan. This infrastructure cost is approximately 18 percent of the estimated average sales price (\$400,000) for a dwelling unit in the Specific Plan area (Mackay and Somps, 2007). A fee and cost burden to sales price ratio of 20 percent is generally regarded as the upper limit of feasibility for development (EPS, 2007). Under the Reduced Density Alternative, backbone infrastructure costs would remain roughly equivalent to the proposed project, but would be spread over 652 units instead of 933, resulting in a fee and cost burden in excess of the 20 percent threshold of feasibility. As a result, it would be impracticable to develop this alternative under existing or foreseeable market conditions. The Board finds the Reduced Density Alternative to be infeasible for the above reasons and rejects it as a viable alternative to the project.

Alternative 4 would meet the project objectives related to implementing the County's *General Plan and Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan*, at least in terms of unit count. It would provide enhancement of the following objectives as compared to the proposed project: enhancement of smart growth principles and the Sacramento Area Council of Government's *Blueprint for Regional Growth*, and providing a more balanced range of housing densities and product choices. Alternative 4 would not provide for enhanced trail connectivity, nor would it provide for preservation of agricultural uses in the same manner as the proposed project. Development of the site with substantial medium- and high-density development would result in a substantial departure from the established low-density character of the Community Plan Area. Alternative 4 would provide the same number of units as the proposed project but would be weighted heavily toward Medium and High-Density Residential units, which typically maintain a lower property value and assessment on a per unit basis than Low-Density or Agricultural-10 parcels and a reduced ability to spread facilities and services costs in a feasible manner. Alternative 4 would maximize the amount of open space area preserved within the site and would achieve this objective to a higher degree than the proposed project, at the expense of achieving other important objectives. The desirability of Alternative 4 is not on balance with the project in terms of its economic, environmental, social and technological elements. The project is the more desirable choice for the community and the region. The Board finds the Clustered Development Alternative to be infeasible for the above reasons and rejects it as a viable alternative to the project.

## **7. Environmentally Superior Alternative**

### **Basis for Identifying Environmentally Superior Alternative**

An EIR is required to identify the environmentally superior alternative from among the range of reasonable alternatives that are evaluated. Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an environmentally superior alternative be designated, and states that "if the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives." Table 16-6 in the Draft EIR compares the five alternatives to the proposed project in terms of the impact areas that were analyzed in the Revised Draft EIR. The conclusions contained in the table are subjective and required that judgments be made on emphasis in some areas of analysis.

### **Identification of Environmentally Superior Alternative**

The analysis in the EIR indicates that Alternative 1A, the No Development Alternative, would be the Environmentally Superior Alternative. Among the "build" alternatives, Alternative 3, the Reduced

Density Alternative, was determined in the EIR to be the Environmentally Superior Alternative, for the reasons discussed below.

Alternative 2 and Alternative 4 were eliminated from consideration as the Environmentally Superior Alternative because they would introduce a higher number of new residents than other alternatives, which would have ripple effects on traffic, air, noise, and public utilities and services. The development patterns in Alternative 2, the Floodplain Encroachment Avoidance Alternative, would avoid building in the floodplain and decrease associated impacts in many resource areas, including biological resources and hydrology. Its smaller footprint would also translate to decreased impacts to cultural resources, soils and geology, and hazardous materials. However, as Alternative 2 would generate the same number of new residents as the proposed project, it would therefore not reduce impacts on traffic, air quality, noise or public utilities and services as compared to most other alternatives.

Under Alternative 4, the Clustered Density Alternative, the only development in the floodplain would be at the Watt Avenue entrance to the Plan Area, near Walerga Road, at the internal roadway connection, with the Rural Residential flag lot, and with the ultimate widening of PFE Road. This alternative would allocate the most land for open space, which would decrease impacts to biological resources and hydrology. Like Alternative 2, its smaller footprint would translate to decreased impacts to cultural resources, soils and geology, and hazardous materials. But similar to Alternative 2, this alternative would generate nearly the same number of new residents as the proposed project and Alternative 2. While clustered development tends to reduce vehicle trips and corresponding emissions of criteria pollutants and noise, this alternative would nevertheless generate the second highest number of vehicle trips of all alternatives. Other impacts associated with Alternative 2 would be similar under Alternative 4.

Alternative 1B, the Community Plan Development Alternative, and Alternative 3, the Reduced Density Alternative, were the strongest candidates for the Environmentally Superior Alternative. Both would generate approximately 70 percent of the population of the build alternatives and of the proposed project, resulting in less demand on the transportation network and on public services. Both alternatives would concentrate most of their development outside of the floodplain, with Alternative 1B avoiding the floodplain entirely. Alternative 1B and Alternative 3 would also have less acreage devoted to farmlands than the proposed project and the other two build alternatives. This would result in loss of more farmland but would further reduce impacts on biological resources. Alternative 3 would generate substantially fewer vehicle trips than all of the other alternatives. This would reduce but not eliminate significant impacts of the proposed project and all of the other alternatives related to traffic congestion, air quality, and noise. It would also result in less demand on public utilities and services. For these reasons, Alternative 3, the Reduced Density Alternative, is found to be the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

## **XII. FINDINGS RELATED TO THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LOCAL SHORT-TERM USES OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND MAINTENANCE AND ENHANCEMENT OF LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY.**

Based on the EIR and the entire record before the Board of Supervisors, the Board of Supervisors makes the following findings with respect to the project's balancing of local short term uses of the environment and the maintenance of long term productivity:

- a. As the Project is implemented, certain impacts would occur on a short-term level. Such short term impacts are discussed fully above, as well as in the EIR document. Such short term impacts may include, without limitation, impacts on traffic and circulation, air quality and noise, although measures have been and will be incorporated to mitigate these impacts to the extent feasible.
- b. The long-term implementation of the project would serve to provide necessary housing, employment opportunities and recreational/open space uses to the County of Placer. Notwithstanding the foregoing, some long term impacts would result. These impacts include, without limitation, impacts on transportation and circulation and air quality. However, implementation of the Project would provide many benefits, as set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, below.

- c. Although there are short term adverse impacts from the Project, the short and long-term benefits justify its implementation.

### XIII. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

As set forth in the preceding sections, the Placer County Board of Supervisors' approval of the Riolo Vineyard Specific Plan Project will result in significant adverse environmental effects that cannot be avoided even with the adoption of all feasible mitigation measures, and there are no feasible project alternatives which would mitigate or substantially lessen the impacts. Despite the occurrence of these effects, however, the Board chooses to approve the project because, in its view, the economic, social, and other benefits that the project will produce will render the significant effects acceptable.

In making this Statement of Overriding Considerations in support of the findings of fact and the project, the Board of Supervisors has considered the information contained in the Final EIR for the project as well as the public testimony and record in proceedings in which the project was considered. The Board has balanced the project's benefits against the unavoidable adverse impacts identified in the Final EIR. The Board hereby determines that the project's benefits outweigh the significant unmitigated adverse impacts.

#### A. SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

As discussed in Section IX above, the Riolo Vineyard Specific Plan project will result in the following significant and unavoidable impacts, even with the implementation of all feasible mitigation:

##### Project-Specific Impacts

- Permanent loss of farmland
- Williamson Act Contract cancellation
- Inconsistency with plans and policies, if the Placer County General Plan and *Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan Amendments* are not adopted
- Temporary and long-term visual impacts due to construction
- Contribute to traffic volumes on regional roadways and intersections that would exceed their capacity with or without the proposed project
- Additional transit patrons would not be accommodated by existing transit service
- Construction activities would increase short-term criteria air pollutant emissions
- Operational air quality impacts, including significant PM<sub>10</sub>, ROG, and NOX emissions in the short term and significant PM<sub>10</sub> and ROG emissions in the long-term
- Inconsistent with the *Placer County Air Quality Attainment Plan*
- Emissions of greenhouse gases potentially contributing to global warming
- Construction equipment would generate short-term noise level increases at noise-sensitive locations
- Transportation noise sources in excess of an Ldn of 60 dBA externally at the property line and in excess

of 45 dBA internally at second floor elevations.

### **Cumulative impacts**

- Permanent loss of farmland
- Loss of vegetation and wildlife habitat
- Transformation in landscape character from rural to urban
- Increase in ambient night sky illumination
- Unacceptable levels of service along some roadway segments and at some intersections within the transportation analysis study area:
  - With PFE Road open, the proposed project would cause PFE Road east of Watt Avenue to operate at LOS E. Walerga Road south of PFE Road and Baseline Road west of Locust Road would have an increased volume to capacity ratio of more than 1 percent at an already substandard LOS;
  - With PFE Road closed, the proposed project would cause Watt Avenue south of Baseline Road and PFE Road, east of Watt Avenue, to operate at LOS E. Walerga Road south of PFE Road and Baseline Road from Watt Avenue Walerga Road would have an increased volume to capacity ratio of more than 1 percent at a substandard LOS.
  - With PFE Road open or closed, the proposed project would cause the intersection of Watt Avenue at PFE Road to operate at LOS D, and the following intersections to have an increase in the volume to capacity ratio of more than 1 percent at a substandard LOS: Watt Avenue at Baseline Road, Fiddymont Road/Walerga Road at Baseline Road, Walerga Road at PFE Road, and Cook-Riolo Road at PFE Road;
  - With PFE Road closed, the proposed project would cause the intersection of Galleria Boulevard and Antelope Creek Drive to operate beyond acceptable LOS thresholds;
  - With PFE Road open, the proposed project would contribute traffic to the freeway segment between Riego Road and Elkhorn Boulevard on SR 70/99, and between Watt Avenue and Eureka Road on I-80, which would be operating at LOS F;
  - With PFE Road closed, the proposed project would cause the freeway segment of SR 70/99 between Riego Road and Elkhorn Boulevard, SR 65 between Blue Oaks Boulevard and I-80, and I-80 between Watt Avenue and Eureka Road to operate beyond acceptable LOS thresholds;
- Increase in regional criteria pollutant emissions during construction and operation
- Increase in noise levels

### **B. OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS**

In the Board's judgment, the proposed project and its benefits outweigh its unavoidable significant effects. The following statement identifies the reasons why, in the Board's judgment, the benefits of the project as approved outweigh its unavoidable significant effects. Any one of these reasons is sufficient to justify approval of the project. Thus, even if a court were to conclude that not every reason is supported by substantial evidence, the Board would stand by its determination that each individual reason is sufficient. The substantial evidence supporting the various

benefits can be found in the preceding findings, which are incorporated by reference into this Section (XIII), and in the documents found in the Record of Proceedings, as defined in Section V.

Some of the Project's benefits include the following principles:

1. **Encourage distinctive, attractive communities with quality design.** The project will create a distinctive community designed in harmony with the land. Open space is a defining element of the Specific Plan, providing a sense of balance with the environment. The riparian area of Dry Creek and the adjacent floodplain will provide an appealing landscape throughout the Riolo Vineyard community, enhanced by the preservation of the existing native oak trees and the development of trail corridors for bicyclists, pedestrians, and equestrians. The Specific Plan community will provide several community and neighborhood parks, all within walking distance from residences. Quality design is defined by the project's adopted Development Standards and Design Guidelines.
2. **Offer housing choices and opportunities.** The Specific Plan provide opportunities for single-family residential development, as well as smaller percentages of medium and high-density housing. In this manner, the Riolo Vineyard plan provides a choice of housing design and community living to meet diverse housing needs and individual preferences. The medium and high-density communities in the Riolo Vineyard plan respond to the unmet need for such housing in the south Placer County area by young families, seniors and others who prefer such communities to a traditional single family residential lifestyle. In so doing, the Riolo Vineyard will contribute to Placer County's efforts to provide affordable housing.
3. **Take advantage of compact development.** SACOG has recognized that creating environments that are more compactly built and use space in an efficient but more aesthetic manner can encourage more walking, biking, and public transit use. The Riolo Vineyard plan is an important component of achieving this principle in the south Placer County region. By incorporating medium and high-density residential communities in an area suitable for these communities, the Riolo Vineyard plan will reduce future development pressure on outlying agricultural and open space areas and assist in preserving such areas for generations to follow. Moreover, the Riolo Vineyard plan will enhance pedestrian and bicycle access through trailways, paths and sidewalks, and bike paths throughout the site.
4. **Preserve open space, farmland, and natural beauty through natural resources conservation.** The Riolo Vineyard site is located along the Dry Creek riparian corridor, and Riolo Vineyard plan will preserve this unique resource and its natural beauty, along with seasonal wetland areas and grasslands occurring within the 100-year flood plain of Dry Creek. The Specific Plan will develop trail amenities throughout, in order to enhance the scenic and recreational potential of Dry Creek.
5. **Capitalize on Existing Infrastructure Investments.** An existing network of roads and infrastructure serving the area form the foundation of the Riolo Vineyard plan, and additional improvements will be implemented by the Riolo Vineyard plan to improve access and services. The project site is located between two sub-region serving arterials (Watt Avenue and Walerga Road) and will contribute toward the widening of these arterials to their ultimate planned width. The Riolo Vineyard property is surrounded by existing and planned development, including the Doyle Ranch and Morgan Creek residential communities and the approved Placer Vineyard Specific Plan. The Riolo Vineyard plan will tie into these surrounding developments and contribute to the overall community fabric of the area as it transitions into urbanization.
6. **Support a variety of transportation choices.** It is anticipated that future residents of the Riolo Vineyard community will primarily rely upon personal motor vehicles as the means of transportation. However, by providing a mix of residential product types, including medium and high density communities, the Riolo Vineyard plan will support the availability of transit to serve the area. In addition, the Riolo Vineyard plan is intended to facilitate on-site circulation by pedestrians and bicyclists.

through an inviting network of walkways, trails and bike paths connecting residential communities to neighborhood parks and to one another. The Riolo Vineyard plan will capitalize on the unique opportunities afforded by the adjacent Dry Creek by enhancing trail facilities along the creek to compliment a regional recreation corridor.

7. **Facilitate the construction of new public facilities to serve County residents.** The project will provide, or contribute its fair share to the provision of, all public facilities and services necessary to meet the needs of development within the Specific Plan area. The Development Agreement provides for payments towards, the dedication of, or the accelerated construction of local and regional transportation infrastructure, wastewater infrastructure, and other public facilities which are over and above the measures required to mitigate for the impacts of the Project.

## C. CONCLUSION

The Board has balanced these benefits and considerations against the potentially significant unavoidable environmental effects of the project and has concluded that the impacts are outweighed by these benefits, among others. After balancing environmental costs against project benefits, the Board has concluded that the benefits the County will derive from the project, as compared to existing and planned future conditions, outweigh the risks. The Board believes the project benefits outlined above override the significant and unavoidable environmental costs associated with the project.

In sum, the Board adopts the mitigation measures in the final Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, attached to and incorporated by reference into the Riolo Vineyard Specific Plan, and finds that any residual or remaining effects on the environment resulting from the project, identified as significant and unavoidable in the preceding Findings of Fact, are acceptable due to the benefits set forth in this Statement of Overriding Considerations.