Before the Board of Supervisors
County of Placer, State of California

In the matter of: A RESOLUTION CERTIFYING THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, ADOPTING A STATEMENT OF FINDINGS, A STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS AND A MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN REGARDING THE TIMBERLINE AT AUBURN PROJECT

Reso. No. _____

The following resolution was duly passed by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Placer at a regular meeting held August 9, 2011, by the following vote:

Ayes:

Noes:

Absent:

Signed and approved by me after its passage.

Board of Supervisors

_____
Robert Weygandt, Chair

Attest:

_____
Ann Holman
Clerk of said Board

This Statement of Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations is made with respect to the "Project Approvals" (as defined below) for the Timberline at Auburn Project (the "Project") and states the findings of the Board of Supervisors (the "Board") of the County of Placer (the "County") relating to the environmental impacts of the Project to be developed in accordance with the Project Approvals.

WHEREAS, the Western Care Construction, Inc., ("Applicant") has requested the Board take the following requested actions related to the Project, which are referred to collectively as the "Project Approvals":

Attachment A

1. Adoption of amendments to the Auburn Bowman Community Plan/Placer County General Plan;

2. Adoption of land use rezonings;

3. Approval of a zoning text amendment to Section 17.04.030 of the County Zoning Ordinance;

4. Approval of a Conditional Use Permit;

5. Approval of a Minor Use Permit;

6. Approval of Variances;

7. Approval of an Exception to the County Noise Ordinance, and;

8. Approval of a Tentative Subdivision Map.

WHEREAS, the Project Approvals constitute the "Project" for purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"--Public Resources Code sections 21000 et seq.) ("CEQA") and CEQA Guidelines Sec. 15378 and these determinations of the Board, and

WHEREAS, a notice of preparation for the Timberline at Auburn environmental impact report were prepared by the County and sent to the State Clearinghouse on August 27, 2008, (SCH No. 2008082117), and

WHEREAS, in due course, a draft environmental impact report ("Draft EIR") was prepared under the direction of the County and released for public comment on November 10, 2010, and

WHEREAS, public comments on the Draft EIR were received through December 27, 2010 and a public hearing to receive comments on the Draft EIR was held in front of the Planning Commission on December 16, 2010, and

WHEREAS, responses were prepared to all issues raised in public comments, and the County published and released the Final EIR, along with an associated Notice of Availability (NOA) on March 16, 2011, and

WHEREAS, the County gave due notice of the public hearing to be held by the Planning Commission to consider the Final EIR for the Project, and a public hearing was held before the Planning Commission on April 28, 2011, at which time the Planning Commission considered and certified the Final EIR, and

WHEREAS, thereafter, an appeal was filed challenging the certification of the Final EIR and the Project entitlements, and

WHEREAS, the County gave full and legal notice of the public hearing to be held by the Board of Supervisors to consider the Final EIR for the Project and Project Approvals, and a public hearing was held before the Board on August 9, 2011, and

WHEREAS, the Board duly considered the Final EIR for the Project Approvals, which consists of the DEIR, and the Final EIR, the addendices thereto, the comments of the public, both oral and written, and all written materials in the record connected therewith, and is fully informed thereon,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF PLACER:

(1) The Final EIR has been prepared in accordance with all requirements of CEQA and the Guidelines.

(2) The Final EIR was presented to and reviewed by the Board. The Final EIR was prepared under supervision by the County and reflects the independent judgment of the County. The Board has reviewed the Final EIR, and bases its findings on such review and other substantial evidence in the record.

(3) The Board hereby certifies the Final EIR as complete, adequate and in full compliance with CEQA as a basis for considering and acting upon the Project Approvals and, exercising its independent judgment, makes the specific findings with respect thereto as set forth in Exhibit A, attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.

(4) All mitigation measures proposed in the Final EIR shall be implemented, and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan ("MMRP") is adopted, and will implement all mitigation measures adopted with respect to the Project pursuant to all of the Project Approvals. The MMRP has thus become part of and limitations upon the entitlements conferred by the Project Approvals.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: That notwithstanding the imposition of the mitigation measures in the MMRP as set forth above, significant impacts of the Project have not been reduced to a level of insignificance or eliminated by changes in the proposed Project. The Board of Supervisors finds that the project will bring substantial benefits to the County and that the Project's benefits outweigh the Project's significant unmitigated adverse impacts and pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15093 adopts and makes the Statement of Overriding Considerations as set forth in Section 7 of Exhibit A, attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference, to explain why the Project's benefits override its unavoidable impacts. Having carefully considered the Project, its impacts and the foregoing benefits, the Board of Supervisors finds, in light of the important social, economic and other benefits that the Project will bring, the adverse environmental impacts of the Project that are not fully mitigated are acceptable.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: That the Planning Department is directed to file a Notice of Determination with the County Clerk within five (5) working days of the approval of the Project Approvals in accordance with Public Resources Code section 21152(a) and CEQA Guidelines section 15094.

EXHIBIT A

TIMBERLINE AT AUBURN PROJECT
(State Clearing House # 2008082117)

FINDINGS OF FACT AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

Adopted by the

Placer County Board of Supervisors

August 9, 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section **Page**

1. Introduction 1

2. Description of the Project 2

3. Procedural History 9

4. General Findings 10
   - A. Impacts Determined to be Less-Than-Significant 12
   - B. Potentially Significant Impacts Reduced to Less-Than-Significant Through Mitigation Measures 9
     - 4.1 Land Use 13
     - 4.2 Biological Resources 14
     - 4.3 Transportation and Circulation 23
     - 4.4 Air Quality 33
     - 4.5 Noise 37
     - 4.6 Soils, Geology, and Seismicity 40
     - 4.7 Hydrology and Water Quality 44
     - 4.8 Public Services and Utilities 49
     - 4.9 Hazardous Materials and Hazards 53
     - 4.10 Cumulative Impacts and Other CEQA Sections 56
     - 4.11 Initial Study 58

5. Significant Impacts Which Remain Significant and Unavoidable 59
   - 5.1 Transportation and Circulation 59
   - 5.2 Air Quality 60
   - 5.3 Biological Resources (Cumulative) 62
   - 5.4 Transportation and Circulation (Cumulative) 62
   - 5.5 Air Quality (Cumulative) 64
   - 5.6 Growth-Inducement 67

6. Alternatives 69
   - 6.1 No Project Alternative 70
   - 6.2 Clustered Development Alternative 71
   - 6.3 Reduced Intensity Alternative 73

7. Statement of Overriding Considerations 73

8. Conclusion 75

1 INTRODUCTION

The Timberline at Auburn Project ("Project") has been considered by Placer County (County), the lead agency for the project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The environmental analysis contained in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Project provides a thorough evaluation of significant and potentially significant effects on the environment that would occur as a result of Project development and alternatives to the Project.

The State CEQA Guidelines state the following regarding approving a project in Public Resources Code, Section 21081:

> *No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an environmental impact report has been certified which identifies one or more significant effects on the environment that would occur if the project is approved or carried out unless both of the following occur:*
>
> *(a) The public agency makes one or more of the following findings with respect to each significant effect:*
>
> *(1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.*
> *(2) Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.*
> *(3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.*
>
> *(b) With respect to significant effects which were subject to a finding under paragraph (3) of subdivision (a), the public agency finds that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the significant effects on the environment.*

Because the EIR identified significant effects that would occur as a result of the project and in accordance with the provisions of the State CEQA Guidelines, the Board of Supervisors hereby adopts these findings as part of the approval of the Project.

These findings do not attempt to describe the full analysis of each environmental impact contained in the EIR. Instead, the findings provide a summary description of each impact, describe the applicable mitigation measures identified in the Draft EIR or Final EIR and adopted by the Board, and state the Board's findings on the significance of each impact after imposition of the adopted mitigation measures, accompanied by a brief explanation. Full explanations of these environmental findings and conclusions can be found in the Draft EIR and Final EIR. These findings hereby incorporate by reference the discussion and analysis in those documents supporting the Final EIR's determinations regarding mitigation measures and the project's impacts and mitigation measures designed to address those impacts. In making these findings, the Board of Supervisors ratifies, adopts, and incorporates into these findings the analysis and explanation in the Draft EIR and Final EIR and ratifies, adopts, and incorporates in these findings the determinations and conclusions of the Draft EIR and Final EIR relating to environmental impacts and mitigation measures, except to the extent any such determinations and conclusions are specifically and expressly modified by these findings.

2 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

The Project is located in unincorporated Placer County, north of the Bell Road/Richardson Drive intersection. The Placer County General Plan and Auburn Bowman Community Plan currently designate 25 acres of the site as Open Space, 4.5 acres as Mixed Use, 18.3 acres as High Density Residential (10 to 15 dwelling units per acre), 43.7 acres as Medium Density Residential (5 to 10 dwelling units per acre) and 27.5 acres Low Density Residential (1 to 2.5 acres per unit). The existing Placer County zoning for the site includes 43.7 acres of Residential Single Family with density limitation of five units per acre, 18.3 acres of Residential Multi-Family with density limitation of 15 units per acre, 3.5 acres of Residential Agriculture with minimum building site of 40,000 square feet, 3.5 acres of Office and Professional and Residential Multi-Family combining Design Corridor, one acre of Office Professional Combining Design Corridor, 24 acres zoned Farm, and 25 acres of Open Space.

The Project is composed of a continuing care retirement community (CCRC), a commercial center, and a loop trail to be developed on the ARD parcel to the northeast. The Project would include up to 858 residential units, of which 780 would be located in the continuing care retirement community (CCRC) and the remaining 78 units would be second and third story lofts above commercial and office spaces.

Continuing Care Retirement Community

The continuing care retirement community (CCRC) would be composed of a range of senior housing, access to existing adjacent senior facilities, access to the ARD Regional Park and trail network, extensive on-site services including dining facilities, an aquatic center, a library, a business center, parking facilities, and a private on-site bus.

Commercial and Office Uses

The Project includes a commercial center that is intended to satisfy most of the needs of the continuing care retirement community (CCRC) residents as well as area residents and visitors on approximately 25 acres located on the east side of the Project. The commercial center would be located from south to north along Richardson Drive. The retail portion (shopping center) would consist of three buildings totaling 33,500 square feet (28,500 square feet of retail and 5,000 square feet of office).

Trails

An open space network of trails and pathways would link all of the Project's proposed complexes and facilities. A series of mini parks are also planned to be established in key locations along the trail and pathways system as places to sit, rest and view the environment. In addition, consistent with the Auburn Bowman Community Plan, the Project includes a pedestrian/bicycle trail along Richardson Drive.

The Project also includes the construction of a trail on the 24-acre ARD parcel in the northernmost portion of the Project site. The approximately 4,500-foot trail will serve to provide recreational opportunities in a natural landscape for Project residents as well as to provide a link to the existing ARD regional park located northeast of the Project site, which will benefit not only Project residents, but existing residents located north and west of the ARD trail site.

The Project includes the following entitlement approvals from Placer County:

- *General/Community Plan Amendment* –The Project requires County approval of an amendment to the Auburn Bowman Community Plan to change the existing land use designations. Changes to the Placer

County General Plan and Auburn-Bowman Community Plan are considered to be the same (see Table 3-3 and Figure 3-11 of the Project Description chapter of the DEIR).

- *Rezone* –The Project requires County approval of a change in zoning designations from the existing zoning designations (see Table 3-4 and Figure 3-12 of the Project Description chapter of the DEIR).

- *Conditional Use Permit(s)* – The Project requires a conditional use permit allowing the continuing care retirement community (CCRC) community and adjacent commercial center as previously described. In addition the use permit(s) will allow for the operation of the new off-site trail and the creation/enhancement of the off-site wetland on the ARD property. In addition, as part of the use permit approval(s) for the Project, the proposed entryway signage at Bell Road and Richardson Drive would be reviewed for compliance with County sign standards.

- *Placer County Airport Land Use Compatibility Determination* – The Project requires a determination from the County that finds the Project in compliance with the Placer County Airport Land Use map. It should be noted that the proposed Site Plan and its associated land uses have been determined to be compatible by the Placer County Airport Land Use Commission.

- *Subdivision Maps* – The County must review and approve the proposed vesting phased tentative subdivision map and all final maps.

- *Noise Exception* – The Project requires the County must review and approve an exception to the provisions of Article 9.36 of the Placer County Code. Section 9.36.060 of the Placer County Noise Ordinance requires the exterior noise level standard to be applied to the property line of the receiving land use for stationary noise sources (i.e., non-transportation). The noise levels at the property line of Lot 15 would exceed Noise Ordinance standards. While actual noise impacts would not occur, an exception to the Placer County property line exterior noise level standard is necessary.

- *Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment* – The County must amend the zoning ordinance to allow multiple single family dwelling units on one parcel of land when the land and units are held in one common ownership. Specifically, Section 17.040.030 of the Zoning Ordinance is proposed to be amended as follows:

  > "Multifamily dwellings" (land use) means and includes: (1) a building or a portion of a building used and/or designed as residences for two or more families living independently of each other, or (2) two or more detached single-family dwellings on a single lot where all of the single-family dwellings and the lot are under common ownership, provided that one of the units is not a secondary dwelling. Includes: halfplex structures (a halfplex is a single dwelling unit that is half of a two-unit building where a property line separates the two units), duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes (detached buildings under one ownership with two, three, or four dwelling units (respectively) in the same building) and apartments (five or more units under one ownership in a single building); common ownership, attached unit projects such as condominiums and townhouses; and rooming and boarding houses (single dwellings where bedrooms are rented to five or more people and at least one common meal is offered each day). The boarding of four or fewer renters is not considered to be a land use different from a single-family dwelling.

- *CIP Program Amendment* – The County must amend the CIP to include the intersections of Bell Road and First Street and Bell Road and Richardson Drive.

- *Variance for backing into public or private roadways* – The County must approve a variance to allow for perpendicular parking on private streets.

- *Variance for increased fence height and sound wall encroachment into front yard setback* – The County must approve a variance to increase the allowable fence height from six (6) feet to eight (8) feet surrounding the RV/ Boat storage use located on Richardson Drive. In addition, the variance would be needed to enable the proposed 6-foot sound wall to encroach into the front yard setback of Lot 8.

- *Parking Variance* – The County must review and approve the parking variance to allow the development of one parking space per loft living unit.

- *Signage Permit* – The County must review and approve the proposed signage for the project.

- *Signage Variance* – The County must review and approve certain multi-tenant signage for the commercial areas of the Project, which exceeds the typical number of tenants allowed per sign and are located less than 100 feet from the street corner.

- *Improvement Plans/Encroachment Permit* –The County must review and approve the Improvement Plans for the Project, including any encroachment into County rights-of-way.

- *Building Permit* – The County must review and approve building permits for the Project.

- *Sewer Permit* – The County must review and approve the sewage connections for the Project.

Vesting Phased Tentative Map

The Vesting Phased Tentative Map includes a total of 33 lots for residential, commercial, or office development. Lot 1 is further divided into 21 CCRC villas, which comprise the entirety of Phase 2 of the Project. The Phased Tentative Map also includes a lot for a sewer lift station, located in the far northwestern corner of the Project.

Design Guidelines

As a condition of approval for the Project, the applicant will be required to prepare Design Guidelines. One of the broader goals of the Design Guidelines would be to create overall continuity of landscape and architectural themes, while still allowing for individual expressions within the parameters of the Guidelines. The Design Guidelines will provide design concepts for specific elements, including but not necessarily limited to architectural treatments, entrances, streetscapes, intersections, and buffer areas. As is typical, the Design Guidelines for the Timberline Project will supersede and replace conflicting County Guidelines for purposes of the landscape and architectural design of the Project. However, where no guidance is provided within the Design Guidelines for specific items, the guidelines contained in the Placer County Landscape Design Guidelines shall apply.

Infrastructure

The Project would require improvements and connections to the existing water lines, sewer facilities, drainage facilities, and roadways.

Water

Potable water is supplied to the Project area by the Nevada Irrigation District via their North Auburn Water Treatment Plant. The Project would connect to existing 12-inch water lines located within the public utility

easements of the portion of Richardson Drive (north and south of the Project site), Education Street, Quartz Drive, and in Golden Eagle Drive. Water lines ranging from 8 to 12 inches in diameter would be extended throughout the Project site to provide water to the proposed uses.

Sewer

The Project site is located in the service area boundary of Sewer Maintenance District No.1 (SMD-1) within the service area of the DeWitt trunk sewer system. The Project proposes to re-align the portion of the sewer trunk within the Timberline project area. The Project will provide sewer connections to six units on Sunset Terrace to the west and Education Street to the east. The Project will make a connection to Meadowbrook Drive in order to route an anticipated 42 EDUs to the Joeger Road Lift Station. The Project will be required to upsize the lift station and will upsize the Dry Creek trunk downstream of the lift station depending on additional flows. The Project will be required to upsize the DeWitt trunk sewer line due to capacity restrictions to accommodate Project flows. The upsizing includes the trunk line from the project area to the SMD No. 1 wastewater treatment plant on Joeger Road with the exception of a short stretch of pipeline. Therefore, infrastructure improvements would be required prior to construction of the Project. The provision of sewer service is discussed in depth in Chapter 12, Public Services and Utilities, of the Draft EIR. In addition, potential off-site impacts associated with upsizing portions of the sewer conveyance pipe to the SMD No. 1 wastewater treatment plant are discussed below under "Off-Site Improvements," and further addressed in Chapter 5, Biological Resources.

Drainage

Implementation of the Project would result in additional flows of stormwater as a result of the increase in impervious surfaces. The Project design incorporates stormwater detention basins to serve the dual purposes of stormwater detention and water quality improvement. The main detention areas would be located in the northeast area of the Project site. Following detention, stormwater flows would be conveyed to existing stormwater pipes in Richardson Drive (north of the project site) and the created mitigation wetlands located in the ARD parcel.

Roadways

The Project would connect the southern section of Richardson Drive, which currently terminates just north of Bell Road, to the northern section located north of the Timberline site. In addition, connections off of Richardson Drive would be established with Quartz Drive and Education Street to the east. The phasing of Richardson Drive is addressed in the below section *Estimated Project Phasing*. A connection to Golden Eagle Drive would be established to allow for fire access; however, under normal circumstances the connection would be gated to ensure that non-emergency vehicles would not use the roadway.

Off-Site Improvements

The Project includes the construction of several off-site improvements related to the sewer and roadway infrastructure needed to serve the Project.

Sewer

Some or all of the off-site sewer trunk line from the Project's northern boundary to the Joeger Road Sewer Treatment Plant (SMD-1 WWTP), located on Joeger Road, will need to be replaced. Some sewer pipe sections are currently in need of replacement due to capacity constraints in a 10-year storm event, other sections need to be replaced to accommodate increased Timberline flows. Three stretches of pipe between the Project and the Joeger Road SMD-1 WWTP do not require upsizing as part of the Timberline improvements. However, because the majority of the sewer trunk from the Project to the SMD-1 WWTP would be replaced/upsized during the course of the buildout of the Project the Project sewer report includes a recommendation for these three stretches of pipe to be concurrently upsized to accommodate buildout development, which is considered the DeWitt Trunk

Tributary area of the SMD-1 WWTP service boundary. The installation of the new lines will be to the County's specifications and the work will be inspected by the County Sewer District. A connection fee will be paid before a property is connected to the public sewer. The connection fee is used to offset the project's impacts to the capacity of the SMD-1 WWTP.

Alignment

The entire length of this off site pipe alignment is approximately 6,000 feet in length and whose diameter of the new replacement pipe will range in size from 12 to 24 inches. The average depth of pipe coverage is approximately 3.5 feet and whose method of compaction and type of backfill will be determined by the Placer County sewer line installation specifications. Generally, sewer lines that are to be installed in roadways need to meet a higher level of compaction and backfill requirements. The new pipeline will follow the same alignment as the existing sewer pipeline but the trench may be slightly wider and deeper to reflect the new size of the replacement pipe. Typically, the minimum width of the trench is the outside diameter of the pipe plus 24 inches; for example, a new 24-inch pipe will be installed in a trench that is approximately 48 inches wide. The construction method called "Pipe Bursting," described in detail below, is usually the preferred method, but is typically used only when the new replacement pipe is no more than two sizes larger than the existing pipe. The "Dig and Replace" method is more labor intensive and requires a larger construction area and trench boxes to support the pipe excavation in areas where the pipe is buried deeper, typically in excess of 4 feet, or if the soil types dictate that extra stability is needed. It is conservatively assumed for the environmental analysis of this EIR that all sections of the off-site alignment, except the section between manhole AE2-24 and AE2-25, will be installed utilizing the Dig and Replace method. However, once detailed construction design drawings are complete it is probable that more sections of the off-site alignment will be constructed utilizing the "Pipe Bursting" method.

The numbers next to the alignment, such as "AE2-22", are numbers given by the County to specific sewer manholes along the alignment. Access to the construction area would be from public roads, where such roads are adjacent to the existing sewer easement, or by traversing along the easement. The off-site sewer alignment currently varies in width, depending on the location. Generally, for segments of the off-site alignment where there are no sensitive resources, the sewer construction impact area (i.e., work area) would have a maximum width of approximately 30 feet; however, if there are sensitive resources or receptors, such as wetlands or residential properties, the construction impact area would be reduced to approximately 10 feet in width.

Specific widths of the construction impact area along the off-site sewer alignment are as follows, using the manhole designations as identification points:

- Northern boundary of Timberline Project, north to AE2-24. For most of this section a 25-foot construction width would be utilized; however, there are several areas in this section where the construction width would narrow down to avoid wetland areas and existing native oaks.
- AE2-24 to AE2-25. The construction impact area would be 10 feet in width.
- AE2-25 to AF2-05. This portion of the off-site alignment is within County road right-of-way; therefore, construction activities would be restricted to the County road easement width.
- AF2-05 to Joeger Road. The construction impact area would be restricted to 10 feet unless property owners grant permission to utilize a wider area up to 30 feet in width.

Roadways

This EIR includes an analysis of the potential environmental impacts resulting from construction of the below identified intersection improvements, as well as a minimum of 10 feet from the edge of proposed improvements.

Bell Road/First Street Intersection

This two-way stop-controlled intersection is projected to operate at an unacceptable LOS E and F during AM and PM peak hour periods, respectively, under Short Term Plus Project Phase 1 conditions. The Project traffic study determined that installation of a traffic signal at this intersection would provide acceptable LOS C or better conditions. Installation of the traffic signal will include the following improvements on the south side of Bell Road: adjustment to the width and alignment of the First Street pavement to match Blue Oaks Drive across Bell Road (including tapers back to existing pavement), construction of curb, gutter, and 8-foot wide ADA sidewalks, drainage improvements as necessary, and grading improvements as necessary to achieve appropriate vehicle sight distance.

New Airport Road/Bell Road Intersection

This signalized intersection is projected to operate at unacceptable LOS F during the PM peak hour under Short Term Plus Project Phase 1 conditions. The Project traffic study determined that the following improvements would lower the "Plus Project" volume to capacity ratio (v/c) to less than the "No Project" v/c: widen the southbound approach to include one left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane.

Bell Road/Richardson Drive Intersection

This intersection is projected to operate at unacceptable LOS D and E during AM and PM peak hour periods, respectively. The Project traffic study determined that the following improvements would provide acceptable LOS C or better conditions: signalize the intersection or install a modern, one-lane roundabout with the phase of development that will generate a project total of 123 PM peak hour vehicle trips or more. It should be noted that by the time of intersection improvements, the project is also required to include the construction of the encroachment onto Bell Road from Lot 33 as right-in / right-out only with the installation of a raised island in the encroachment ("pork chop" island) or a raised median within Bell Road.

Estimated Project Phasing

The Project would be built in four phases over 10-15 years. The following is a projected build-out of the Project; however, construction would ultimately be determined by market demand. While each phase listed below and environmental analysis evaluates the full phase being constructed there will be sub phases that will allow for smaller pieces of the phase to be built as demand dictates.

While Phase 1 includes 395 residential units, market demand may dictate constructing select commercial Phase 1 retail lots (sub phases) prior to constructing the senior dwelling units. Regardless of the extent of each phase build out the applicant must have all required infrastructure constructed to service the specific buildings that would be constructed.

Phase 1 – [Year 1-2]

Phase 1 of the Project will begin construction within two years of Project approval. The following uses would be constructed during Phase 1:

- A total of 395 continuing care retirement community (CCRC) dwelling units – includes three independent living buildings (C1, C3, and C4) (180 units), 95 villas, and one additional independent living building (K2) (120

units). Service Common buildings J1, B1 (Partial) and A would also be constructed;

- A 28,500-square-foot Shopping Center – includes commercial/retail buildings (I1, I2, and I3). I1 and I2 include 72 2nd and 3rd floor lofts and I3 includes 5,000-square-foot general office space on the 2nd floor.; and
- A 20,000-square-foot medical/dental office building - includes one medical office/professional office building (H5) with six third floor lofts.

Phase I would include mass grading of 86 acres of the 119-acre project site, construction of two detention ponds, off-site wetland creation area, off-site loop trail, Phase 1 utilities, encasement of the Nevada Irrigation District ditch, and enlargement of those portions of the sewer trunk line that require enlargement. In addition, Richardson Drive would be extended north to the retirement community's main entrance from Bell Road and would include a connection to Education Street. An emergency access road would be constructed at Golden Eagle Drive.

Phase 2 – [Year 3-5]

Phase 2 of the Project will begin construction within 5 years of Project approval. The following would be constructed during Phase 2:

- Construct 21 additional CCRC villas

Phase 3 – [Year 5-7]

Phase 3 of the Project will begin construction within seven years of Project approval. The following uses would be constructed under this phase:

- A total of 120 continuing care retirement community (CCRC) dwelling units – includes two independent living buildings (D2 and C2) (120 units) and Service Common Building B1 (Partial);
- A 45,000 square-foot health/fitness club – includes remaining commercial buildings (L1 and L2); and
- A total of 70,000 square feet of medical office, including four medical office/professional office buildings (H1-H4).
- A RV/boat storage complex.

In addition, Richardson Drive would be extended north from the retirement community's main entrance and connect with Richardson Drive near Park Drive. This extension would include connection to Quartz Drive.

Phase 4 – [Year 10-12]

Phase 4 of the Project will begin construction within 12 years of Project approval. Phase 4 would involve construction of the remainder of the Project, including 244 continuing care retirement community (CCRC) dwelling units (C5, C6, D1, D3, K1), 24 duplex units, and Service Common building B2.

Project Objectives

The following Project objectives have been identified by the applicant:

1. Provide a mixed-use continuing care retirement community (CCRC) of approximately 858 residential units, approximately 28,500 square feet of retail uses, and approximately 190,000 square feet of medical/professional office uses on a single, infill site in close proximity to existing compatible land uses;

2. Help realize the County's implementation of the Blueprint project of the Sacramento Area Council of Governments through the provision on a single infill site of: (1) a range of housing types, (2) mix of uses, (3) transportation choices, (4) compact development, (5) use of existing assets, and (6) quality design, all close to medical facilities and other compatible uses;

3. Connect through an accessible and interconnected network of trails a mixed-use, continuing care retirement community (CCRC) to the County's Dewitt Center, a regional park, and existing neighborhoods;

4. Provide a potential opportunity for on-site affordable workforce housing units; and

5. Provide through an economically feasible project a network of road connections to the surrounding Auburn community to provide alternative parallel roadway opportunities for local travelers.

Based on its own review of the EIR and other information and testimony received in connection with the Project, the Board of Supervisors finds these objectives to be acceptable and persuasive from a public policy standpoint. In choosing to approve the project, the County thus embraces these objectives as the County's own, and accords them weight in considering the feasibility of alternatives set forth in the EIR, and in invoking overriding considerations in approving the Project. (See *Sierra Club v. County of Napa* (2004) 121 Cal.App.4th 1490, 1507-1508; *Sequoyah Hills Homeowners Assn. v. City of Oakland* (1993) 23 Cal.App.4th 704, 715 (*Sequoyah Hills*).)

3 PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The County issued a notice of preparation to prepare an EIR for the Timberline at Auburn Project on August 27, 2008, and held a public scoping meeting on September 10, 2008. The County prepared a Draft EIR and released it for public comment on November 10, 2010. Public comments on the Draft EIR were received through December 27, 2010 and a public hearing to receive comments on the Draft EIR was held in front of the Planning Commission on December 16, 2010. Responses were prepared to all issues raised in public comments. The County published and released the Final EIR along with an associated Notice of Availability (NOA) on March 16, 2011.

The County gave due notice of the public hearing to be held by the Planning Commission to consider the Final EIR for the Project, and a public hearing was held before the Planning Commission on April 28, 2011. The Planning Commission considered the EIR and Project entitlements, and certified the Final EIR. Thereafter, an appeal was filed challenging the certification of the Final EIR and the Project entitlements.

The County gave due notice of the public hearing to be held by the Board of Supervisors to consider the Final EIR for the Project, and a public hearing was held before the Board on August 9, 2011. After closing the hearing to public comment, the Board of Supervisors, having considered the Final EIR as prepared for the Project, which includes the Draft EIR dated November 2010, and the Final EIR, dated March 2011, the comments of the public, both oral and written, all written materials in the record connected with the Draft and Final EIR, and the Project, and the recommendation of the Planning Commission, makes the following findings:

1. The Final EIR has been prepared in accordance with all requirements of CEQA.

2. The Final EIR was presented to and reviewed by the County. The Final EIR was prepared under the supervision of the County and reflects the independent judgment of the County. The Board of Supervisors has reviewed the Final EIR, and bases the findings stated below on such review and other substantial evidence in the record.

3. The County finds that the Draft EIR considers a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives, sufficient to foster informed decision making, public participation and a reasoned choice. Thus, the alternatives analysis in the Draft EIR is sufficient to carry out the purposes of such analysis under CEQA.

4. The Board of Supervisors hereby certifies the Final EIR as complete, adequate and in full compliance with CEQA and as providing an adequate basis for considering and acting upon the Project approval and makes the following specific findings with respect thereto.

5. The Board of Supervisors agrees with the characterization of the Draft EIR and Final EIR with respect to those impacts identified as "less-than-significant" and finds that those impacts have been described accurately and are less-than-significant as so described in the Draft EIR and Final EIR. This finding does not apply to impacts identified as significant or potentially significant that are reduced by mitigation measures to a level characterized in the Draft EIR and Final EIR as less-than-significant or impacts characterized in the Draft EIR and Final EIR as significant and unavoidable. Each of those impacts and the mitigation measures adopted to reduce them are dealt with specifically in the findings below.

6. The Board of Supervisors agrees with the characterization of the Draft EIR and Final EIR with respect to the following impacts: Impact 7-4, "Impact to roadway segments under Short Term Plus Project Phase 1 conditions;" Impact 7-8, "Impact to roadway segments under Short Term Plus Project Phases 1 and 2 conditions;" Impact 8-4, "Impacts related to long-term increases of criteria air pollutants;" Impact 15-2 "Cumulative loss of biological resources in Placer County and the effects of ongoing urbanization in the region;" Impact 15-5, "Impact to roadway segments under Cumulative Plus Project conditions;" Impact 15-6, "Impacts to arterial segments under Cumulative Plus Project conditions;" Impact 15-8 "Cumulative impacts to regional air quality;" Impact 15-9 "The project could potentially result in a cumulatively considerable incremental contribution to the global production of greenhouse gases." These impacts are identified as significant and unavoidable because feasible mitigation does not exist to fully reduce project-level and cumulative, biological resources, transportation and circulation impacts, or cumulative air quality impacts to less-than-significant levels.

7. All mitigation measures proposed in the Draft EIR and Final EIR are adopted and incorporated into the Project.

8. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP) will apply to all mitigation measures adopted with respect to the Project pursuant to all of the Project approvals, and will be implemented.

9. The mitigation measures and the MMRP have been incorporated into the Conditions of Approval for the Project and have thus become part of and limitation upon the entitlement conferred by the approval of the Project.

10. The descriptions of the impacts in these findings are summary statements. Reference should be made to the Draft EIR and Final EIR for a more complete description.

11. The Community Development Resource Agency is directed to file a Notice of Determination with the County Clerk within five (5) working days in accordance with Public Resources Code section 21152(a) and CEQA Guidelines section 15094.

4 GENERAL FINDINGS

In addition to this Statement of Findings, the public record for the project is composed of the following elements, as well as the mandatory elements of a record set forth in Public Resources Code section 21167.7, subdivision (e) (a full reference list is provided in Chapter 20 of the Draft EIR):

- Albertazzi, Brad. Captain of the Placer County Fire Department/CAL FIRE. Personal Communication. April 14, 2009.
- Amanda Rogers. Community Services Officer II, Placer County Sheriff's Office. Letter Correspondence dated December 29, 2008.
- California Air Resources Board. *http://www.arb.ca.gov.* Accessed January 2010
- California Department of Education. *http://data1.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/.* Accessed April 20, 2010.
- Crancer, Douglas. Assistant Superintendent of Business and Facilities. Personal Communication. November 25, 2008.
- Earth Systems Consultants. *Geotechnical Feasibility Study.* June 1993.
- ECO:LOGIC. *Timberline Project, Wastewater Facilities Capacity Study.* August 2010.
- ECO:LOGIC. *Placer County SMD No. 1 – Highway 49 Trunk Sewer Capacity Study for the Ridgeview Office Complex.* May 2007.
- ECO:LOGIC. *Timberline Project, Water Supply Assessment and Verification.* January 2009.
- ECORP Consulting, Inc. *Section 404 Individual Permit for Timberline.* February 28, 2008.
- ECORP Consulting, Inc. *Special-Status Species Assessment for Timberline.* October 10, 2007.
- ECORP Consulting, Inc. *Timberline Property – Tree Survey.* August 17, 2007.
- ECORP Consulting, Inc. *Wetland Delineation Timberline.* September 27, 2007.
- ECORP Consulting, Inc. *Wetland Delineation Timberline Offsite.* April 3, 2008.
- ESRI, *Business Analyst Online: Market Profile: Placer County.* April 2010.
- Evans, Anne. Secretary to the Superintendent. Personal Communication. December 1, 2008.
- Gallaway Consulting, Inc. *Arborist Report, Timberline APN 051-180-059.* October 2008.
- Gallaway Consulting, Inc. *Arborist Report, Timberline Recreational Trail.* October 2008.
- Gallaway Consulting, Inc. *Consistency Evaluation of the Existing Wetland Delineation, Special-Status Species Assessment, and Arborist Reports for the Timberline Project.* November 19, 2008.
- Gallaway Consulting, Inc. *Findings of the Representative Sampling of Trees 22 to 23-inch DPH Identified in the 2004 Arborist Report for the Timberline Project.* October 2008.
- Gallaway Consulting, Inc. *Timberline Project Auburn Recreation District Property Wetland Area Tree Inventory and Canopy Assessment.* February 17, 2009.
- Gallaway Consulting, Inc. *Timberline Project Botanical Survey.* June 5, 2008.
- Gallaway Consulting, Inc. *Timberline Project Canopy Cover Assessment and Oak Woodlands Impact Evaluation.* December 4, 2008.
- Holdrege & Kull, *Geotechnical Engineering Report for Timberline at Auburn.* August 14, 2008.
- Holdrege & Kull. *Preliminary Characterization of Abandoned Mine Features at Timberline @ Auburn.* July 22, 2008.
- Holdrege & Kull. *Removal Action Completion Report and Site Closure Request for Timberline @ Auburn.* July 29, 2009.
- j.c. brennan & associates, Inc., *Timberline at Auburn Environmental Noise Assessment.* March 2010.
- Morton & Pitalo, Inc. *Timberline at Auburn Preliminary Drainage Study.* June 18, 2008 (updated December 15, 2008).
- Nevada Irrigation District, *Addendum for the North Auburn Highway 49 Transmission Pipeline Project, Placer County, California,* February 2009.
- Omni-Means, Ltd. *Existing Plus Project Analysis and Trigger Mechanism for Mitigation.* August 12, 2010.
- Omni-Means, Ltd. *Timberline at Auburn Transportation Impact Analysis Report.* March 2010.
- Owen Engineering and Management Consultants, Inc. (now Owen Psomas). *SMD-1 Wastewater Master Plan.* June 2007.
- Placer County. *Auburn/Bowman Community Plan,* June 1994.
- Placer County. *Placer County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.* Adopted October 25, 2000.
- Placer County. *Placer County Code, Chapter 17, Zoning,* as amended.
- Placer County. *Placer County General Plan,* August 1994.

- Placer County. *Placer County General Plan Background Report.* August 1994.
- Placer County. *Placer County General Plan EIR*, 1993.
- Placer County. *Placer County Noise Ordinance*. 2004.
- Placer County. *Timberline at Auburn, Auburn, CA Memorandum*, Health and Human Services Department: Environmental Health Division. September 22, 2009.
- Placer County Airport Land Use Commission. *Airport Land Use Compatibility Determination: Timberline at Auburn*. June 22, 2008
- Placer County Library. http://www.placer.ca.gov/Departments/Library.aspx. Accessed March 27, 2009.
- PMC. *Archaeological and Historical Investigations for a Timberline at Auburn Wetland and Trails Project*. March 2008.
- PMC. *Archaeological and Historical Investigations for a Residence at 2342 Bell Road.* April 10, 2008.
- Raney Planning & Management. *Off-Site Sewer Alignment Photos*. 2009
- RMC Water and Environment. *Technical Memorandum No. 3a South Placer Regional Wastewater and Recycled Water Systems Evaluation Project.* February 13, 2006.
- Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District. *Recommended Guidance for Land Use Emission Reductions, Version 2.4*. August 15, 2007
- Sierra Nevada Arborists. *Initial Arborist Report and Inventory Summary, Harmon Park Project*. August 23, 2004.
- United States Environmental Protection Agency. *Placer County SMD 1 Pretreatment Performance Evaluation*. November 2003.
- United States Geological Survey. http://tin.er.usgs.gov/mrds/. Accessed January 2010.
- Wallace Kuhl and Associates, Inc. *Environmental Site Assessment: Harmon Park*. February 1, 2005.
- Yoast, Robert A. Norberg Engineering Co., Inc. Personal communication (email). July 20, 2009.

Having considered the Final EIR as prepared for the project (which includes the Draft EIR dated November 2010, and the Final EIR, dated March 2011), the comments of the public, both oral and written, and all written materials in the record connected with the Draft and Final EIR, and the project, the Board of Supervisors has also relied on all of the documents listed above in reaching its decision on the Project, even if not every document was formally presented to the Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission or County staff as part of the County files generated in connection with the Project. Without exception, any documents set forth above not found in the Project files fall into one of two categories. Many of them reflect prior planning or legislative decisions with which the County was aware in approving the Auburn Bowman Community Plan (See *City of Santa Cruz v. Local Agency Formation Commission* (1978) 76 Cal.App.3d 381, 391-392; *Dominey v. Department of Personnel Administration* (1988) 205 Cal.App.3d 729, 738, fn. 6.) Other documents influenced the expert advice provided to County Staff or consultants, who then provided advice to the Board of Supervisors and the Planning Commission. For that reason, such documents form part of the underlying factual basis for the Board of Supervisor's decisions relating to the approval of the Project. (See Pub. Resources Code, § 21167.6, subd. (e)(10); *Browning-Ferris Industries v. City Council of City of San Jose* (1986) 181 Cal.App.3d 852, 866; *Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v. County of Stanislaus* (1995) 33 Cal.App.4th 144, 153, 155.)

After reviewing the public record, as composed of the aforementioned elements, the Board of Supervisors hereby makes the following findings regarding the significant effects of the Project, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 and Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

IMPACTS DETERMINED TO BE LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT

Except as stated otherwise in certain cases below, the County agrees with the characterization in the Draft and Final EIR with respect to all impacts initially identified as "less-than-significant" and finds that those impacts have been described accurately and are less-than-significant as described in the Draft and Final EIR. This finding applies to the following impacts:

4-1 Consistency with the ABCP.
4-2 Consistency with Placer County Ordinances.
4-4 Compatibility with existing adjacent land uses.
5-7 Impacts related to conflicts with local policies and ordinances regarding the protection of natural resources.
6-1 Impacts related to the existing visual character or quality of the site and surroundings.
6-2 Impacts to scenic vistas and natural resources.
6-3 Impacts associated with light pollution and glare.
7-15 Impacts to air traffic patterns.
8-2 Impacts related to a temporary increase in ROG and NO_X emissions.
8-3 Contribution to CO concentrations at local "hotspot" intersections.
9-2 Traffic-related noise impacts as a result of project implementation.
9-5 Potential exposure of new noise-sensitive uses to transportation noise levels.
9-6 Potential aviation noise could disturb sleep patterns of new sensitive receptors within the project site.
11-5 Impacts to important surface water resources (i.e., Lake Tahoe, Folsom Lake, Rock Creek Reservoir, etc.) in the watershed.
12-5 Impacts to solid waste disposal.
12-6 Impacts related to the provision of adequate gas and electricity, cable, and telephone services for the proposed project.
12-8 Adequate library services available for new residents.
12-9 Adequate park and recreation facilities available for new residents.
13-4 Impacts related to the construction of structures within the Placer County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.
14-1 Loss of availability of a known State, regional, and/or locally valuable mineral resource.
15-1 Increases in the intensity of land uses in the region due to the proposed project and all other projects in Placer County.
15-3 Long-term impacts to the visual character of the region from the proposed project in combination with existing and future developments in the Auburn/Bowman area.
15-10 Cumulative increase in project vicinity noise levels.
15-11 Long-term geologic and seismic impacts from the proposed project in combination with existing and future developments in the Auburn-Bowman area.
15-12 Long-term increases in peak stormwater runoff flow related to the proposed project and in combination with existing and future developments in Placer County.
15-13 Increase in demand for additional public services and utilities as a result of the proposed project and other projects proposed in the Placer County area.
15-14 Long-term hazards and hazardous materials-related impacts from the proposed project in combination with existing and future developments in Placer County.
15-15 Long-term impacts to the mineral resources of the region from the proposed project in combination with existing and future developments in the Auburn-Bowman area.

POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS REDUCED TO LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT THROUGH MITIGATION MEASURES

4.1 LAND USE

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: COMPATIBILITY WITH THE PLACER COUNTY AIRPORT LAND USE COMPATIBILITY PLAN (IMPACT 4-3)

The proposed project is located within the Auburn Municipal Airport LUCP, which is part of the Placer County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (PCALUCP). Approximately 26.5 acres of the eastern part of the

Timberline at Auburn Site are located within Compatibility Zone C1 (See Figure 3-3, Site Plan, Chapter 3, Project Description, of the Draft EIR) and 67.5 acres of the site are located within Zone C2. Zone C1 is affected by moderate degrees of both noise and risk, while the major concern in Zone C2 is the potential annoyance associated with aircraft overflights. Safety is only a concern with regard to uses involving high concentrations of people, and particularly risk-sensitive uses such as schools and hospitals. Noise is addressed in Chapter 9, *Noise*; and safety concerns are addressed in Chapter 13, *Hazardous Materials and Hazards*.

On June 6, 2008, the Airport Land Use Commission staff found the proposed project consistent with the PCALUCP subject to several conditions (See Appendix D of the Draft EIR, Airport Land Use Compatibility Determination). The ALUC conditions include consistency with PACLUCP noise CNEL contours, residential density and commercial intensity, open land requirements, airspace protection, and overflight deed notification. A detailed analysis of the project residential density and commercial intensity consistency is located in Appendix D.

As outlined in the Airport Land Use Compatibility Determination a deed notice alerting potential residents to air traffic overflights is required for all residential uses within the C1 and C2 zones. Should future residents not be notified of the potential for overflights a ***potentially significant*** impact to the future operations of the airport could occur.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measure that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts to compatibility with the Placer County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.

4-3 *The applicant shall inform and notify prospective buyers and renters of residential properties in writing, prior to purchase or signing of lease agreement, about existing and on-going aircraft overflights in the form of a disclosure statement. The notifications shall disclose that the Timberline at Auburn site is within an overflight zone, which may result in periodic noise from aircraft. The language and format of such notification shall be reviewed and approved by the County Attorney prior to recording any final map(s). Each disclosure statement shall be acknowledged with the signature of each prospective residential property owner/renter.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce Impact 4-3 (Impacts to compatibility with the Placer County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan) to a less-than-significant level because the applicant would inform and notify prospective buyers and renters about existing and on-going overflights.

4.2 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS TO SPECIAL-STATUS PLANTS (IMPACT 5-1)

According to the literature and databases search, the project site could contain potential habitat for Butte County fritillary, big-scale balsamroot, Brandegee's clarkia, and oval-leaved viburnum. All four special-status plant (CNPS List) species are found within cismontane woodland habitat, and all but the Big-scale balsamroot are also found in chaparral habitat. Therefore, if present, construction and operational activities associated with the proposed project could disturb these special-status plant species, resulting in a ***potentially significant*** impact.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measure that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts to special-status plant species.

5-1 *Prior to Grading Plan approval for each phase of the project, focused surveys shall be performed by a qualified botanist in order to determine the presence or absence of the following special-status plant species: Butte County fritillary, big-scale balsamroot, Brandegee's clarkia, and oval-leaved viburnum. The surveys shall be conducted on-site as well as in off-site improvement areas (off-site sewer alignment, Bell Road / New Airport Road intersection, and Bell Road / First Street intersection), as applicable for each phase, during the identification periods (bloom periods) for all of the special-status plant species listed above. The general bloom periods of each species are as follows: big-scale balsamroot blooms from March to June; Brandegee's clarkia blooms from April to May; Butte County fritillary blooms from March to May; and oval-leaved viburnum blooms from May to June. If any of the special-status plant species are found, a mitigation plan shall be prepared in consultation with the appropriate agencies. The plan shall detail the various mitigation approaches to ensure no net loss of special-status plants. Mitigation could include, but would not necessarily be limited to, avoidance of the plant species, salvage of plant materials where possible, acquisition of credits at an approved mitigation bank, or acquisition and preservation of property that supports the plant species.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce Impact 5-1 (Impacts to special-status plants) to a less-than-significant level because focused surveys would be conducted prior to grading that would confirm or deny the presence of the identified potentially occurring special-status plant species. In addition, the mitigation measure provides performance standards for additional measures if any of the species are found during the surveys (including avoidance and/or preservation).

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS TO WESTERN BURROWING OWL (IMPACT 5-2)

According to the CNDBB search, three documented occurrences of the western burrowing owl have been identified within 20 miles of the project site. The occurrences are located 12, 15 and 18 miles west of the proposed project site, and at substantially lower elevations. As such, project activities are not anticipated to result in the destruction of burrows or foraging habitat adjacent to occupied burrows. Although the potential for western burrowing owl to occur on-site is low, the project site is designated by the CDFG as potential wintering habitat for western burrowing owl. Furthermore, buildout of the proposed project is projected to occur over a 10 to 15 year time span, which could result in impacts to western burrowing owl at different times throughout buildout of the project. Therefore, project implementation could result in ***potentially significant*** impacts to the western burrowing owl.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts to western burrowing owl.

5-2(a) *Prior to Grading Plan approval for each phase of the project, pre-construction burrowing owl surveys shall be conducted on the project site and within 250 feet of the boundary of each phase by a qualified biologist no more than 30 days prior to initiation of construction activities for each phase. The surveys shall also be conducted in off-site improvement areas (off-site sewer alignment, Bell Road / New Airport Road intersection, and Bell Road / First Street intersection). Presence or signs of burrowing owls and all potentially occupied burrows shall be recorded and monitored according to CDFG and California Burrowing Owl Consortium guidelines. If burrowing owls are not detected by sign or direct observation, further mitigation is not necessary. If burrowing owls are detected, the project applicant shall implement Mitigation Measure 5-2(b).*

5-2(b) *Prior to initiation of any construction activities, during the non-breeding season (September 1 through January 31) a non-disturbance buffer of 160 feet, and during the nesting season (February 1 to August 31) a non-disturbance buffer of 250 feet shall be established around each burrow with an active nest until the young have fledged and are able to exit the burrow, as determined by a qualified biologist. In the case of occupied burrows without active nesting, active burrows after the young have fledged, or if development commences after the breeding season, passive relocation, which involves installing a one-way door at the burrow entrance to encourage the owls to move from the occupied burrow of the owls, shall be performed. The CDFG shall be consulted for current guidelines and methods for passive relocation of any owls found on the site.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 5-2 (Impacts to western burrowing owl) to a less-than-significant level because the measures require pre-construction burrowing owl surveys to be conducted and, if burrowing owls are detected, a non-disturbance buffer of 160 feet, and during the nesting season (February 1 to August 31), a non-disturbance buffer of 250-feet shall be established around each burrow with an active nest until the young have fledged and are able to exit the burrow. For occupied burrows without active nesting, active burrows after the young have fledged, or if development commences after the breeding season, passive relocation, which involves installing a one-way door at the burrow entrance to encourage the owls to move from the occupied burrow of the owls, is required.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS TO RAPTORS AND MIGRATORY BIRD SPECIES (IMPACT 5-3)

Several species of raptors, including northern harrier and white-tailed kite have the potential to nest within the mixed oak woodland habitat on-site. In addition, the trees, shrubs, and grasslands on the site provide suitable nesting habitat for a number of common and special-status birds, including loggerhead shrike, protected solely by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Therefore, the project's impacts to raptors and migratory birds would be ***potentially significant.***

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts to raptors and migratory bird species.

5-3(a) *Prior to Grading Plan approval for each phase of the project, if construction is expected to occur during the raptor nesting season (February 1 to August 31), a pre-construction raptor survey shall be performed to determine if active raptor nests are present within the boundaries of each phase, or within 500 feet of said boundaries. The survey shall be conducted on-site as well as in off-site improvement areas (off-site sewer alignment, Bell Road / New Airport Road intersection, and Bell Road / First Street intersection). The survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist not more than 30 days prior to the onset of construction activities for each phase. If active raptor nests are not found on or within 500 feet of the phase area, further mitigation is not necessary. In addition, if construction activities are proposed to occur during the non-breeding season (September 1 to January 31), a survey is not required and further studies are not necessary. However, if active raptor nests are found on or within 500 feet of the phase area, the project applicant shall implement Mitigation Measure 5-3(b).*

5-3(b) *Construction activities shall not occur within 500 feet of the active raptor nests until the young have fledged or until the biologist has determined that the nest is not active any longer.*

5-3(c) *Prior to Grading Plan approval for each project phase, if any vegetation removal is expected to occur as a result of the project during the typical avian nesting season (February 1 to August 31), a pre-construction survey shall be performed to determine if active migratory bird nests are present on or within 500 feet of the phase area. The survey shall be conducted on-site as well as in off-site improvement areas (off-site sewer alignment, Bell Road / New Airport Road intersection, and Bell Road / First Street intersection). The survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist not more than two weeks prior to the onset of vegetation removal. If active migratory bird nests are found, disturbance or removal of the nest shall be avoided until the young have fledged and the nest is not active any longer.*

It should be noted that extensive buffers, such as those recommended for nesting raptors, are not necessary for nesting avian species protected solely by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. However, depending on the bird species, site conditions, and the proposed construction activities near an active nest, a small buffer could be prescribed, as determined by the biologist. Alternatively, vegetation removal could be scheduled to avoid all potential impacts. Vegetation removal conducted between September 1 and January 31 will prevent impacts to nesting birds or unfledged young.

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce Impact 5-3 (Impacts to raptors and migratory bird species) to a less-than-significant level because the measures require pre-construction surveys during breeding seasons for any of the species, and if said surveys confirm the presence of any raptors or migratory bird species, construction activities shall not occur within 500 feet of any nest until the young have fledged and, if determined

by a qualified biologist, other restrictions may be imposed on construction activities in the vicinity of any active nest(s).

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS TO SPECIAL-STATUS BAT SPECIES (IMPACT 5-4)

Several species of special-status bat, including the hoary bat, western red bat, Yuma myotis, Townsend's big-eared bat, and the pallid bat have the potential to roost and/or nest within the mixed oak woodland habitat located on the project site. In addition, the non-native annual grassland and/or oak woodland habitat located on-site present potentially suitable foraging/roosting/nesting habitat for the abovementioned bat species. Therefore, development of the proposed project could have ***potentially significant*** impacts to special-status bat species.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts to special-status bat species.

5-4(a) *Prior to Grading Plan approval for each phase of the project, pre-construction surveys of all potential special-status bat roosting habitat locations on-site shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than 30 days prior to initiation of construction activities associated with each phase. The surveys shall be conducted on-site as well as in off-site improvement areas (off-site sewer alignment, Bell Road / New Airport Road intersection, and Bell Road / First Street intersection). Any presence and/or signs of the hoary bat, western red bat, Yuma myotis, Townsend's big-eared bat, or the pallid bat shall be recorded and monitored according to CDFG guidelines. If bat species are not detected by sign or direct observation, further mitigation is not necessary. If any of the special-status bat species are detected, the project applicant shall be responsible for implementing Mitigation Measure 5-4(b).*

5-4(b) *If bat roosting sites and/or nursing sites of any special-status bat species are identified within the boundaries of each phase, a no-disturbance buffer zone of 250 feet (or as determined in consultation with CDFG) shall be established by a qualified biologist around each identified roosting site during the nursery season (April 1 through August 31). Any required eviction of bat roosts shall be conducted by a qualified biologist during the non-breeding season (September 1 through March 31). Eviction activities shall be conducted using bat exclusion techniques (i.e., exclusionary nets, etc.) developed by Bat Conservation International (BCI) and in consultation with CDFG.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 5-4 (Impacts to special-status bat species) to a less-than-significant level because prior to the development of the project, focused surveys for the bat species will be required to be performed during the breeding season for each species. If bats are detected, a non-disturbance buffer of 250-feet shall be established around each bat roost during the nursery season (April 1 through August 31). In addition, any required eviction of bat roosts shall be conducted by a qualified biologist during the non-breeding season (September 1 through March 31) using bat exclusion techniques (i.e., exclusionary nets, etc.) developed by Bat Conservation International (BCI) and in consultation with CDFG.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS TO OAK WOODLAND COMMUNITIES AND SIGNIFICANT TREES (IMPACT 5-5)

Implementation of the proposed project would impact approximately 22.86 acres of oak woodland. In addition, 10 Significant Trees totaling 333 inches dbh would be removed by implementation of the proposed project (excluding the 25 Significant Trees recommended for removal by the arborist report due to poor health and not requiring mitigation per County policy). In addition, the project includes the upsizing of an off-site sewer pipe, and construction of off-site intersection improvements which would result in the removal of a relatively small number of additional oak trees, one of which is considered Significant. Including the one offsite 27" dbh Significant Tree to be removed by the project, the total number of Significant Trees to be removed is 11, encompassing a total of 360 inches. In addition, construction of the improvements could impact nearby trees and would require implementation of protection methods during construction. Therefore, the project would result in a ***potentially significant*** impact to protected trees.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts to oak woodland communities and significant trees.

5-5(a) *To mitigate oak woodland losses within the development footprint, the project shall provide mitigation at a 1:1 ratio by either of the following methods: (1) preserve in perpetuity 22.86 acres of oak woodland in Placer County, or (2) make an in-lieu fee payment to the Placer County Tree Preservation Fund equivalent to the fair market value of a conservation easement on 22.86 acres of oak woodland property in Placer County, with such fair market value established via an appraisal within 120 days of the time of approval of the tentative subdivision up for the project, or (3) a combination of these two mitigation methods. Any in-lieu payment shall be paid at the time of recordation of the first final subdivision map on the property. Such in-lieu funds shall include both a conservation component and an in-perpetuity management component. These funds will be used by the County to purchase conservation easements for other oak woodland in the County. If changes in the project are required during the Grading Plan process that result in changes in the impact area, the amount of such oak woodland acreage to be mitigated shall be revised accordingly consistent with this Mitigation Measure 5-5(a).*

5-5(b) *Each Significant Tree (24 inches dbh or greater) identified for removal (other than those identified by the arborist for removal) shall be mitigated by either of the following methods:*

(1) Prior to Grading Plan approval, the applicant shall submit payment to the Placer County Tree Preservation Fund in the amount of $36,000 for impacts to Significant Trees on-site. If changes in the project are required during the Grading Plan process that result in changes in impacts to Significant Trees, this figure shall be revised accordingly consistent with this Mitigation Measure 5-5(b); or

(2) For the 11 Significant Trees to be removed because of project development, the project shall include planting of on-site 24-inch box trees and 15-gallon trees (cumulatively 25%), 5-gallon trees (25 percent) and D-pots (50 percent) at the ratios outlined in Table 5-3 below:

Table 5-3
Proposed Significant Oak Tree Mitigation Ratios

Condition	Replacement Value/ Inch of Impact	Percent of Total Mitigation
24-inch box	1/3	25% Cumulative
15-gallon	1/2	
5-gallon	2/1	25%
D-pot	5/1	50%

Mitigation tree planting shall occur in two open space areas specified on the project site. These planting areas on-site, once planted with replacement oak trees, will also serve as replacement habitat for oak woodland values lost on the project site. Mitigation tree planting shall be installed by the applicant and inspected and approved by an authorized representative of the DRC prior to acceptance of improvements by the Engineering and Surveying Department. At its discretion, the DRC may establish an alternate deadline for installation of mitigation replacement trees if weather or other circumstances prevent the completion of this requirement.

5-5(c) *Prior to Grading Plan approval, including the off-site sewer improvements and intersections of Bell Road / First Street and Bell Road / New Airport Road, the plans shall include a list of tree protection methods, for review and approval by the Planning Department. The list of tree protection methods shall be implemented during construction of off-site improvements. The list of tree protection methods shall include, but not limited to, the following:*

- *The applicant shall hire an International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) certified arborist to be present on-site during all grading, construction, and tree removal activities. The arborist shall evaluate all proposed improvements that may affect each native tree to be preserved, make recommendations on these proposed improvements, and oversee construction of these improvements during site development to ensure that the appropriate trees are removed or preserved in compliance with the tree removal permit and approved Improvement Plans.*

- *The applicant shall install a four-foot tall, brightly colored (yellow or orange), synthetic mesh material fence around all oak trees to be preserved that are greater than six inches dbh (or 10 inches dbh aggregate for multi-trunked trees). The fencing shall delineate an area that is at least the radius of which is equal to the largest radius of the protected tree's drip line plus one foot. The fence shall be installed prior to any site preparation or construction equipment being moved onsite or any site preparation or construction activities taking place. Development of this site, including grading, shall not be allowed until this condition is satisfied. Any encroachment within the areas listed below, including within driplines of trees to be saved, must first be approved by a designated representative of the Development Review Committee (DRC). Grading, clearing, or storage of equipment or machinery may not occur until a representative of the DRC has inspected and approved all temporary construction fencing. This includes both onsite and offsite improvements.*

Trees shall be preserved where feasible. This may include the use of retaining walls, planter islands, or other techniques commonly associated with tree preservation. The Grading/Improvement Plans shall indicate the location of the fencing and include a note describing the fencing requirements consistent with this mitigation measure.

- *The project applicant shall implement the following guidelines before and during grading and construction for protection of all oak trees to be preserved:*
    - *Plans and specifications shall clearly state protection procedures for oak trees on the project site. The specifications shall also include a provision for remedies if oak trees are damaged;*
    - *Before construction commences, those oak trees within 25 feet of construction sites shall be pruned and the soil aerated and fertilized;*
    - *Vehicles, construction equipment, mobile offices, or materials shall not be parked, stored, or operated within the driplines of oak trees to be preserved;*
    - *Cuts and fills around trees shall be avoided where feasible.*
    - *Soil surface removal greater than one foot shall not occur within the driplines of oak trees to be preserved. Cuts shall not occur within five feet of their trunks;*
    - *Earthen fill greater than one foot deep shall not be placed within the driplines of oak trees to be preserved, and fill shall not be placed within five feet of their trunks;*
    - *Underground utility line trenching shall not be placed within the driplines of oak trees to be preserved where feasible without first obtaining approval from a designated representative of the DRC. If it is necessary to install underground utilities within the driplines of oak trees, boring or drilling rather than trenching shall be used;*
    - *Paving shall not be placed in the vicinity of oak trees to be preserved (at a minimum, within the dripline of any oak tree) without first obtaining approval from a designated representative of the DRC; and*
    - *Irrigation lines or sprinklers shall not be allowed within the dripline of native oak trees.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 5-5 (Impacts to oak woodland communities and significant trees) to a less-than-significant level because, pursuant to the County's Oak Woodland Policy, which recommends payment of $100 per inch dbh of Significant Trees impacted to be deposited into the Placer County Tree Preservation Fund, the project applicant would submit to the Tree Preservation Fund a payment in the amount of $36,000 for impacts to Significant Trees. The Tree Preservation Fund is used to plant and maintain trees on publicly owned property, to acquire easements of right-of-way, and for educational programs and materials. In addition, the applicant would be required to preserve 22.86 acres of oak woodland in Placer County or make an in-lieu fee payment to the Placer County Tree Preservation Fund.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS TO JURISDICTIONAL WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES AND WATERS OF THE STATE (IMPACT 5-6)

A total of 3.468 acres of jurisdictional wetlands and other waters of the U.S. are located on-site. It should be noted that a Section 404 Permit application was submitted to ACOE based the on the site plan for the project that identified 2.493 acres of jurisdictional wetlands and waters of the U.S. would be filled by mass grading, which includes 0.060-acre of seasonal marsh; 0.046-acre of wetland; 2.055 acres seasonal wetland swale; and 0.332-acre of ephemeral drainage. Any waters of the U.S. that would be lost or disturbed would be required to be replaced or rehabilitated on a "no-net-loss" basis in accordance with the USACE mitigation guidelines, and habitat restoration, rehabilitation, and/or replacement should be at a location and by methods agreeable to the USACE.

The Section 404 Permit application identifies the preservation and purchase of mitigation credits at a nearby off-site location. The current project proposal includes constructing wetlands on the ARD property.

In addition, the project includes the upsizing of an off-site sewer pipe through the ARD property and properties north of the project site. Although the off-site sewer alignment area does not include wetlands or seasonal wetlands, the construction impact area is located near seasonal wetland swales on the ARD property. During construction of the off-site sewer alignment, Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall be implemented to ensure impacts to nearby wetlands do not occur.

Because the project would impact 2.493 acres of jurisdictional wetlands and other waters of the U.S., a ***potentially significant*** impact would occur.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts to jurisdictional waters of the United States and waters of the State.

5-6(a) *To the extent feasible, the project shall be designed and constructed to avoid and minimize adverse effects to waters of the United States or jurisdictional waters of the State of California within the project area and adhere to the USACE regulations and guidelines.*

5-6(b) *Prior to Grading Plan approval for each phase of the project, a Section 404 permit for fill of jurisdictional wetlands shall be acquired, and mitigation for impacts to jurisdictional waters that cannot be avoided shall conform with the USACE "no-net-loss" policy and the USACE Regulatory Guidance Letter No. 02-2 establishing policies and guidance on appropriate mitigation for impacts to jurisdictional waters. Mitigation for impacts to both federal and State jurisdictional waters shall be addressed using these guidelines.*

If a Section 404 permit is obtained, the applicant must also obtain a water quality certification from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act (CWA).

5-6(c) *Implement Mitigation Measure 10-2(c).*

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 5-6 (Impacts to jurisdictional waters of the United States and waters of the State) to a less-than-significant level through either preservation of on-site resources or payment of an in-lieu fee to the USACE, as well as applicable permitting with the USACE.

4.3 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS TO TRAFFIC FLOW FROM CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC ASSOCIATED WITH DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROJECT SITE (IMPACT 7-1)

The proposed project would be constructed over a multi-year period (approximately 10-15 years). Construction activities would result in numerous disruptions to the transportation system in and around the project area (grading, excavation, paving, demolition, etc.). Heavy vehicles would access the project area for delivery of materials and removal of debris. Project designs do not include the importation or exportation of fill material to/from the project site during any of the project phases. However, construction vehicles and equipment would need to be staged during construction periods. Short-term construction activities and staging of construction vehicles and equipment could result in degraded roadway operations, resulting in a ***potentially significant*** impact.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measure that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts to traffic flow from construction traffic associated with development of the project site.

7-1 *Submit, for review and approval, a striping and signing plan with the project Improvement Plans. The plan shall include all on- and off-site traffic control devices and shall be reviewed by the County Traffic Engineer. A construction signing plan shall also be provided with the Improvement Plans for review and approval by the County Traffic Engineer.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce Impact 7-1 (Impacts to traffic flow from construction traffic associated with development of the project site) to a less-than-significant level because the County Traffic Engineer would review the striping and signing plan, traffic control devices, and construction signing plan to ensure safe flow of traffic during construction.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS TO STUDY INTERSECTIONS UNDER THE EXISTING PLUS PROJECT PHASE 1 CONDITIONS (IMPACT 7-2)

Phase 1 Project traffic causes the intersection of Bell Road/Richardson Drive to degrade from acceptable LOS B under Existing Conditions to unacceptable LOS D (AM) and E (PM). The addition of Phase 1 Project traffic would also result in slight increases in delay at four (4) intersections that are currently operating at unacceptable LOS under Existing Conditions, which would create ***potentially significant*** traffic impacts.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts to study intersections under the Existing Plus Project Phase 1 Conditions.

Intersection #2) Bell Road/Richardson Drive

7-2(a) *Construct the following improvements at the intersection of Bell Road and Richardson Drive with the phase of development that will generate a project total of 123 PM peak hour vehicle trips or more:*

- *Signalize the intersection and widen the southbound and westbound approaches as noted below to accommodate the projected 95th percentile queue lengths:*
  - *Widen the westbound (Bell Road) approach to include an exclusive right-turn lane; with this improvement the westbound approach will include one left-turn lane, one through lane and one right-turn lane.*
  - *Widen the southbound (Richardson Drive) approach to include an additional left-turn lane; with this improvement the southbound approach will include one left-turn lane, and one shared through-left-right-turn lane.*

  Or

- *Install a one lane modern roundabout.*

The improvements to be constructed shall be shown on the Improvement Plans to the satisfaction of the ESD and DPW and shall meet all current and applicable engineering standards.

Because this improvement is included within the CIP, the project would be eligible for reimbursement/fee credit towards the CIP fees for this construction.

Intersection #4) Bell Road/First Street

7-2(b) *Construct a traffic signal at the intersection of Bell Road and First Street with the phase of development that will generate a project total of 240 PM peak hour vehicle trips or more. The traffic signal shall be shown on the Improvement Plans to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works and the Engineering and Surveying Department and shall meet all current and applicable engineering standards. Additional improvements to First Street shall be required to accommodate intersection geometrics, conformance to existing improvements, and curb, gutter, and 8-foot wide sidewalks.*

It should be noted that if the improvement is not included in the CIP, the applicant may request that a reimbursement agreement be set up by the County (with the cost of set-up paid by the applicant) to collect fair share payments of future development projects.

Intersection #16) New Airport Road/Bell Road

7-2(c) *Improve the intersection of Bell Road and New Airport Road to the following standard with the phase of development that will generate a project total of 106 PM peak hour vehicle trips or more:*

- *Widen the New Airport southbound approach to include one left turn lane, one through lane, and one right turn lane.*

The improvements shall be shown on the Improvement Plans to the satisfaction of the DPW and ESD and shall meet all current and applicable engineering standards. Additional widening may be required to accommodate auxiliary lanes, intersection geometrics, bicycle lanes, or conformance to existing improvements. The roadway structural section shall be designed for a Traffic Index of 9. 0, but said section shall not be less than 3" AC/8" Class 2 AB, unless otherwise approved by DPW and the Engineering and Surveying Department. (Ref Section 4, LDM).

It should be noted that if the improvement is not included in the CIP, the applicant may request that a reimbursement agreement be set up by the County (with the cost of set-up paid by the applicant) to collect fair share payments of future development projects.

Intersection #18) Bell Road/I-80 WB Ramps

7-2(d) *This project will be subject to the payment of traffic impact fees that are in effect in this area (Auburn/Bowman), pursuant to applicable Ordinances and Resolutions. The applicant is notified that the following traffic mitigation fee(s) will be required and shall be paid to Placer County DPW prior to issuance of any building permits for the project:*

- *County Wide Traffic Limitation Zone: Article 15.28.010, Placer County Code*

The current total combined estimated fee is $2,570,234 ($4,705 per DUE). The fees were calculated using the information supplied. If either the use or the square footage changes, then the fees will change. The actual fees paid will be those in effect at the time the payment occurs for each phase.

Intersection #19) Bell Road/I-80 EB Ramps

7-2(e) *Implement Mitigation Measure 7-2(d).*

7-2(f) *Prior to Improvement Plan approval for each phase, the applicant shall submit to the ESD and DPW for review and approval, an accounting of trips prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer identifying the number of PM peak hour vehicle trips that the proposed phase will generate along with the total number of PM peak hour trips generated by all phases of the project with approved Improvement Plan approvals. Upon approval of Improvement Plans for the phase that generates a project total of more than 240 PM peak hour trips, this accounting of trips shall not be required for the development of the remainder of the project phases.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce Impact 7-2 (Impacts to study intersections under the Existing Plus Project Phase 1 Conditions) to a less-than-significant level because the project applicant would pay traffic mitigation fees and construct improvements that would improve traffic operations to acceptable levels.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS TO STUDY INTERSECTIONS UNDER THE SHORT TERM PLUS PROJECT PHASE 1 CONDITIONS (IMPACT 7-3)

Phase 1 Project traffic would cause the intersection of Bell Road/Richardson Drive to degrade from acceptable LOS B under Existing Conditions to unacceptable LOS D (AM) and E (PM). In addition, the following four (4) intersections are currently found to be operating at unacceptable LOS under Existing Conditions (as well as

Existing Plus Project Phase 1 Conditions and Short-Term No Project Conditions), and the addition Phase 1 Project traffic under the Short Term would result in increases in delay, which would create potentially significant impacts at these locations per the Standards of Significance listed above.

- Intersection #4) Bell Road/First Street
- Intersection #16) New Airport Road/Bell Road
- Intersection #18) Bell Road/I-80 WB Ramps
- Intersection #19) Bell Road/I-80 EB Ramps

Therefore, the Short Term Plus Project Phase 1 Conditions would result in ***potentially significant*** intersection impacts.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts to study intersections under the Short Term Plus Project Phase 1 Conditions.

Intersection #2) Bell Road/Richardson Drive

7-3(a) *Implement Mitigation Measure 7-2(a). Once implemented, either of the two improvements recommended for Intersection #2 would reduce the impact to the Bell Road/Richardson Drive intersection to a less-than-significant level.*

Intersection #4) Bell Road/First Street

7-3(b) *Implement Mitigation Measure 7-2(b). Once implemented, the required improvement for Intersection #4 would reduce the impact to the Bell Road/First Street intersection to a less-than-significant level.*

Intersection #16) New Airport Road/Bell Road

7-3(c) *Implement Mitigation Measure 7-2(c). Once implemented, the required improvements to New Airport Road/Bell Road (Intersection #16) would lower the "Plus Project" v/c ratio to less than the "No Project" v/c ratio. This approach to mitigating the project's impact is consistent with direction provided by the ESD.*

Intersection #18) Bell Road/I-80 WB Ramps

7-3(d) *Implement Mitigation Measure 7-2(d). The Bell Road/I-80 WB Ramps intersection is included within the CCIP; therefore, the project applicant shall pay the CCIP fee, which shall reduce the project's impact to a less-than-significant level per Policy 6 of the ABCP.*

Intersection #19) Bell Road/I-80 EB Ramps

7-3(e) *Implement Mitigation Measure 7-2(e). The Bell Road/I-80 EB Ramps intersection is included within the CCIP; therefore, the project applicant shall pay the CCIP fee, which shall reduce the project's impact to a less-than-significant level per Policy 6 of the ABCP.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 7-3 (Impacts to study intersections under the Short Term Plus Project Phase 1 Conditions) to a less-than-significant level because the project applicant would construct improvements that would improve Short Term Plus Project intersection operations to acceptable levels of service.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS TO ARTERIAL OPERATIONS UNDER SHORT TERM PLUS PROJECT PHASE 1 CONDITIONS (IMPACT 7-5)

Implementation of Phase 1 of the proposed project would exacerbate unacceptable LOS during the PM peak hour at the arterial segment of Northbound SR 49 between Willow Creek Drive and Bell Road. This arterial segment was determined to operate at unacceptable LOS for Short Term No Project Conditions and implementation of Phase 1 of the project would further degrade operations on the arterial segment, which is considered a ***potentially significant*** impact.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts to arterial operations under the Short Term Plus Project Phase 1 Conditions.

7-5 *Implement Mitigation Measure 7-2(d).*

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 7-5 (Impacts to arterial operations under the Short Term Plus Project Phase 1 Conditions) to a less-than-significant level because the project applicant would pay the applicable CIP fee(s) toward improvements that would improve Short Term Plus Project arterial segment operations to acceptable levels of service. These improvements are currently included in the CIP, which is a reasonable, enforceable program that is sufficiently tied to the actual mitigation of the traffic impacts at issue. Therefore, payment of the CIP fee would guarantee that the needed improvements would be constructed.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS TO LANE QUEUING UNDER THE SHORT TERM PLUS PROJECT PHASE 1 CONDITIONS (IMPACT 7-6)

The following four (4) intersection movements on SR 49 would have queues greater than the available storage length:

- Northbound Left at the intersection of SR 49/Dry Creek Road
- Northbound Through at the intersection of SR 49/Bell Road
- Northbound Right at the intersection of SR 49/Bell Road
- Southbound Through/Through-Right at the intersection of SR 49/Bell Road

The above four (4) turning movement queues are already impacted under the Short Term No Project Condition. The lack of available storage length for the four (4) above-listed intersection movements under the Short Term Plus Project Phase 1 Conditions is a ***potentially significant*** impact.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts to lane queuing under the Short Term Plus Project Phase 1 Conditions.

Northbound left at the intersection of SR 49/Dry Creek Road

7-6(a) Implement Mitigation Measure 7-2(d).

Northbound Through at the intersection of SR 49/Bell Road, Northbound Right at the intersection of SR 49/Bell Road, Southbound Through, Through-Right at the intersection of SR 49/Bell Road

7-6(b) Implement Mitigation Measure 7-2(d).

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 7-6 (Impacts to lane queuing under the Short Term Plus Project Phase 1 Conditions) to a less-than-significant level because the project applicant would pay the applicable CIP fee(s) toward improvements that would improve Short Term Plus Project lane queuing operations to provide adequate storage. These improvements are currently included in the CIP, which is a reasonable, enforceable program that is sufficiently tied to the actual mitigation of the traffic impacts at issue. Therefore, payment of the CIP fee would guarantee that the needed improvements would be constructed.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS TO STUDY INTERSECTIONS UNDER THE SHORT-TERM PLUS PROJECT PHASE 1 AND PHASE 2 CONDITIONS (IMPACT 7-7)

A comparison of levels of service for Phase 1 Project intersection LOS shows that the same intersections found to operate at unacceptable LOS under Phase 1 Project Conditions would continue to operate at unacceptable LOS under Phases 1 and 2 Project Conditions, with slight increase in delays. As discussed previously under Short Term Phase 1 Project Conditions, the impacted intersections are as follows:

- Intersection #2) Bell Road/Richardson Drive;
- Intersection # 4) Bell Road/First Street;
- Intersection #16) New Airport Road/Bell Road;
- Intersection # 18) Bell Road/I-80 EB Ramps; and
- Intersection #19) Bell Road/I-80 EB Ramps.

Therefore, the Short Term Plus Project Phases 1 and 2 Conditions would result in ***potentially significant*** intersection impacts.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts lane queuing under the Short Term Plus Project Phase 1 and Phase 2 Conditions.

7-7 *Implement Mitigation Measures 7-2(a) through 7-2(e).*

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce Impact 7-7 (Impacts to study intersections under the Existing Plus Project Phase 1 and Phase 2 Conditions) to a less-than-significant level because the project applicant would pay traffic mitigation fees and construct improvements that would improve "Plus Project" traffic operations to acceptable levels.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS TO ARTERIAL OPERATIONS UNDER SHORT TERM PLUS PROJECT PHASE 1 AND PHASE 2 CONDITIONS (IMPACT 7-9)

Short Term Plus Project Phases 1 and 2 PM peak hour (directional) arterial operations along Northbound SR 49 between Willow Creek Drive and Bell Road is projected to operate at deficient arterial segment LOS. This arterial segment is also impacted under the Short Term No Project and Short Term Plus Project Phase 1 Conditions and implementation of Phase 2 of the project would further degrade operations on the arterial segment, which is considered a ***potentially significant*** impact.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measure that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts to arterial operations under the Short Term Plus Project Phase 1 and Phase 2 Conditions.

7-9 *Implement Mitigation Measure 7-5.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce Impact 7-9 (Impacts to arterial operations under the Short Term Plus Project Phase 1 and Phase 2 Conditions) to a less-than-significant level because the project applicant would pay the applicable CIP fee(s) toward improvements that would improve Short Term Plus Project Phase 1 and 2 arterial segment operations to acceptable levels of service. These improvements are currently included in the CIP, which is a reasonable, enforceable program that is sufficiently tied to the actual mitigation of the traffic impacts at issue. Therefore, payment of the CIP fee would guarantee that the needed improvements would be constructed.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS TO LANE QUEUING UNDER THE SHORT TERM PLUS PROJECT PHASE 1 AND PHASE 2 CONDITIONS (IMPACT 7-10)

The following four (4) intersection movements on SR 49 would have queues greater than the available storage length.

- Northbound Left at the intersection of SR 49/Dry Creek Road
- Northbound Through at the intersection of SR 49/Bell Road
- Northbound Right at the intersection of SR 49/Bell Road
- Southbound Through/Through-Right at the intersection of SR 49/Bell Road

The above four (4) turning movement queues are already impacted under the Short Term No Project and Short Term Plus Project Phase 1 Conditions. The lack of available storage length for the four (4) above-listed intersection movements under the Short Term Plus Project Phases 1 and 2 Conditions is a ***potentially significant*** impact.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts lane queuing under the Short Term Plus Project Phase 1 and Phase 2 Conditions.

7-10 *Implement Mitigation Measures 7-6(a) and (b).*

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 7-10 (Impacts to lane queuing under the Short Term Plus Project Phase 1 and Phase 2 Conditions) to a less-than-significant level because the project applicant would pay the applicable CIP fee(s) toward improvements that would improve Short Term Plus Project Phase 1 and Phase 2 lane queuing operations to provide adequate storage. These improvements are currently included in the CIP, which is a reasonable, enforceable program that is sufficiently tied to the actual mitigation of the traffic impacts at issue. Therefore, payment of the CIP fee would guarantee that the needed improvements would be constructed.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS RELATED TO EMERGENCY ACCESS AND/OR PROJECT ACCESS (IMPACT 7-11)

Emergency Vehicle Access

The project would be served by two fire stations both located within two miles of the project site under the jurisdiction of the Placer County Fire Department/CAL FIRE. Emergency medical and fire services would be able to serve the project site in a timely response. In addition, CAL FIRE and the Placer County Fire Department will review final site design prior to approval. However, the Golden Eagle Road EVA is not connected to the project site consistent with State requirements, therefore impacts related to emergency vehicle access to the project site would be ***potentially significant.***

Project Site Access

While the proposed access for the project would be expected to result in acceptable traffic circulation overall, additional improvements would be needed to the Richardson Drive/Bell Road intersection upon completion of improvements per Mitigation Measure 7-2(a), resulting in a ***potentially significant*** impact.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts related to emergency access and/or project access.

7-11(a) *The project applicant shall construct an emergency access road from the existing Golden Eagle Drive to each lot that is developed west of the intersection of Road "A" and Road "C" to the satisfaction of the ESD and the servicing fire district.*

7-11(b) *Concurrent with the completion of the Richardson Drive/Bell Road improvements outlined in Mitigation Measure 7-2(a), the project applicant shall restrict Bell Road driveway movements (driveway accessing Lot 33) to right-in right-out by construction of a pork-chop median within the encroachment or raised median within Bell Road. The project applicant shall submit Improvement Plans for the proposed Richardson Drive/Bell Road intersection improvements for the review and approval by Engineering and Surveying Department.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce Impact 7-11 (Impacts related to emergency access and/or project access) to a less-than-significant level because the project would be required to provide emergency access roads and project access improvements.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS TO TRANSIT FACILITIES (IMPACT 7-12)

The proposed project has the potential to create demand in addition to the existing route system, which would require a re-route of the existing fixed route. Four bus turnouts/stops along Richardson Drive have been incorporated on the project site plan, consistent with County direction. The commercial nature of the proposed project is expected to increase ridership on the existing transit routes in the project vicinity. Because the commercial patrons and residential occupants of the project will increase demand for transit and the final design of the proposed bus/transit turnouts need to be approved by multiple parties, the project's impact to transit service would be ***potentially significant.***

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measure that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts to transit facilities.

7-12 *The project applicant shall provide bus/transit turnout(s) to the satisfaction of the California Highway Patrol, local bus service provider, the Engineering and Surveying Department, and the Department of Public Works along both sides of Richardson Drive, south of Education Street, or along both sides of the newly constructed section of Education Street. Turnouts along Richardson Drive shall require the removal of as many on-street parking stalls as necessary to safely access the turnout. Turnouts along Education Street shall consist of a wider roadway cross-section to incorporate 7.5-foot wide bikelanes. A letter shall be provided from the CHP and local bus service provider which addresses the need for a turnout and the turnout design (if required) and the turnout shall be as shown on the project Improvement Plans prior to their approval.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce Impact 7-12 (Impacts to transit facilities) to a less-than-significant level because the California Highway Patrol, local bus service provider, and County Engineering and Surveying Department would review the Improvement Plans for bus/transit turnout(s).

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS TO BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES (IMPACT 7-13)

The proposed project includes designs for new pedestrian sidewalks that would connect existing sidewalks in the residential neighborhoods to the project site. The proposed sidewalks would increase the connectivity of the area and are considered to be a beneficial impact. Overall, the construction and operation of the proposed project is not anticipated to impact the local pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure; however, the proposed sidewalks would need to meet the Americans with Disabilities Act standards and any related ABCP standards. Therefore, the potential impacts related to on-site and off-site pedestrian and bicycle facilities are considered ***potentially significant***.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measure that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts to bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

7-13 *Prior to Improvement Plan approval for each phase of the project, the project applicant shall ensure that the sidewalk network meets Americans with Disabilities Act accessibility requirements, subject to review and approval by the Engineering and Surveying Department and the Department of Public Works.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce Impact 7-13 (Impacts to bicycle and pedestrian facilities) to a less-than-significant level because the County Engineering and Surveying Department would review the Improvement Plans for pathway design compliance with the Americans with ADA and any applicable ABCP standards.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS RESULTING FROM INADEQUATE PARKING CAPACITY (IMPACT 7-14)

The total number of parking spaces proposed for the project – including guest parking – is 1,994, which is 16 spaces less than the amount of parking required for the project per the Placer County Zoning Ordinance. With County approval of a parking variance to allow for one parking stall per loft living unit located above the commercial buildings on Richardson Drive, the project would include sufficient parking. It should be noted that the project Traffic Study includes a recommendation that the 17 parallel parking spaces proposed along the west side of Richardson Drive, south of Education Street, should be removed upon completion of Phase 3 of the project, which is when Richardson Drive will be fully extended through the project site. However, the possibility exists for three to four spaces to be retained on the west side of Richardson immediately south of Education Street. Should the 17 parallel parking spaces proposed along the west side of Richardson Drive, south of Education Street, not be removed upon completion of Phase 3 of the project, a ***potentially significant*** impact could occur.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measure that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts resulting from inadequate parking capacity.

7-14 *Prior to construction acceptance for the Richardson Drive roadway connection to the north, the applicant shall remove the 17 proposed parallel parking spaces along the west side of Richardson Drive, south of Education Street, to the satisfaction of the Engineering and Surveying Department and the Department of Public Works. A note shall be included on the Improvement Plans for the Richardson Drive roadway connection to the north indicating the removal of these parkings spaces prior to completion of the improvements. The County shall determine the feasibility of retaining three to four parking spaces on the west side of Richardson Drive immediately south of Education Street.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce Impact 7-14 (Impacts resulting from inadequate parking capacity) to a less-than-significant level because the applicant shall remove the 17 proposed parallel parking spaces prior to acceptance of the Richardson Drive roadway connection to the north. A note shall be included on the Improvement Plans for the Richardson Drive roadway connection to the north indicating the removal of these parking spaces prior to completion of the improvements.

4.4 AIR QUALITY

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS RELATED TO FUGITIVE PARTICULATE MATTER EMISSIONS AND THE RELEASE OF NOA ASSOCIATED WITH PROJECT CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES (IMPACT 8-1).

Maximum construction emissions would occur during the first phases of construction when clearing, earthmoving, and grading occur. Particulate Matter (PM_{10}) emissions generated by the project (up to 332.93 pounds per day) would exceed the PCAPCD threshold (82 pounds per day) without mitigation. In addition, if on-site rocks contain asbestos, grading and construction activities could release asbestos fibers into the environment, if

not properly controlled. During the first phase of project construction, construction activities associated with the proposed project would generate 332.93 pounds per day of PM_{10} emissions, which would exceed the PCAPCD's significance threshold. In addition, project construction could result in the release of NOA into the air. Therefore, ***potentially significant*** short-term impacts would occur.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts related to fugitive particulate matter emissions and the release of NOA from project construction activities.

8-1(a) *Prior to Grading Plan approval for each phase of project construction, the project applicant shall submit a Construction Emission / Dust Control Plan to the PCAPCD for approval. This plan must address the minimum Administrative Requirements found in section 300 and 400 of PCAPCD Rule 228, Fugitive Dust.*

8-1(b) *The project applicant shall include the following standard note on the Grading Plans: The prime contractor 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 of greater) that will be used an aggregate of 40 or more hours for the construction project. The inventory shall be updated, beginning 30 days after any initial work on site has begun, and shall be submitted on a monthly basis throughout the duration of the project, except that an inventory shall not be required for any 30-day period in which no construction activity occurs. At least three business days prior to the use of subject heavy-duty off-road equipment, the project representative shall provide the PCAPCD with the anticipated construction time line including start date, and name and phone number of the property owner, project manager, and on-site foreman.*

8-1(c) *The project applicant shall include the following standard note on the Grading Plans: 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 to cease operations and the equipment must be repaired within 72 hours. Additional information regarding Rule 202 can be found at: http://www.placer.ca.gov/Departments/Air/Rules.aspx.*

8-1(d) *The project applicant shall include the following standard note on the Grading Plans: The contractor shall suspend all grading operations when fugitive dust exceeds PCAPCD Rule 228 (Fugitive Dust) limitations. The prime contractor shall be responsible for having an individual who is CARB-certified to perform Visible Emissions Evaluations (VEE). This individual shall evaluate compliance with Rule 228 on a weekly basis. It is to be noted that fugitive dust is not to exceed 40 percent opacity and not go beyond property boundary at any time. If lime or other drying agents are utilized to dry out wet grading areas they shall be controlled as to not to exceed PCAPCD Rule 228 Fugitive Dust limitations.*

8-1(e) *Prior to the approval of Grading Plans, an enforcement plan shall be established, and submitted to the PCAPCD for review, in order to weekly evaluate project-related on-and-off- road heavy-duty vehicle engine emission opacities, using standards as defined in California Code of Regulations, Title 13, Sections 2180-2194. An Environmental Coordinator, CARB-certified to perform Visible Emissions Evaluations (VEE), shall routinely evaluate project related off-road and heavy duty on-road equipment emissions for compliance with this requirement. Operators of vehicles and equipment found to exceed opacity limits will be notified and the equipment must be repaired within 72 hours.*

8-1(f) *The project applicant shall include the following standard note on the Grading Plans: During construction, no open burning of removed vegetation shall be allowed. All removed vegetative material shall be either chipped on site or taken to an appropriate disposal site.*

8-1(g) *The project applicant shall include the following standard note on the Grading Plans: The prime contractor shall be responsible for keeping adjacent public thoroughfares clean of silt, dirt, mud, and debris, and shall "wet broom" if silt, dirt, mud or debris is carried over to adjacent public thoroughfares. Dry mechanical sweeping is prohibited.*

8-1(h) *The project applicant shall include the following standard note on the Grading Plans: During construction, traffic speeds on all unpaved surfaces shall be limited to 15 miles per hour or less.*

8-1(i) *The project applicant shall include the following standard note on the Grading Plans: The prime contractor shall suspend all grading operations when wind speeds (including instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 miles per hour and dust is impacting adjacent properties.*

8-1(j) *The project applicant shall include the following standard note on the Grading Plans: The contractor shall apply water twice daily to control dust, as required by Rule 228, Fugitive Dust, to prevent dust impacts off-site. Operational water truck(s) shall be on-site, at all times, to control fugitive dust. Construction vehicles leaving the site shall be clean or cleaned to prevent dust, silt, mud, and dirt from being released or tracked off-site.*

8-1(k) *The project applicant shall include the following standard note on the Grading Plans: During construction, the contractor shall minimize idling time to a maximum of five minutes for all diesel powered equipment.*

8-1(l) *The project applicant shall include the following standard note on the Grading Plans: The contractor shall use CARB ultra low diesel fuel for all diesel-powered equipment. In addition, low sulfur fuel shall be utilized for all stationary equipment. The requirement may be reconsidered if the equipment manufacturer states that said use will void equipment warranties.*

8-1(m) *The project applicant shall include the following standard note on the Grading Plans: The contractor shall utilize existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or clean fuel generators rather than temporary power generators.*

8-1(n) *The project applicant shall include the following standard note on the Grading Plans: All on-site stationary equipment that is classified as 50 hp or greater shall either obtain a State-issued portable equipment permit or a PCAPCD-issued portable equipment permit.*

8-1(o) *Prior to the approval of Grading Plans, the project applicant shall provide a plan to the PCAPCD for approval by the District 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 NO_X reduction compared to the most recent CARB 2005 fleet average. 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.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 8-1 (Impacts related to fugitive particulate matter emissions and the release of NOA from project construction activities) to a less-than-significant level because implementation of the measures would reduce emissions of PM_{10} below the PCAPCD threshold of 82 pounds per day as well as prevent the release of NOA during construction.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS TO NEARBY SENSITIVE RECEPTORS FROM ODORS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROJECT (IMPACT 8-5).

Major stationary sources of odors have not been identified within the vicinity of the project site. At full buildout, the proposed project would include residential, office (professional or medical), retail, and restaurant uses on approximately 119 acres. Odors are not typical of residential, office, or retail uses. In addition, the proposed project would not include industrial or intensive agricultural uses. However, commercial uses may include sources of odorous emissions (e.g., charbroiling restaurants, dry cleaners). The operation of such sources could result in the frequent exposure of onsite receptors to substantial objectionable odorous emissions. In addition, the potential exists that odors could carry to adjacent residential areas. As a result, the potential that the proposed project could result in the emission of objectionable odors is considered to be a ***potentially significant*** impact.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measure that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts to nearby sensitive receptors from odors associated with the project.

8-5 *If an odor-emitting facility is to occupy space in the retail and restaurant portions of the project site, odor control devices shall be installed for the review and approval of the Planning Department prior to the issuance of occupancy permits to reduce the exposure of receptors to objectionable odorous emissions.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce Impact 8-5 (Impacts to nearby sensitive receptors from odors associated with the project) to a less-than-significant level because odor control devices will be required to be installed for review and approval by the Planning Department prior to issuance of occupancy permits to reduce the exposure of receptors to objectionable odorous emissions.

4.5 NOISE

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS FROM CONSTRUCTION WOULD TEMPORARILY INCREASE NOISE LEVELS DURING CONSTRUCTION (IMPACT 9-1).

Noise from construction activities would add to the existing noise environment of the project site and immediate vicinity. Sensitive receptors would include the adjacent single-family residences located to the north, south, and west, multi-family residential complexes to the east (along Richardson Drive), and healthcare facilities to the south. The nearest sensitive receptor that could be exposed to construction-related noise would be approximately 50 feet away from the project boundaries. Although exempt, construction activities associated with the development of the project could expose sensitive receptors immediately surrounding the project site to high levels of noise during the daytime construction hours. Therefore, short-term construction noise remains a ***potentially significant*** impact to nearby sensitive receptors located adjacent to the project site.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts from construction which would temporarily increase noise levels during construction.

9-1(a) *Construction activities shall comply with the Placer County Noise Ordinance.*

9-1(b) *Fixed construction equipment, which may include, but not be limited to, compressors and generators, shall be located as far away from sensitive receptors, to the extent feasible. In addition, impact tools shall be shielded or shrouded. Intake and exhaust ports of powered construction equipment shall also be muffled or shielded.*

9-1(c) *A disturbance coordinator shall be appointed for the project site who would receive any public noise-related complaints about construction equipment and practices. The disturbance coordinator shall be responsible for determining the cause of the complaint(s) and the implementation of any feasible measures to alleviate the complaint(s). The disturbance coordinator's contact information shall be posted throughout the site and adjacent public spaces.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 9-1 (Impacts from construction would temporarily increase noise levels during construction) to a less-than-significant level because the construction activities would comply with the County Noise Ordinance, fixed construction equipment would be located as far away from sensitive receptors, to the extent feasible, and a disturbance coordinator would alleviate any complaints received.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: POTENTIAL IMPACTS FROM ON-SITE NOISE SOURCES TO EXISTING SENSITIVE RECEPTORS (IMPACT 9-3).

Project operations could expose existing nearby sensitive receptors to on-site noise levels that exceed applicable noise standards. The operation of the on-site features of the proposed project would result in significant increases in noise levels derived from activities associated with the loading docks, tennis courts, central plant and emergency generators, and parking lots H1-H3. The predicted noise levels related to truck circulation, loading

docks, recreational, and commercial recreational/fitness parking lot area noise would comply with County noise standards and a ***less-than-significant*** impact would result. The predicted increases to the existing noise levels related to Central Plant and HVAC, parking lot, and commercial parking lot noise would exceed County noise standards and are considered ***potentially significant*** impacts.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's potential impacts from on-site noise sources to existing sensitive receptors.

9-3(a) *Loading and delivery activities shall be limited to daytime hours 7:00 AM to 10:00 PM.*

9-3(b) *Prior to Improvement Plan approval, a noise barrier shall be shown along the south and east boundaries of the project site to reduce impacts to affected sensitive receptors from increased parking lot noise levels determined in this DEIR (shown conceptually in Figure 9-6), for the review and approval by the Planning Department. A noise barrier six feet in height would be required (minimum) along the south and eastern property boundaries, lots 26, 27, and 28, to reduce future parking lot noise levels below the Placer County Standards. Barriers could take the form of earth berms, solid walls, or a combination of the two. Appropriate materials for noise walls include precast concrete or masonry block. Other materials may be acceptable provided they have a density of approximately four pounds per square foot.*

9-3(c) *Prior to Improvement Plan approval, the project applicant shall be responsible for designing the Central Plant to minimize the ventilation openings facing nearby residences along the project site boundaries. Any openings in the building façade shall require treatment with acoustical silencers/louvers. Additionally, any rooftop ventilation openings or stacks shall be shielded from view with building parapets and may also require treatment with acoustical silencers/louvers. The noise emitted from the mechanical equipment within the Central Plant must comply with the Placer County exterior noise standards (45 dB L_{eq} and 65 dB L_{max} respectively) at the nearest sensitive receptors.*

9-3(d) *The emergency backup generator(s) shall be installed with an acoustical enclosure and engine muffler which could reduce noise levels to compliance with the Placer County standards (50 dB L_{eq} daytime exterior noise level standard) at the nearest sensitive receptor.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 9-3 (Impacts from on-site noise sources to existing sensitive receptors) to a less-than-significant level because a noise barrier would be required along the south and east boundaries of the project site to reduce noise levels to affected sensitive receptors, for the review and approval of the Placer County Planning Department. In addition, loading and delivery activities would be limited to the hours of 7:00 AM to 10:00 PM.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: POTENTIAL IMPACTS FROM PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION TO NEW ON-SITE SENSITIVE RECEPTORS (IMPACT 9-4).

Project operations could expose new on-site receptors to on-site noise levels that exceed applicable noise standards. The operation of the following on-site features of the proposed project would result in significant increases in noise levels derived from activities associated with the loading docks, tennis courts, central plant and emergency generators, parking lots H1-H3, and the commercial parking lots. The predicted increases to the existing noise levels would exceed County noise standards and are considered ***potentially significant*** impacts.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's potential impacts from project implementation to new on-site sensitive receptors.

9-4(a) *Prior to Improvement Plan approval, a noise barrier shall be shown along the boundary of Lot 8 and Lot 19 to reduce impacts to affected sensitive receptors from loading dock noise levels determined in this DEIR (shown conceptually in Figure 9-6), for the review and approval by the Planning Department. A noise barrier six feet in height would be required (minimum) along the boundaries of Lot 8 and Lot 19 and wrap along the east side and a portion of the north side of Lot 8 to shield the rear yard lots of Villa F. Barriers could take the form of earth berms, solid walls, or a combination of the two. Appropriate materials for noise walls include precast concrete or masonry block. Other materials may be acceptable provided they have a density of approximately four pounds per square foot.*

9-4(b) *Implement Mitigation Measure 9-3(a).*

9-4(c) *Implement Mitigation Measure 9-3(c).*

9-4(d) *Prior to Improvement Plan approval, the project improvement plans shall show a setback distance of 130 feet from the tennis court, as measured from the center of the tennis court, to the nearest on-site residence, for review and approval by the Planning Department. In addition, a sign shall be posted on the tennis court, limiting tennis court usage to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. and lighting of the tennis court shall automatically shut off at 10:00 p.m.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 9-4 (impacts from project implementation to new on-site sensitive receptors) to a less-than-significant level because a noise barrier would be required along the boundary of Lot 8 and Lot 19 to reduce noise levels from loading dock noise levels, for the review and approval of the Placer County Planning Department. In addition, the project improvement plans shall show a setback distance of 130 feet from the tennis court and loading and delivery activities would be limited to the hours of 7:00 AM to 10:00 PM.

4.6 SOILS, GEOLOGY, AND SEISMICITY

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: RISKS TO PEOPLE AND STRUCTURES ASSOCIATED WITH SEISMIC ACTIVITY, INCLUDING SURFACE RUPTURE, SLOPE INSTABILITY, AND/OR LANDSLIDES (IMPACT 10-1).

The *Geotechnical Engineering Report* indicates that construction of the project would result in permanent cut slopes up to 15 feet in height, as well as fill slopes up to 10 feet in height. However, the *Geotechnical Engineering Report* notes that the risk of seismically-induced hazards, such as slope instability or surface rupture, is remote at the project site. Although the risk of seismically-induced hazards, such as slope instability or surface rupture, is remote at the project site, implementation of the proposed project could result in instability of on-site soils; therefore, the impact would be ***potentially significant***.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's risks to people and structures associated with seismic activity, including surface rupture, slope instability, and/or landslides.

10-1 *The project applicant shall submit to the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD), for review and approval, a geotechnical engineering report produced by a California Registered Civil Engineer or Geotechnical Engineer. The report shall address and make recommendations on the following:*

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

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

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 10-1 (Risks to people and structures associated with seismic activity, including surface rupture, slope instability, and/or landslides) to a less-than-

significant level because the applicant shall submit a geotechnical engineering report for review and approval by the Engineering and Surveying Department, which shall include appropriate design recommendations for inclusion in the building designs, as necessary.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH EROSION (LOSS OF TOPSOIL) AND/OR SEDIMENTATION (IMPACT 10-2).

Construction activities typically result in disturbance of site soils, in turn leading to increased soil erosion due to loss of soil cohesiveness. Surface grading and earth-moving activities associated with construction projects would create temporary exposed earth surfaces. The on-site soils (Auburn Silt Loam, Auburn-Argonaut Complex, and Auburn Rock Outcrop Complex) have a moderate to high potential for erosion. Construction activities would result in the disturbance of on-site soils, as well as potentially increase soil erosion processes. Therefore, risks associated with erosion are considered to be ***potentially significant.***

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts related to risks associated with erosion (loss of topsoil) and/or sedimentation.

10-2(a) *The applicant shall prepare and submit Improvement Plans, specifications and cost estimates (per the requirements of Section II of the Land Development Manual [LDM] that are in effect at the time of submittal) to the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD) for review and approval. The plans shall show all conditions for the project as well as pertinent topographical features both on- and off-site. All existing and proposed utilities and easements, on-site and adjacent to the project, which may be affected by planned construction, shall be shown on the plans. All landscaping and irrigation facilities within the public right-of-way (or public easements), or landscaping within sight distance areas at intersections, shall be included in the Improvement Plans. The applicant shall pay plan check and inspection fees and Placer County Fire Department Improvement Plan review and inspection fees. (NOTE: Prior to plan approval, all applicable recording and reproduction cost shall be paid). The cost of the above-noted landscape and irrigation facilities shall be included in the estimates used to determine these fees. It is the applicant's responsibility to obtain all required agency signatures on the plans and to secure department approvals. If the Design/Site Review process and/or DRC review is required as a condition of approval for the project, said review process shall be completed prior to submittal of Improvement Plans. Record drawings shall be prepared and signed by a California Registered Civil Engineer at the applicant's expense and shall be submitted to the ESD prior to acceptance by the County of site improvements.*

10-2(b) *All proposed grading, drainage improvements, vegetation and tree removal shall be shown on the Improvement Plans and all work shall conform to provisions of the County Grading Ordinance (Ref. Article 15.48, Placer County Code) that are 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 Development Review Committee (DRC). All cut/fill slopes*

shall be at 2:1 (horizontal:vertical) unless a soils report supports a steeper slope and the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD) concurs with said recommendation.

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

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

10-2(c) *Water quality Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall be designed according to the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks for Construction, for New Development / Redevelopment, and/or for Industrial and Commercial, (and/or other similar source as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD)). Construction (temporary) BMPs for the project could include, but are not limited to, the following: Fiber Rolls (SE-5), Hydroseeding (EC-4), Stabilized Construction Entrance (LDM Plate C-4), Straw Bale Barriers (SE-9), Storm Drain Inlet Protection (SE-10), Silt Fence (SE-1), revegetation techniques, dust control measures, and concrete washout areas.*

10-2(d) *Projects with ground disturbance exceeding one acre that are subject to construction stormwater quality permit requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program shall obtain such permit from the State Water Resources Control Board and shall provide to the Engineering and Surveying Department evidence of a state-issued WDID number or filing of a Notice of Intent and fees prior to start of construction.*

10-2(e) *Stockpiling and/or vehicle staging areas shall be identified on the Improvement Plans and located as far as practical from existing dwellings and protected resources in the area.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 10-2 (Risks associated with erosion (loss of topsoil) and/or sedimentation) to a less-than-significant level because all work would comply with the County's Grading Ordinance and required BMPs would be implemented during construction.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: LOSS OF STRUCTURAL SUPPORT DUE TO LIQUEFACTION (IMPACT 10-3).

According to the Placer County General Plan Background Report, geologic and soil maps do not provide sufficient information to map substrates having liquefaction potential, and only borings approximately 30 feet deep can reveal whether or not the soils on-site are prone to liquefaction. In addition, the *Geotechnical Engineering Report* indicates that the liquefaction potential on the proposed project site is remote. However, because soils throughout the County have the potential to experience liquefaction, a ***potentially significant*** impact would result.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measure that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts related to loss of structural support due to liquefaction.

10-3 *Implement Mitigation Measure 10-1.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce Impact 10-3 (Loss of structural support due to liquefaction) to a less-than-significant level because the County would review and approve all future grading plans to ensure compliance with the performance standards identified in the geotechnical engineering report and mitigation measures.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH STRUCTURAL DAMAGE FROM EXPANSIVE SOILS (IMPACT 10-4).

Construction of the proposed roadways and future construction of residential and commercial development would require solid building surfaces. Expansive soils shrink and swell as a result of moisture changes, causing heaving and cracking of slabs-on-grade, pavements, and structures founded on shallow foundations. According to the *Geotechnical Engineering Report*, moderately expansive soil was detected in the upper portion of exploratory trench T-4. Because expansive soils are present on-site, a ***potentially significant*** impact would result.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measure that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impact related to risks associated with structural damage from expansive soils.

10-4(a) *Implement Mitigation Measure 10-1.*

10-4(b) *The preliminary geotechnical engineering report performed by Holdrege & Kull, dated August 14, 2008, indicated the presence of critically expansive soils or other soil problems which, if not corrected, would lead to structural defects.*

For non-pad graded lots, prior to Improvement Plan approval the applicant shall submit to the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD) for review and approval, a soil investigation of each lot in the subdivision produced by a California Registered Civil or Geotechnical Engineer (Section 17953-17955 California Health and Safety Code).

For pad graded lots, prior to Final Acceptance of project improvements or consideration of early Building Permits and after the completion of the pad grading for all lots, the applicant shall submit to the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD) for review and approval, a soil investigation of each lot produced by a California Registered Civil or Geotechnical Engineer (Section 17953-17955 California Health and Safety Code).

The soil investigations shall include recommended corrective action that is likely to prevent structural damage to each proposed dwelling. In addition, the applicant shall include in the Development Notebook or modify the Development Notebook to include the soil problems encountered on each specific lot as well as the recommended corrective actions. A note shall be included on the Improvement Plans, CC&Rs, and the Informational Sheet filed with the Final Map(s), which indicates the requirements of this condition. Once approved by the ESD, two copies of the final soil investigations for each lot shall be provided to the ESD and one copy to the Building Department for their use.

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 10-4 (Risks associated with structural damage from expansive soils) to a less-than-significant level because the County would review and approve all future grading plans to ensure compliance with the performance standards identified in the geotechnical engineering report and mitigation measures.

4.7 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: PROJECT IMPACTS TO THE EXISTING DRAINAGE PATTERN AND INCREASES IN SURFACE RUNOFF (IMPACT 11-1).

Implementation of the proposed project would result in additional flows of stormwater as a result of the increase in impervious surfaces. The project design incorporates stormwater detention basins to serve the dual purposes of stormwater detention and water quality improvement. The *Timberline at Auburn Preliminary Drainage Report* was prepared for the proposed project to evaluate the potential impacts related to the grading and development of impervious surfaces. Per County requirements, the preliminary drainage report included a comparison of peak design storm flows for 2-, 10-, and 100-year storm events between existing conditions and the proposed project. Based on the results of the report, it was determined that after implementation of the proposed project with local detention basins, peak flows during 2-, 10-, and 100-year storm events would decrease for both Rock Creek and Dry Creek when compared to existing conditions. However, the proposed project does not currently include specific construction plans or an approved, final drainage report for the development; therefore, the project could result in ***potentially significant*** impacts to the existing drainage pattern.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts to the existing drainage pattern and increases in surface runoff.

11-1(a) *Stormwater runoff shall be reduced to pre-project conditions through the installation of retention/detention facilities. Retention/detention facilities shall be designed in accordance with the requirements of the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal, and to the satisfaction of the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD). The ESD may, after review of the project drainage report, delete this requirement if it is determined that drainage conditions do not warrant installation of this type of facility. In the event on-site detention requirements are waived, this project may be subject to payment of any in-lieu fees prescribed by County Ordinance. No retention/detention facility construction shall be permitted within any identified wetlands area, floodplain, or right-of-way, except as authorized by project approvals.*

11-1(b) *Prepare and submit with the project Improvement Plans, a drainage report in conformance with the requirements of Section 5 of the LDM and the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal, to the Engineering and Surveying Department for review and approval. The report shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and shall, at a minimum, include: A written text addressing existing conditions, the effects of the improvements, all appropriate calculations, a watershed map, increases in downstream flows, proposed on- and off-site improvements and drainage easements to accommodate flows from this project. The report shall identify water quality protection features and methods to be used both during construction and for long-term post-construction water quality protection. "Best Management Practice" (BMP) measures shall be provided to reduce erosion, water quality degradation, and prevent the discharge of pollutants to stormwater to the maximum extent practicable.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 11-1 (Project impacts to the existing drainage pattern and increases in surface runoff) to a less-than-significant level because ESD would review and approve a final drainage report for the project to ensure compliance with the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual and the County's NPDES permit. In addition, site-specific BMPs would be implemented.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: CONSTRUCTION-RELATED IMPACTS TO SURFACE WATER QUALITY (IMPACT 11-2).

As the proposed project would require construction activities that would result in a land disturbance greater than one acre, the applicant would be required by the State to obtain the General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity (Construction General Permit), which pertains to pollution from grading and project construction. Compliance with the Permit requires the project applicant to file a Notice of Intent (NOI) with the SWRCB and prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) prior to construction. The SWPPP would incorporate Best Management Practices (BMPs) in order to prevent, or reduce to the greatest feasible extent, adverse impacts to water quality from erosion and sedimentation. In addition, runoff from both roadways and proposed areas of development on-site would be routed to either a designated vegetated swale and/or water quality treatment pond prior to discharge to the tributaries to Dry Creek and Rock Creek. The two above-mentioned on-site stormwater detention basins would also act as water quality ponds. However, because the proposed project could result in short-term impacts to surface water quality, the impact would be ***potentially significant.***

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's construction-related impacts to surface water quality.

11-2(a) *The location, size, and ownership of any canals (Columbia East Canal) on or adjacent to the property shall be described in the drainage report and shown on the Improvement Plans. The applicant shall provide the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD) with a letter from the agency(s) controlling the canal(s) describing any restrictions, requirements, easements, etc. relative to construction of the project. Said letter shall be provided to the ESD prior to Improvement Plan approval. During construction, drainage from the project site shall not enter the Columbia East Canal. Measures such as temporary construction fencing shall be placed around the canal to prevent people, animals and debris from entering the canal during construction. Concurrent with the encasement and realignment of the Columbia East Canal, a trash rack and spillway shall be constructed at the downstream end of the encased canal if required by NID. The encasement and realignment of the Columbia East Canal shall be coordinated, reviewed, and approved by the NID.*

11-2(b) *Implement Mitigation Measures 10-2(a) through 10-2(e).*

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 11-2 (Construction-related impacts to surface water quality) to a less-than-significant level because the proper sizing of water quality facilities would be ensured, required BMPs would be implemented during construction, the drainage of each individual lot would be reviewed by ESD, and drainage from the project site will be prevented from entering Columbia East Canal via temporary construction fencing placed around the canal to prevent people, animals and debris from entering the canal during construction, as well as construction of a trash rack and spillway at the upstream end of the canal.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: OPERATIONAL WATER QUALITY DEGRADATION ASSOCIATED WITH URBAN RUNOFF FROM THE PROJECT SITE (IMPACT 11-3).

The increased impervious area created by the development of the proposed project would alter the types and levels of pollutants that could be present in project site runoff. Runoff from streets, driveways, parking lots, and landscaped areas typically contains nonpoint source pollutants such as oil, grease, heavy metals, pesticides, herbicides, fertilizers, and sediment. The proposed project includes designs for two on-site detention basins to be constructed on-site in order to assist with capturing potential pollutants before entering local waterways, such as Dry Creek. However, the potential for urban pollutants to enter and potentially pollute the local water systems would still exist; therefore, the impact would be ***potentially significant***.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts related to operational water quality degradation associated with urban runoff from the project site.

11-3(a) *Water quality Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall be designed according to the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks for Construction, for New Development / Redevelopment, and/or for Industrial and Commercial; (and/or other similar source as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Department [ESD]).*

Storm drainage from on- and off-site impervious surfaces (including roads) shall be collected and routed through specially designed catch basins, vegetated swales, vaults, infiltration basins, water quality basins, filters, etc. for entrapment of sediment, debris and oils/greases or other identified pollutants, as approved by the ESD. BMPs shall be designed at a minimum in accordance with the Placer County Guidance Document for Volume and Flow-Based Sizing of Permanent Post-Construction Best Management Practices for Stormwater Quality Protection. Post-development (permanent) BMPs for the project include, but are not limited to, the following: water quality inlets (TC-50), wet ponds (TC-20), detention basins (TC-22), and vegetated swales (TC-30). No water quality facility construction shall be permitted within any identified wetlands area, floodplain, or right-of-way, except as authorized by project approvals.

All BMPs shall be maintained as required to ensure effectiveness. The applicant shall provide for the establishment of vegetation, where specified, by means of proper irrigation. Maintenance of these facilities shall be provided by the project owners/permittees.

11-3(b) *This project is located within the area covered by Placer County's municipal stormwater quality permit, pursuant to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Phase II program. Project-related stormwater discharges are subject to all applicable requirements of said permit. BMPs shall be designed to mitigate (minimize, infiltrate, filter, or treat) stormwater runoff in accordance with "Attachment 4" of Placer County's NPDES Municipal Stormwater Permit (State Water Resources Control Board NPDES General Permit No. CAS000004).*

11-3(c) *All storm drain inlets and catch basins within the project area shall be permanently marked/embossed with prohibitive language such as "No Dumping! Flows to Creek" or other language as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Department and/or graphical icons to discourage illegal dumping. Message details, placement, and locations shall be included on the Improvement Plans. ESD-approved signs and prohibitive language and/or graphical icons, which prohibit illegal dumping, shall be posted at public access points along channels and creeks within the project area.*

11-3(d) *All stormwater runoff shall be diverted around trash storage areas to minimize contact with pollutants. Trash container areas shall be screened or walled to prevent off-site transport of trash by the forces of water or wind. Trash containers shall not be allowed to leak and must remain covered when not in use.*

11-3(e) *Materials with the potential to contaminate stormwater that are to be stored outdoors shall be placed in an enclosure such as, but not limited to, a cabinet, shed, or similar*

structure that prevents contact with runoff or spillage to the stormwater conveyance system, or protected by secondary containment structures such as berms, dikes, or curbs. The storage area shall be paved to contain leaks and spills and shall have a roof or awning to minimize collection of stormwater within the secondary containment area.

11-3(f) *Loading dock areas shall be covered and run-on and/or runoff of stormwater to the dock area shall be minimized. Direct connections to storm drains from depressed loading docks (truck wells or sumps) are prohibited.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 11-3 (Operational water quality degradation associated with urban runoff from the project site) to a less-than-significant level because proper signage discouraging illegal dumping would be included, operational measures to reduce the potential for pollutants to contaminate stormwater would be incorporated, and compliance with the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual would be required.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: EXPOSURE OF PEOPLE AND STRUCTURES TO FLOOD HAZARDS ON THE PROJECT SITE (IMPACT 11-4).

The proposed project site is located in an unmapped area for the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA's) Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs). The proposed underground and surface drainage improvements would be sized to handle the 100-year storm event. As a result, the 100-year floodplain under post development conditions would be contained inside the pipes, detention basin, and proposed drainage channel. Therefore, based on the analysis included within the *Preliminary Drainage Report*, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in impacts related to flood hazards. However, the proposed project does not currently include specific construction plans or a final drainage study for the project site and flood-related impacts are therefore considered as ***potentially significant***.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's expose of people and structures to flood hazards on the project site.

11-4(a) *Implement Mitigation Measure 11-1(b).*

11-4(b) *Show the limits of the future, unmitigated, fully developed, 100-year floodplain (after grading) for the on-site tributaries, as shown in the Preliminary Drainage Report, on the Improvement Plans and Informational Sheet(s) filed with the appropriate Final Map(s), and designate same as a building setback line unless greater setbacks are required by other conditions contained herein.*

11-4(c) *The drainage report shall demonstrate that the proposed project will not increase the 100-year floodplain water surface elevation upstream or downstream of the project area.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 11-4 (Exposure of people and structures to flood hazards on the project site) to a less-than-significant level because the project will implement BMPs,

designate building setbacks from 100-year floodplain areas, and would not increase the 100-year floodplain water surface elevation upstream or downstream of the project area.

4.8 PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS RELATED TO ADEQUATE WATER SUPPLY AND DELIVERY TO THE PROJECT (IMPACT 12-1).

The Nevada Irrigation District (NID) water supply is sufficient to supply the Timberline project, including the additional density bonus requested, and still meet existing and future planned uses within the District's service boundary. NID has indicated that in order to achieve a pressure of 40 psi at all proposed water main connections the North Auburn Highway 49 Transmission Main Project would need to be constructed, or the proposed utility layout for the project should be revised so as not to have water mains at the higher elevations, preliminarily identified by the project engineer as Lots 17 and 18. Therefore, should the North Auburn Highway 49 Transmission Main Project not be completed prior to buildout of those southerly portions of the proposed project containing the highest on-site elevations, a ***potentially significant*** impact would result from the project's additional water demand and request for service.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts related to adequate water supply and delivery to the project.

12-1(a) *Prior to Improvement Plan approval for each phase, the project applicant shall submit to the Environmental Health Services Department, for review and approval, a "will-serve" letter or a letter of availability from NID for domestic water service. The applicant shall connect the project to this treated domestic water supply.*

12-1(b) *Prior to Improvement Plan approval for each phase of development, NID shall provide a will-serve letter stating that the required fire flow is available for fire protection services to the project, to the satisfaction of the servicing fire district and the County. If an alternative water source to NID is proposed, then prior to Improvement Plan approval, the alternative water source shall meet the required fire flows for fire protection services to the project, to the satisfaction of the servicing fire district and the County, and may require additional environmental review.*

12-1(c) *If graywater harvesting is intended to be used for the proposed project, the project applicant shall submit building plans to the County Building Department in order for the County to review them for compliance with the graywater building standards contained in Chapter 16A of the California Plumbing Code. At the time of final inspection, an operation and maintenance manual shall be produced outlining procedures and systems to ensure graywater system compliance. In addition, graywater shall not be used in spray irrigation or allowed to pond or runoff, and shall not be discharged directly into or reach any storm sewer system or any surface body of water. Graywater shall not be allowed for indoor use, such as flushing toilets and urinals. Prior to the use of graywater for the*

project, the applicant shall obtain approval from the Placer County Environmental Health Services Department.

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 12-1 (Impacts related to adequate water supply and delivery to the project) to a less-than-significant level because confirmation regarding adequate water supply and system service capacity would be obtained prior to approval of Improvement Plans, and the project applicant would fund and construct all necessary water system improvements for the project.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS RELATED TO INCREASED DEMAND FOR WASTEWATER DISPOSAL (IMPACT 12-2).

The Wastewater Study for the project determined that the addition of Timberline flows to the system would require upsizing off-site pipe segments. The project would upsize off-site sewer pipes to provide capacity for each phase of the project and would be triggered based on proposed EDU counts for each project phase. Each phase of the development will be required to implement the necessary sewer trunk improvements and secure a sewer "will-serve" letter. In addition, the County has indicated that while there is currently permitted capacity at the WWTP, other peak flow and organic loading conditions may limit the specific amount available. Therefore, the project's impact on the demand for wastewater conveyance and treatment would be ***potentially significant***.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts related to increased demand for wastewater disposal.

<u>Conveyance</u>

12-2 (a) *Prior to Improvement Plan approval of the phase of development with a sewer tributary to the Joeger Road Lift Station, the project applicant shall provide a sewer study and Lift Station Design Report for the upsizing of the Joeger Road Lift Station to accommodate the buildout flows of the Joeger Road Lift Station tributary area for review and approval by the Facility Services Department, Environmental Engineering Division. The project shall show on the Improvement Plans the construction of the necessary improvements to the Joeger Road Lift Station as identified/required in the sewer study and Lift Station Design Report. The sewer study shall describe the average daily dry weather and peak wet weather wastewater generation from the site, the ultimate sewer shed area and the methodology used to derive the estimates. The applicant shall be responsible for upsizing upstream and downstream pipes to accommodate built-out flows when they are impacted due to the additional flow to the Joeger Road Lift Station from the project.*

Prior to approval of the lift station design for the upsizing of the Joeger Road Lift Station, the project applicant may elect to conduct additional flow monitoring of the Joeger Road Lift Station. The method of monitoring is subject to the review and approval of the Facility Services Department, Environmental Engineering Division. The results of the additional flow monitoring analysis may be used in lieu of the data used in the sewer study to design the upsizing of the Joeger Road Lift Station to accommodate buildout flows to the lift station.

If necessary improvements to the Joeger Road Lift Station are determined to be infeasible based on the Lift Station Design Report, the applicant shall provide a sewer study and Lift Station Design Report for an on-site lift station for the review and subject to final determination by the Facility Services Department, Environmental Engineering Division.

12-2 (b) *Prior to Improvement Plan approval, the project applicant shall submit a sewer study to the Facility Services Department, Environmental Engineering Division for review and approval of each phase of the project, which at a minimum shall include the project phase description, number of EDUs, ADWF, and PWWF. The sewer study shall identify which sections of off-site sewer pipe need to be upsized to accommodate the phase. The required sewer pipe improvements shall be shown on the Improvement Plans for each phase. The applicant shall be responsible for constructing needed improvements.*

Treatment

12-2(c) *The applicant shall be required to implement an off-site mitigation program that will replace and/or rehabilitate sewer infrastructure in order to reduce inflow and infiltration in areas tributary to the DeWitt trunk line within Sewer Maintenance District No. 1. The off-site mitigation program will create capacity within the existing system equivalent to the project's peak wet weather flows. The off-site mitigation program shall consist of upsizing of the DeWitt Trunk line as shown in Table 12-15 and Table 12-16 and/or other off site replacement and/or rehabilitation projects on existing infrastructure. The off-site mitigation program shall be coordinated, reviewed, and approved by the Facility Services Department, Environmental Engineering Division prior to or concurrent with the Improvement Plan approval of each phase of on-site development projects. The on-site development project sewer improvements shall not be accepted as complete by the County until the County accepts the off-site sewer mitigation program improvements as complete.*

12-2(d) *Sewer connection fees shall be paid at the time of sewer permit issuance. The connection fee is used to offset the project's increase in capacity at the SMD-1 WWTP. The actual fees paid shall be those in effect at the time the payment occurs.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 12-2 (Impacts related to increased demand for adequate wastewater disposal) to a less-than-significant level because a sewer survey for the Joeger Road Lift Station and a site-specific sanitary sewer system for each phase of the project will be reviewed and approved by the County and confirmation regarding adequate wastewater capacity would be obtained. In addition, the applicant shall be required to implement an off-site mitigation program that will replace and/or rehabilitate sewer infrastructure to the DeWitt trunk line. The off-site mitigation program shall be coordinated, reviewed, and approved by the Facility Services Department, Environmental Engineering Division prior to or concurrent with the Improvement Plan approval of each phase of on-site development projects.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS RELATED TO THE PROVISION OF ADEQUATE FIRE PROTECTION AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES FOR THE PROJECT (IMPACT 12-3).

The project would result in an increase in demand for fire protection and emergency services, which could adversely affect the ability of Placer County Fire Department/CAL FIRE to provide these services throughout their service boundaries. Because the Placer County Fire Department/CAL FIRE has not provided a will-serve letter stating that the existing fire protection services are adequate to serve the project site, a ***potentially significant*** impact could occur.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measure that would reduce to a less-than-significant level the project's impacts related to the provision of adequate fire protection and emergency medical services for the project.

12-3 *Provide the Engineering and Surveying Department with a letter from the appropriate fire protection district describing conditions under which service will be provided to each phase of the project. Said letter shall be provided prior to Improvement Plan approval of each phase and a fire protection district representative's signature shall be provided on the plans.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce Impact 12-3 (Impacts related to the provision of adequate fire protection and emergency medical services for the project) to a less-than-significant level because confirmation regarding adequate fire protection and emergency medical services would be obtained prior to approval of Improvement Plans, and all needs related to fire protection would be to District Standards.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: ADEQUATE LAW ENFORCEMENT SERVICES (IMPACT 12-4).

The proposed project is located within the jurisdiction of, and would be provided services by the PCSD. Placer County has adopted a public safety policy that includes the provision of capital facilities and personnel sufficient to maintain an officer/population ratio of one deputy per 1,000 residents. The Sheriff's Department has recommended that many of the potential crime problems dealing with circulation systems and structures may be reduced by using the concepts of "Crime Prevention through Environmental Design." By working closely with law enforcement during all stages of this project, design features that encourage criminal activity could be identified and solutions found to mitigate problematic designs. Without the incorporation of sufficient "Crime Prevention through Environmental Design" concepts, project impacts to law enforcement services would be ***potentially significant.***

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measure that would reduce to a less-than-significant level the project's impacts related to the provision of adequate law enforcement services for the project.

12-4 *Prior to Improvement Plan approval for each phase of development, the Sheriff's Department shall review and approve the design relating to safety and provide a copy of their approval to the DRC. 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.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce Impact 12-4 (Adequate law enforcement services) to a less-than-significant level because confirmation regarding adequate design of the project relative to safety concerns would be obtained from the Sheriff's Department prior to approval of Improvement Plans.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS TO SCHOOL SERVICES AND FACILITIES (IMPACT 12-7).

The project is located within the AUSD and PUHSD. The proposed project would generate an estimated 858 residential units to the project area. However, 780 of those units would be allocated to a Continuing Care Retirement Community which would not contribute to the student population. The remaining 78 units would be allocated to second-story lofts. The student generation rate for PUHSD is 0.24 per housing unit. Based on the student generation rate, the proposed project could generate approximately 19 (78 x 0.24 = 18.7) additional students for the PUHSD (grades 9-12). Because the PUHSD is already over capacity, additional students to the District may result in further overcrowding and compromising programs. Therefore, the project would have a ***potentially significant*** impact to current schools.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measure that would reduce to a less-than-significant level the project's impacts to school services and facilities.

12-7 *Prior to building permit issuance, the project applicant shall pay minimum statutory developer fees per SB 50, which are in effect at time of building permit issuance to provide revenue for school overcrowding and funding shortfalls.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce Impact 12-7 (Impacts to school services and facilities) to a less-than-significant level because payment of developer fees would occur prior to issuance of building permits.

4.9 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS AND HAZARDS

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS RELATED TO PAST MINING ACTIVITY IN THE PROJECT AREA (IMPACT 13-1).

Holdrege & Kull prepared a *Preliminary Characterization of Abandoned Mine Features* report that summarizes the results of a preliminary characterization of abandoned mine features located in the vicinity of the site. Based on a review of historical records and field exploration Holdrege & Kull identified small stockpiles of excavated soil and rock at areas PP1 through PP5 and further stated that the excavations may be associated with past mining activities or prospecting activities. Holdrege & Kull determined that because undisturbed weathered bedrock was encountered in PP1 and PP4, the pits are not associated with deeper mining activity. PCEH reviewed the *Preliminary Characterization of Abandoned Mine Features* report and agreed with the conclusions and recommendations made by Holdrege & Kull. The PCEH memorandum states that if additional mining related features are encountered during construction activities, a qualified geotechnical engineer shall consult with the County to address potential impacts. As a result, the risk associated with past mining activity represents a ***potentially significant*** impact.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measure that would reduce to a less-than-significant level the project's impacts related to past mining activity in the project area.

13-1 *During site grading and excavation, discovery of substantial areas that have previously been excavated and filled, or of mining shafts, or of other unanticipated voids shall be reported to the Placer County Environmental Health Services Department. A qualified geotechnical engineer shall consult with the Placer County Environmental Health Services Department and determine whether additional geotechnical studies are required. If so, all recommendations of the geotechnical expert shall be implemented in the final project design and prior to Final Map approval.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 13-1 (Impacts related to past mining activity in the project area) to a less-than-significant level because discovery of substantial areas that have been excavated and filled, mining shafts, or unanticipated voids would be reported submitted to County EHS, and the applicant would retain a qualified geotechnical engineer to consult with the County EHS.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS RELATED TO EXPOSURE OF PEOPLE TO ASBESTOS AND LEAD-BASED PAINT (IMPACT 13-2).

The proposed project site contains a single residence located at the southeast corner of the site along Bell Road. The structure is in excess of 50 years old, and was constructed prior to the ban on asbestos-containing materials. Lead-based paints could also be present in the structure. In addition, a large portion of the existing sewer pipe in the off-site sewer alignment is constructed of asbestos cement pipe (ACP). ACP is defined under NESHPS as a Category II, non-friable, non-regulated material in its intact state, but which may become friable upon removal, demolition and/or disposal. Consequently, if the removal/disposal process renders the ACP friable, it is regulated under the disposal requirements of 40 CFR 61.150. The potential presence of asbestos and/or lead-based paint within the on-site residence as well as ACP portions of the existing off-site sewer pipe could result in potential hazards to humans during demolition activities during development of the proposed project; therefore, a ***potentially significant*** impact would result.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to a less-than-significant level the project's impacts related to exposure of people to asbestos and lead-based paint.

13-2(a) *Prior to the approval of a demolition permit, the project applicant shall provide the Planning Department and the Environmental Health Services Department with a detailed*

assessment pertaining to the potential presence of asbestos-containing materials in the on-site structure. If asbestos-containing materials are not detected, further mitigation shall not be required. If asbestos-containing materials are detected, the applicant shall prepare and implement an asbestos abatement plan consistent with federal, State, and local standards, subject to the review and approval of the Planning Department prior to the issuance of a demolition permit.

13-2(b) *During removal of the existing asbestos cement pipe within the off-site sewer alignment, under the oversight of the County Environmental Health Services Department, a licensed asbestos abatement consultant or Certified Inspector shall be retained by the contractor during all asbestos cement pipe removal to provide recommendations or suggestions regarding maintaining the pipe in a non-friable state, and generally supervise the removal operation. If any pipe becomes friable, the licensed asbestos abatement consultant or Certified Inspector shall conduct perimeter air monitoring, and ensure proper disposal of the friable asbestos. In addition, if more than 260 linear feet of pipe is removed that becomes friable, a NESHAPs notification shall be filed.*

13-2(c) *Prior to the approval of a demolition permit, the project applicant shall provide the Planning Department and the Environmental Health Services Department with a detailed assessment pertaining to the potential presence of lead-based paint in the on-site structure. If lead-based paint is not detected in the assessment, further mitigation shall not be required. If such paint is found, all loose and peeling paint shall be removed and disposed of by a licensed and certified lead paint removal contractor, in accordance federal, State, and local regulations. The demolition contractor shall be informed that all paint on the buildings shall be considered as containing lead. The contractor shall take appropriate precautions to protect his/her workers, the surrounding community, and to dispose of construction waste containing lead paint in accordance with federal, State, and local regulations subject to review approval of the Planning Department, prior to the issuance of a demolition permit.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 13-2 (Impacts related to exposure of people to asbestos and lead-based paint) to a less-than-significant level because prior to approval of a demolition permit, a detailed assessment pertaining to the potential presence of asbestos and lead-based paint would be reviewed by the Planning Department and Environmental Health Services Department. In addition, a licensed contractor would be retained for asbestos and lead-based paint removal, if required.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS RELATED TO EXPOSURE OF PROJECT RESIDENTS OR THE SURROUNDING POPULATION TO CHEMICAL HAZARDS OR CONSTRUCTION HAZARDS (IMPACT 13-3).

The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment did not indicate the presence of onsite chemical hazards. Nor is the project located in the vicinity of sites listed on the CERCLIS list. The project site is located north of the DeWitt Hospital, which is the site of groundwater contamination associated with the past storage of oil. However, the proposed project would not draw groundwater, nor would the groundwater contamination result in adverse impacts to project residents. According to the *Geotechnical Feasibility Study*, and as discussed in Chapter 10, Soils, Geology, and Seismicity, of this EIR, data analyzed from the site reconnaissance and the test pits suggest that, during construction, ripping of the harder shallow rock areas on-site would probably require a D-10 size dozer, and the possibility exists that relatively localized blasting (the controlled use of explosives to excavate or remove rock) of hard outcrops could be required. The possible need for localized blasting is considered moderately high for utility trench excavations, especially those deeper than five feet or those through outcrop areas, which are located on top of the ridgelines in the northern section. Because the project could include

localized blasting for excavation of utility trenches, a ***potentially significant*** impact related to construction hazards would occur.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measure that would reduce to a less-than-significant level the project's impacts related to exposure of project residents or the surrounding population to chemical hazards or construction hazards.

13-3 *If blasting is required for the installation of site improvements, the developer shall comply with applicable County Ordinances that relate to blasting and shall use only State-licensed contractors to conduct blasting operations.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce Impact 13-3 (Impacts related to related exposure of project residents or the surrounding population to chemical hazards or construction hazards) to a less-than-significant level because the developer would be required to comply with applicable County Ordinances that relate to blasting and would only use State-licensed contractors to conduct blasting operations.

4.10 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS AND OTHER CEQA SECTIONS

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS TO INTERSECTIONS UNDER CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT CONDITIONS (IMPACT 15-4)

The project's traffic in combination with other cumulative traffic would generate ***potentially significant*** impacts at seven intersections, six of which would operate unacceptably under Cumulative No Project Conditions (exception is Dry Creek Road/Richardson Drive). In addition, Article 15.28.010 of the Placer County Code establishes a road network Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The proposed project is subject to this code and, therefore, is required to pay traffic impact fees to fund the CIP for area roadway improvements.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the project's incremental contribution to the above identified cumulative intersection impacts to a level that is less than cumulatively considerable.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts to study intersections under the Cumulative Plus Project Conditions. It should be noted that the applicant shall be entitled to traffic fee credits for constructing public roads in the CIP program that are outside of the project boundaries.

Intersection #1) Dry Creek Road/Richardson Drive

The conversion of this existing TWSC intersection to an AWSC intersection will improve the LOS to "C" or better under Cumulative Plus Project conditions. The conversion of the intersection to include AWSC

will be implemented by the County through the CIP program of work when the conversion is warranted.

15-4(a) Implement Mitigation Measure 7-2(d).

Intersection #2) Bell Road/Richardson Drive

15-4(b) Implement Mitigation Measure 7-2(a).

Intersection #4) Bell Road/First Street

15-4(c) Implement Mitigation Measure 7-2(b).

Intersection #16) New Airport Road/Bell Road

15-4(d) Implement Mitigation Measure 7-2(c).

Intersection #17) Bell Road/Bowman Road

15-4(e) Implement Mitigation Measure 7-2(d).

Intersection #18) Bell Road/I-80 WB Ramps

15-4(f) Implement Mitigation Measure 7-2(d).

Intersection #19) Bell Road/I-80 EB Ramps

15-4(g) Implement Mitigation Measure 7-2(d).

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 15-4 (Impacts to intersections under Cumulative Plus Project Conditions) to a less-than-significant level because the project applicant would pay traffic mitigation fees and construct improvements that would improve Cumulative "Plus Project" traffic operations back to acceptable levels.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS TO LANE QUEUING UNDER CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT CONDITIONS (IMPACT 15-7)

The following intersection movements on SR 49 will have queues greater than the available storage length. These movements would also have queues greater than the available storage length under Cumulative No Project Conditions.

- Northbound Left at the intersection of SR 49/Dry Creek Road;
- Southbound Left at the intersection of SR 49/Dry Creek Road; and
- Northbound Left at the intersection of SR 49/Willow Creek Drive.

The lack of available storage length for the three (3) above-listed intersection movements under the Cumulative Plus Project Conditions is a ***potentially significant*** impact.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the project's incremental contribution to the above identified cumulative lane queuing impact to a level that is less than cumulatively considerable.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts to lane queuing under the Cumulative Plus Project Conditions.

Northbound Left at the Intersection of SR 49/Dry Creek Road

15-7(a) *Implement Mitigation Measure 7-6(a).*

Southbound Left at the Intersection of SR 49/Dry Creek Road

15-7(b) *Implement Mitigation Measure 7-2(d).*

Northbound Left at the Intersection of SR 49/Willow Creek Drive

15-7(c) *Implement Mitigation Measure 7-2(d).*

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce Impact 15-7 (Impacts to lane queuing under Cumulative Plus Project Conditions) to a less-than-significant level because the project applicant would pay traffic mitigation fees and construct improvements that would improve Cumulative "Plus Project" traffic operations back to acceptable levels.

4.11 INITIAL STUDY

CREATE ANY HEALTH HAZARD OR POTENTIAL HEALTH HAZARD? (INITIAL STUDY IMPACT VII-8)

An on-site stormwater detention system would need to be constructed as part of the project. Stormwater detention systems have the potential to allow for the breeding of mosquitoes, which would result in a ***potentially significant*** impact related to creating a potential health hazard.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measure that would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

MM VII.1 *In order to minimize potential health hazards related to mosquito breeding, the project proponent will abide by the Placer Mosquito Abatement District construction guidelines for stormwater detention systems. In order to minimize the potential for breeding mosquito disease vectors in the ponds, the project proponent will develop a Mosquito*

Management Plan with the Placer County Mosquito Abatement District. The project will be conditioned to allow the Placer County Mosquito Abatement District to review the Improvement Plans.

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce Impact VII-8 (Create any health hazard or potential health hazard) to a less-than-significant level because the project applicant would abide by the PMAD construction guidelines for stormwater detention systems, and PMAD would review the project improvement plans.

OTHERWISE SUBSTANTIALLY DEGRADE GROUND WATER QUALITY? (INITIAL STUDY IMPACT VIII-7)

The project may result in a significant increase in urban stormwater runoff. Standard Best Management Practices will be used and as such, the potential for this project to violate any water quality standards is less than significant. It is possible that there was a residence on the property at one time. Although Placer County Environmental Health Services does not have records of individual water wells or on-site sewage disposal systems existing at the property, it is likely that a residence would have been served by a water well and on-site sewage disposal system. The presence of either an on-site sewage disposal system or individual water well could create a ***potentially significant*** impact to groundwater quality.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. This mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measure that would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

MM VIII.1 *If any indication of an abandoned septic system is discovered, it will be properly destroyed under permit with Environmental Health Services. If any indication of abandoned water well is discovered, it will be properly destroyed by a licensed well driller, under permit with Environmental Health Services.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce Impact VIII-7 (Otherwise substantially degrade water quality) to a less-than-significant level because any indication of an abandoned septic system would be destroyed by a licensed well driller under permit with Environmental Health Services.

5 SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS WHICH REMAIN SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE

5.1 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS TO ROADWAY SEGMENTS UNDER THE SHORT TERM PLUS PROJECT PHASE 1 CONDITIONS (IMPACT 7-4).

The Atwood Road roadway segment from Richardson Drive to SR 49 is projected to operate at unacceptable LOS on a daily (ADT) basis. This segment was determined to operate at unacceptable LOS for Short Term No Project Conditions and implementation of Phase 1 of the project would increase average daily traffic (ADT) on the roadway, which is considered a ***significant*** impact.

Finding

Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.

Facts in Support of Finding

The Atwood Road from Richardson Drive to SR 49 roadway segment is not included in the improvements list outlined within the CCIP. The existing development on either side of the roadway limits the extent of improvements that could be constructed along the roadway segment. Economically feasible improvements which would provide acceptable LOS C or better operations are not possible. Therefore, the project's impact under this scenario would remain *significant and unavoidable.*

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS TO ROADWAY SEGMENTS UNDER THE SHORT TERM PLUS PROJECT PHASE 1 AND PHASE 2 CONDITIONS (IMPACT 7-8).

The Atwood Road roadway segment from Richardson Drive to SR 49 is projected to operate at unacceptable LOS on a daily (ADT) basis. This segment was determined to operate at unacceptable LOS for Short Term No Project and Short Term Plus Project Phase 1 Conditions and implementation of Phase 2 of the project would further increase average daily traffic (ADT) on the roadway, which is considered a ***significant*** impact.

Finding

Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.

Facts in Support of Finding

The Atwood Road from Richardson Drive to SR 49 roadway segment is not included in the improvements list outlined within the CCIP. The existing development on either side of the roadway limits the extent of improvements that could be constructed along the roadway segment. Economically feasible improvements which would provide acceptable LOS C or better operations are not possible. Therefore, the project's impact under this scenario would remain *significant and unavoidable.*

5.2 AIR QUALITY

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS RELATED TO LONG-TERM INCREASES OF CRITERIA AIR POLLUTANTS (IMPACT 8-4).

The proposed project would result in the development of commercial and residential land uses that would generate emissions of ROG and NO_X, which are ozone-precursor pollutants, as well as CO and PM_{10}. Based on the modeling conducted using URBEMIS-2007 (Version 9.2.4), operation of the proposed project would result in total predicted emissions of ROG and PM_{10} that would exceed the PCAPCD significance thresholds. Therefore, the project's impact would be ***significant.***

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that partially mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. However, this mitigation would not reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce the project's impacts regarding long-term increases of criteria air pollutants, but not to a less-than-significant level.

8-4 *Prior to Improvement Plan approval, the applicant shall show on the plans incorporation of mitigation measures to reduce the impact to the highest degree feasible. The plans shall be reviewed and approved by the Placer County Air Pollution Control District to ensure proper incorporation of mitigation measures. The mitigation measures shall be the following:*

- *Provide bicycle lanes, sidewalks and/or paths, connecting project residences to adjacent schools, parks, the nearest transit stop and nearby commercial areas.*
- *Provide secure and conveniently placed bicycle parking at parks and other facilities.*
- *Implement feasible travel demand management (TDM) measures for a project of this type. This would include coordination with regional ride-sharing organization and, provision of transit information.*
- *Woodburning or pellet appliances shall not be permitted for the entire planning area with the single exception of only one wood burning appliance which meets the APCD Rule 225 in the common building "A". Only natural gas or propane-fired fireplace appliances are permitted. These appliances shall be clearly delineated on the floor plans submitted in conjunction with the building permit application.*
- *Install exterior outlets in the front and rear of each home to promote use of electric lawn and garden equipment for landscaping.*
- *Construct transit amenities such as bus turnouts/bus bulbs, benches, shelters, etc. in coordination with Placer County Transit.*
- *Provide direct, safe, attractive pedestrian access from project land uses to transit stops and adjacent development.*
- *Include shade trees near buildings to shield them from the sun's rays and reduce local air temperature and cooling energy demand.*
- *Electrify service equipment where feasible.*
- *Install energy-efficient appliances, such as water heaters, refrigerators, furnaces and boiler units that meet or exceed Title 24 requirements.*
- *Install automatic lighting on/off controls and energy-efficient lighting.*
- *Landscape trees should have low ozone-forming potential.*
- *Landscape with drought-resistant species, using groundcover rather than pavement where feasible.*
- *Provide information to homebuyers about available local electric lawn and garden equipment exchange program.*

The commercial portion of the project shall be required to apply Transportation Systems Management (TSM) measures to reduce trips. Appropriate strategies would be:

- *Provide physical improvements, such as sidewalk improvements, landscaping and bicycle parking that would act as incentives for pedestrian and bicycle modes of travel.*
- *Connect site with a regional bikeway/pedestrian trail system.*
- *Implement feasible travel demand management (TDM) measures for a project of this type. This would include coordination with regional ridesharing organizations and transit incentives program.*
- *Provide secure and conveniently located bicycle parking for workers and patrons.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would not reduce Impact 8-4 (impacts regarding long-term increases of criteria air pollutants) to a less-than-significant level because feasible mitigation does not exist to fully reduce the impact below the District's applicable threshold. The impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

5.3 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (CUMULATIVE)

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: CUMULATIVE LOSS OF BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES IN PLACER COUNTY AND THE EFFECTS OF ONGOING URBANIZATION IN THE REGION (IMPACT 15-2).

The ABCP area, like other communities in the region, is experiencing urban growth. Some housing developments are already approved or planned in the surrounding areas. Cumulatively, these projects would reduce wildlife habitat and the numbers of special-status plant and animal species which would be considered a significant impact. However, the majority of the ABCP area in the vicinity of the project site is disturbed as a result of previous development (commercial, industrial, and residential) and is primarily comprised of non-native grassland. However, disturbed lands provide habitat for many common species and may provide habitat for several special-status species. Therefore, the project's cumulative contribution to impacts related to biological resources would be considered ***significant***.

Finding

With implementation of mitigation measures, the project's incremental contribution to the cumulative loss of special-status species, trees and other habitats, and waters of the U.S. was found to be less than cumulatively considerable. However, the project's impacts to biological resources in conjunction with other projects would result in the permanent loss of oak woodland. Therefore, the project's cumulative contribution to impacts related to biological resources would be considered significant.

Facts in Support of Finding

Implementation of the mitigation measures would not reduce Impact 15-2 (Cumulative loss of biological resources in Placer County and the effects of ongoing urbanization in the region) to a less-than-significant level because the feasible measures do not exist. The impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

5.4 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION (CUMULATIVE)

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS TO ROADWAY SEGMENTS UNDER CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT CONDITIONS (IMPACT 15-5).

The Atwood Road roadway segment from Richardson Drive to SR 49 is projected to operate at unacceptable LOS on a daily (ADT) basis. This roadway segment would operate unacceptably under Short Term No Project and

Short Term Plus Project Phase 1 (and Phases 1 + 2) Conditions. Under Cumulative Conditions, this roadway segment would further degrade, which is considered a ***significant*** impact.

Finding

Mitigation measures to reduce the project's cumulative impacts to the Atwood Road from Richardson Drive to SR 49 roadway segment to a less-than-significant level are not feasible.

Facts in Support of Finding

None feasible.

Feasible mitigation to reduce Impact 15-5 (Cumulative impacts to roadway segments under Cumulative Plus Project Conditions) to a less-than-significant does not exist for the Atwood Road from Richardson Drive to SR 49 roadway segment because the roadway segment is not included in the improvements list outlined within the CCIP. The existing development on either side of the roadway limits the extent of improvements that could be constructed along the roadway segment. Economically feasible improvements which would provide acceptable LOS C or better operations are not possible. Therefore, the project's contribution to this cumulative impact would remain *significant and unavoidable.*

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: IMPACTS TO ARTERIAL SEGMENTS UNDER CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT CONDITIONS (IMPACT 15-6).

Implementation of the proposed project would exacerbate unacceptable LOS at two arterial segments, Northbound SR 49 between Willow Creek Drive and Bell Road and Southbound SR 49 between Bell Road and Education Street, for at least one peak hour under the Cumulative Condition, which is considered a ***significant*** impact.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that partially mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. However, this mitigation would not reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce the project's cumulative impacts to the Northbound SR 49 arterial segment to a less-than-significant level, but not to the Southbound SR 49 segment.

Northbound SR 49 (Between Willow Creek Drive and Bell Road)

15-6 *Implement Mitigation Measure 7-2(d).*

Southbound SR 49 (Between Bell Road and Education Street)

The economic feasibility of making the necessary improvements to Southbound SR 49 between Bell Road and Education Street arterial segment is not feasible given the fact that the existing development limits the extent of improvements that could be constructed at this intersection. Therefore, the identified cumulative impact to the Southbound SR 49 between Bell Road and Education Street arterial segment would remain *significant and unavoidable.*

None feasible.

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would not reduce Impact 15-6 (Cumulative impacts to arterial segments under Cumulative Plus Project Conditions) to a less-than-significant level because feasible mitigation does not exist for the Southbound SR 49 arterial segment. The impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

5.5 AIR QUALITY (CUMULATIVE)

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: CUMULATIVE IMPACTS TO REGIONAL AIR QUALITY (IMPACT 15-8).

The PCAPCD cumulative significance thresholds for emissions are applied to project-level emissions. An increase of more than ten pounds per day of ROG and/or NOx (ozone precursors) would be above the PCAPCD cumulative threshold of significance. The PCAPCD does not have cumulative thresholds of significance for PM_{10} emissions, as Placer County is in attainment for PM_{10}. Project operational emissions of ROG and NO_X would exceed the PCAPCD cumulative thresholds of significance; therefore, the cumulative impact associated with the project would be ***significant***.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that partially mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. However, this mitigation would not reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce the project's cumulative impacts regarding regional air quality, but not to a less-than-significant level.

15-8(a) *Low- or No-VOC paints, adhesives and sealants shall be used during the construction of all proposed onsite structures.*

15-8(b) *In order to mitigate the project's contribution to long-term emission of pollutants, the applicant shall:*

Participate in the PCAPCD Off-site Mitigation Program by paying the equivalent amount of money that is equal to the project's contribution of pollutants (ROG and NO_X) that exceed the cumulative threshold of 10 lbs/day. The estimated total amount of excessive ROG for this project is 7.15 tons (88.60 lbs/day – 10 lbs/day = 78.60 lbs/day x 182 days = 14,305.2 lbs/year / 2,000 lbs/ton = 7.15 tons/year), and the estimated total amount of excessive NO_X for this project is 2.03 tons (32.29 lbs/day – 10 lbs/day = 22.29 lbs/day x 182 days = 4,056.8 lbs/year / 2,000 lbs/ton = 2.03 tons/year). The estimated payment for the proposed project is $131,274 based on the amount of $14,300 per ton (7.15 tons ROG + 2.03 tons NO_X = 9.18 tons x 14,300 $/ton = $131,274. The actual amount to be paid shall be determined, per current California Air Resource Board guidelines, at the time of recordation of the Final Map. This condition shall be satisfied prior to recordation of a Final Map.

Or

Participate in an offsite mitigation program, coordinated through the PCAPCD, to offset the project's long-term emission of pollutants. Examples include participation in a "Biomass" program, retrofitting mobile sources (i.e. busses, heavy duty diesel equipment), or any other program that is deemed acceptable by the Director of the

PCAPCD. Any proposed off-site mitigation shall be located within the same region as the proposed project. The fair-share Off-site Mitigation Fee shall be adjusted accordingly.

15-8(c) *Implement Mitigation Measure 8-1(o).*

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would not reduce Impact 15-8 (Cumulative impacts to regional air quality) to a less-than-significant level because feasible mitigation does not exist to fully reduce the impact below the District's applicable threshold. The impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECT: THE PROJECT COULD POTENTIALLY RESULT IN A CUMULATIVELY CONSIDERABLE INCREMENTAL CONTRIBUTION TO THE GLOBAL PRODUCTION OF GREENHOUSE GASES (IMPACT 15-9).

The County has evaluated this project on a qualitative basis to reach a conclusion regarding the significance of the GHG emissions that would result from a project. One measure is the extent to which the project complies with directly applicable emission reduction measures that would support the State's efforts to significantly reduce its contribution to global climate change and the associated impacts. These would include each of the project-applicable strategies to comply with Executive Order S-3-05 or AB 32. The proposed project will incorporate many such strategies as that would reduce the project's contribution to global climate change. Should the project not implement the full range of green measures provided in Table 15-12, the proposed project could conflict with or obstruct implementation of the goals or strategies of Executive Order S-3-05, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, or the Attorney General's suggested global warming mitigation measures. Therefore, the project could have a significant impact associated with the generation of GHG emissions and because it cannot be determined to a reasonable degree of certainty that the project will not result in a numerically cumulatively considerable incremental contribution to the significant cumulative impact of global climate change, even with the implementation of mitigation measures, the impacts of the project on global climate change are considered ***significant and unavoidable.***

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that partially mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment. However, this mitigation would not reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

Facts in Support of Finding

The County adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce the project's cumulative impacts regarding global production of greenhouse gases, but not to a less-than-significant level.

15-9(a) *Prior to Improvement Plan approval, the project applicant shall submit, for review and approval by Placer County Planning Department and the PCAPCD, building and landscaping plans that demonstrate compliance with the following mitigation measures set forth in Table 15-12:*

- *Landscaping plans will provide for tree planting throughout all parking areas to attain 50 percent shading of parking areas within 15 years of building permit issuance. Landscaping plans will incorporate native and/or drought-resistant species (plants, trees, and bushes) to reduce the demand for use of landscape maintenance equipment;*
- *Design buildings to be as energy efficient as possible, including the incorporation of solar energy to the maximum extent feasible. Where solar systems cannot feasibly be incorporated into the project at the outset, best efforts*

should be made so the buildings shall be constructed as "solar ready," as described in the U.S. Department of Energy's "A Homebuilder's Guide to Going Solar," available at http://www.eere.energy.gov/solar;

- *Install efficient lighting and lighting control systems. Use daylight as an integral part of lighting systems in buildings;*
- *Install light colored "cool" roofs where feasible, including the flat or low-slope roofs of the commercial buildings; cool pavements where feasible, including the parking lot of common building "A", the entry way near Richardson Drive, and the paths along the large stormwater lake; and strategically placed shade trees;*
- *Install energy efficient heating and cooling systems, appliances and equipment, and control systems;*
- *Install light emitting diodes (LEDs) for traffic, street, and other outdoor lighting;*
- *Create water-efficient landscapes;*
- *Install water-efficient irrigation systems and devices, such as soil moisture-based irrigation controls;*
- *Design buildings to be water-efficient. Install water-efficient fixtures and appliances;*
- *Restrict watering methods (e.g., prohibit systems that apply water to non-vegetated surfaces) and control runoff;*
- *Implement low-impact development practices that maintain the existing hydrologic character of the site to manage storm water and protect the environment (Retaining storm water runoff on-site can drastically reduce the need for energy-intensive imported water at the site);*
- *Reuse and recycle construction and demolition waste (including, but not limited to, soil, vegetation, and concrete, lumber, metal, and cardboard);*
- *Provide interior and exterior storage areas for recyclables and green waste and adequate recycling containers located in public areas;*
- *Demonstrate on Improvement Plans that improved accessibility to the existing pathway infrastructure that leads to and from local services will be provided along the southern boundary of the project site;*
- *Demonstrate on Improvement Plans that the site will provide maximum access and connectivity to the existing Placer County bus shelter at the entrance of the project site;*
- *Limit idling time for commercial vehicles, including delivery and construction vehicles;*
- *Provide the necessary facilities and infrastructure to encourage the use of low or zero-emission vehicles (e.g., electric vehicle charging facilities and conveniently located alternative fueling);*
- *For commercial uses, provide adequate bicycle parking near building entrances to promote cyclist safety, security, and convenience. For large employers, provide facilities that encourage bicycle commuting, including, e.g., locked bicycle storage or covered or indoor bicycle parking;*
- *Create bicycle lanes and walking paths directed to the location of schools, parks, and other destination points; and*
- *Comply with the requirements within the Regulation for the Management of High Global Warming Potential Refrigerants for Stationary Sources in order to reduce the project's potential emissions of high GWP refrigerants.*

15-9(b) *Prior to the issuance of building permits for the proposed project, the project applicant shall submit, for review and approval by Placer County Planning Department and the*

PCAPCD, building plans that demonstrate compliance with the following mitigation measures:

- *All homes shall include energy-efficient appliances, such as water heaters, refrigerators, furnaces and boiler units that meet or exceed Title 24 requirements; and*
- *All villas shall be constructed to meet the California's new green Building Code "CALGreen" and obtain certification of the Tier 1 Requirements as they are described in the APPENDIX A4 Residential Voluntary Measures, Division A4.6 – Tier I and Tier II.*

Or

All villas within the proposed project shall a) utilize AC units that are two points above the Seasonal Energy Efficient Ratio (SEER) energy efficiency rating in effect at the time of the approval of the Tentative Subdivision Map. Any plans submitted to the Building Division must clearly show that this condition is being met; b) All villas shall include "whole house fans," as feasible. Any plans submitted to the Building Division must clearly show that this condition is being met; and c) All villas shall include, at the builder's discretion, one of the following two options: 1) a "tankless" water heater, or 2) upgraded insulation in all walls and ceilings to exceed the Title 24 requirements in place at the time of building permit issuance. Any plans submitted to the Building Division must clearly show that this condition is being met.

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would not reduce Impact 15-9 (The project could potentially result in a cumulatively considerable incremental contribution to the global production of greenhouse gases) to a less-than-significant level because feasible mitigation does not exist. The impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

5.6 GROWTH INDUCEMENT

An EIR must discuss the ways in which a proposed project could foster economic or population growth in the vicinity of the project and how that growth would, in turn, affect the surrounding environment (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2[d]). Growth can be induced in a number of ways, including through the elimination of obstacles to growth, or through the stimulation of economic activity within the region. The discussion of the removal of obstacles to growth relates directly to the removal of infrastructure limitations or regulatory constraints that could result in growth unforeseen at the time of project approval.

A number of issues must be considered when assessing the growth-inducing effects of development plans, such as the proposed project. These issues include the following:

Elimination of Obstacles to Growth: The extent to which infrastructure capacity provided to accommodate the proposed project would allow additional development in surrounding areas.

Economic Effects: The extent to which development of the proposed project would cause increased activity in the local or regional economy.

Growth-inducing impacts associated with the proposed project would be considered to be any effects of the project allowing for additional growth or an increase in population beyond what was anticipated in the PCGP.

The elimination of either physical or regulatory obstacles to growth is considered to be a growth-inducing effect. A physical obstacle to growth typically involves the lack of public service infrastructure. The extension of public

service infrastructure, including roadways, water mains, and sewer lines, into areas that are not currently provided with these services, would be expected to support new development. Similarly, the elimination or change to a regulatory obstacle, including existing growth and development policies, could result in new growth.

The proposed project would include the development of a continuing care retirement community (CCRC) and an approximately 168,500-square-foot commercial center (including professional or medical office space). The proposed project would include up to 858 residential units, of which 780 would be located in the CCRC, with the remaining 78 units included as second- and third-story lofts above commercial and office spaces. The proposed project would, therefore, directly add population and employees to the project area via the new residences and office buildings.

The SMD-1 Wastewater Treatment Plant, which serves the project area, does not have adequate capacity to serve the proposed project at full buildout. In addition, some pipelines within (and outside) the project area, including portions of the sewer line to the wastewater treatment plant on Joeger Road, would require upsizing to accommodate wastewater flows from the proposed project. Therefore, a new sewer trunk alignment has been incorporated into the project to accommodate building layouts and to upsize the sewer pipeline. The upsized sewer pipes are intended to accommodate buildout of the proposed project and buildout of the entire service area; therefore, construction of these infrastructure improvements would indirectly cause growth inducement in the area. These on- and off-site infrastructure improvements would be required prior to the construction of the proposed project.

Because the proposed project would add population and employees to the project area, thereby directly inducing growth, and because the project would include the construction of infrastructure that would serve off-site areas that are currently undeveloped but may be developed in the future, thereby indirectly inducing growth, the project's growth-inducing impacts are expected to be ***significant and unavoidable***.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

The County received numerous comments on the Draft EIR. In considering specific recommendations from commenters, the County has been cognizant of its legal obligation under CEQA to substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental effects to the extent feasible. The County recognizes, moreover, that comments frequently offer thoughtful suggestions regarding how a commenter believes that a particular mitigation measure can be modified, or perhaps changed significantly, in order to more effectively, in the commenter's eyes, reduce the severity of environmental effects. The County is also cognizant, however, that the mitigation measures recommended in the Draft EIR represent the professional judgment and long experience of the County's expert staff and environmental consultants. The County therefore believes that these recommendations should not be lightly altered. Thus, in considering commenters' suggested changes or additions to the mitigation measures as set forth in the Draft EIR the County, in determining whether to accept such suggestions, either in whole or in part, has considered the following factors, among others: (i) whether the suggestion relates to a significant and unavoidable environmental effect of the originally proposed project or alternative, or instead relates to an effect that can already be mitigated to less than significant levels by proposed mitigation measures in the Draft EIR; (ii) whether the proposed language represents a clear improvement, from an environmental standpoint, over the draft language that a commenter seeks to replace; (iii) whether the proposed language is sufficiently clear as to be easily understood by those who will implement the mitigation as finally adopted; (iv) whether the language might be too inflexible to allow for pragmatic implementation; (v) whether the suggestions are feasible from an economic, technical, legal, or other standpoint; and (vi) whether the proposed language is consistent with the project objectives.

In some instances, the County made changes to the Draft EIR in response to input from commenters. In no instance did the County fail to take seriously a suggestion made by a commenter or fail to appreciate the sincere effort that went into the formulation of suggestions.

6 ALTERNATIVES

The CEQA Guidelines require that an EIR describe a reasonable range of alternatives that would feasibly obtain most of the basic project objectives but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant environmental effects of the project and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. (Guidelines §15126(a)). Case law has indicated that the lead agency has the discretion to determine how many alternatives constitute a reasonable range. (Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors (1990), 52 C.3d 553, 566). CEQA Guidelines note that alternatives evaluated in the EIR should be able to obtain most of the basic objectives of the project (Guidelines §15126.6(a)). An EIR need not present alternatives that are incompatible with fundamental project objectives (Save San Francisco Bay Association vs. San Francisco Bay Conservation & Development Commission (1992), 10 Cal.App.4th 908); and the Guidelines provide that an EIR need not consider alternatives that are infeasible. (CEQA Guidelines §15126.6(a)). The Guidelines provide 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, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site." (CEQA Guidelines §15126.6(f)(1)). The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a "rule of reason" that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice (CEQA Guidelines §15126.6(f)).

Public Resources Code section 21061.1 defines "feasible" to mean "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social and technological factors." CEQA Guidelines section 15364 adds another factor: "legal" considerations. (See also *Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors* ("*Goleta II*") (1990) 52 Cal.3d 553, 565.)

The concept of "feasibility" also encompasses the question of whether a particular alternative or mitigation measure promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project. (*City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 410, 417.) "'[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." (*Id.*; see also *California Native Plant Society v. City of Santa Cruz* (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 957, 1001-1002 (*City of Santa Cruz.*)

The review of project alternatives is guided primarily by the need to substantially reduce potential impacts associated with the project, while still achieving the basic objectives of the project. The following objectives for the project were provided by the applicant:

1. Provide a mixed-use continuing care retirement community (CCRC) of approximately 858 residential units, approximately 28,500 square feet of retail uses, and approximately 190,000 square feet of medical/professional office uses on a single, infill site in close proximity to existing compatible land uses;

2. Help realize the County's implementation of the Blueprint project of the Sacramento Area Council of Governments through the provision on a single infill site of: (1) a range of housing types, (2) mix of uses, (3) transportation choices, (4) compact development, (5) use of existing assets, and (6) quality design, all close to medical facilities and other compatible uses;

3. Connect through an accessible and interconnected network of trails a mixed-use, continuing care retirement community (CCRC) to the County's Dewitt Center, a regional park, and existing neighborhoods;

4. Provide a potential opportunity for on-site affordable workforce housing units; and

5. Provide through an economically feasible project a network of road connections to the surrounding Auburn community to provide alternative parallel roadway opportunities for local travelers.

The detailed discussions in Sections 4 and 5 demonstrate that many of the significant environmental effects of the project have been either substantially lessened or avoided through the imposition of existing policies or regulations or by the adoption of additional, formal mitigation measures recommended in the EIR.

For the sake of full disclosure, moreover, it is noted that, even with mitigation in the form of the application of existing policies and, where feasible, the addition of formal mitigation measures, the following significant effects remain significant and unavoidable:

- Impacts related to long-term increases of criteria air pollutants; as identified in Impact Statement 8-4;
- Impacts to roadway segments under Short Term Plus Project Phase 1 conditions, as identified in Impacts Statement 7-4;
- Impacts to roadway segments under Short Term Plus Project Phases 1 and 2 conditions, as identified in Impact Statement 7-8;
- Impacts to roadway segments under Cumulative Plus Project conditions, as identified in Impact Statement 15-5;
- Impact to arterial segments under Cumulative Plus Project conditions, as identified in Impact Statement 15-6;
- Cumulative loss of biological resources in Placer County and the effects of ongoing urbanization in the region, as identified in Impact Statement 15-2;
- Cumulative impacts to regional air quality, as identified in Impact Statement 15-8;
- The project could potentially result in a cumulatively considerable incremental contribution to the global production of greenhouse gases, as identified in Impact Statement 15-9; and
- Growth-Inducement.

The County can fully satisfy its CEQA obligations by determining whether any alternatives identified in the Draft EIR are both feasible and environmentally superior with respect to these impacts. (See *Laurel Hills Homeowners Assn. v. City Council* (1978) 83 Cal.App.3d 515, 520-521, 526-527; *Kings County Farm Bureau, supra*, 221 Cal.App.3d at pp. 730-731; and *Laurel Heights Improvement Assn. v. Regents of the University of California* (1988) 47 Cal.3d 376, 400-403; see also Pub. Resources Code, Section 21002.) These Findings will assess whether each alternative is feasible in light of the project applicant's objectives for the project, which, as noted earlier, the Planning Commission finds to be legitimate and has embraced as though they were the County's own objectives. As the following discussion will show, no identified alternative qualifies as both feasible and environmentally superior to the project as the Clustered Density Alternative is not the environmentally superior alternative and the Reduced Density Alternative is not feasible.

In accordance with Section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the Planning Commission finds that a range of reasonable alternatives to the project that could feasibly attain the basic project objectives but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project was addressed in the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR considered the following three alternatives to the project: the No Project Alternative, the Clustered Development Alternative, and the Reduced Density Alternative.

6.1 NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

Section 15126.6(e)(1) of the Government Code provides the following direction relative to the No Project Alternative:

> The specific alternative of "no project" shall also be evaluated along with its impact. The purpose of describing and analyzing a no project alternative is to allow decision makers to compare the

impacts of approving the proposed project with the impacts of not approving the proposed project. The no project alterative analysis is not the baseline for determining where the proposed project's environmental impacts may be significant, unless it is identical to the existing environmental setting analysis which does establish that baseline.

The No Project Alternative is defined in this section as the continuation of the existing condition of the project site, undeveloped land (other than the existing single-family home on-site). Impacts related to land use would be decreased as compared to the proposed project, if the No Project-No Build Alternative was implemented. Under the No Project-No Build Alternative, land disturbance would not occur and, therefore, the majority of environmental impacts identified for the proposed project would not occur. Because many of the impacts of concern are directly related to land disturbances, if the No Project-No Build Alternative were selected, those impacts would not ensue. Furthermore, impacts not directly related to land disturbance activities would most likely not occur.

Traffic and related concerns, such as air quality and noise issues related to construction and operational activities on the project site, would not occur if the No Project-No Build Alternative were selected. If the proposed project was not developed, people would not be potentially exposed to hazards in regard to past mining activity in the project area, as well as the exposure of people to asbestos and lead-based paint. Proposed structures would not be subject to soil, geology, and seismicity impacts such as liquefaction and groundshaking because structures would not exist. The No Project-No Build Alternative would not increase demand for public services such as police and fire, because there would be no purpose for pedestrians to congregate at the project site. In addition, the No Project-No Build Alternative would not require the construction of a new off-site sewer alignment with an upsized pipeline. Furthermore, the site would not be irreversibly converted to an urban use under the No Project-No Build Alternative, thereby eliminating visual impacts.

Finding: Implementation of the No Project Alternative would not meet any of the Project Objectives. The County has determined that specific economic, social, and environmental considerations render the No Project Alternative infeasible. (See CEQA Guidelines, Section 15091, subd. (a)(3).). Under CEQA, "Feasible" means "[...] capable of being accomplished in a successful manner in a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors." (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15364.) As noted above, the concept of "feasibility" also encompasses the question of whether a particular alternative or mitigation measure promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project. (*City of Del Mar*, *supra*, 133 Cal.App.3d at p. 417; *City of Santa Cruz*, *supra*, 177 Cal.App.4th at pp. 992, 1000-1003.) The No Project Alternative would not promote the objectives of the project.

To the extent that the project has greater environmental impacts than the No Project Alternative, the County believes they are acceptable, given the great lengths taken to mitigate all environmental impacts to the extent feasible. In sum, the County believes that the benefits of the project as proposed outweigh its environmental costs. (See *Laurel Hills*, *supra*, 83 Cal.App.3d at p. 521 (a public agency may approve [ ] a project once its significant adverse effects have been reduced to an acceptable level - - that is, all avoidable damage has been eliminated and that which remains is otherwise acceptable").)

6.2 CLUSTERED DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE

The Clustered Development Alternative would include the same number of residential units (858), and the same square footage for commercial uses as the proposed project. The Clustered Development Alternative would include the elimination of all construction (minus passive use) on the western portion of the proposed project site and would instead include the units lost (56) in the central portion of the site by adding a three-story independent living building and making up the rest in residential villas. It should be noted that the construction of off-site sewer infrastructure would still be required under the Clustered Development Alternative.

Like the proposed project, the Clustered Development Alternative would require amendments to the Placer County General Plan (PCGP) and Auburn Bowman Community Plan (ABCP) land use designations for the site, as well as a rezone of the site. However, the Clustered Development Alternative would not include land disturbance on the western portion of the project. Both the Clustered Development Alternative and the proposed project would result in the development of the same number of residential units which would generate similar vehicle trips, and demand for public services. In addition, the Clustered Development Alternative would allow for the preservation of an additional 8 acres of on-site oak woodland thereby decreasing direct impacts to oak woodlands, and indirectly decreasing impacts to wildlife that would utilize the oak woodland as habitat, foraging grounds, nesting, or other purposes. However, the Clustered Development Alternative would still result in the removal of approximately 16 acres of oak woodland. Therefore, similar to the proposed project, development of the Clustered Development Alternative would still result in a *significant and unavoidable* cumulative impact to biological resources. Similarly, because the Clustered Development Alternative would include buildout of the site with the same type and intensity of uses as the proposed project, significant and unavoidable traffic and air quality impacts identified for the proposed project would be expected to remain should the Clustered Development Alternative be implemented in-lieu the project.

Finding: Implementation of the Clustered Development Alternative will meet all of the project objectives. Impacts under the Clustered Development Alternative will be similar for most of the issue areas, as compared to those of the originally proposed project. In addition, all mitigation required for the originally proposed project would be required to reduce the impacts of Clustered Development Alternative to a less-than-significant level. However, the following significant and unavoidable impacts resulting from the proposed project will also result from implementation of this Alternative: Impacts related to long-term increases of criteria air pollutants; Impact to roadway segments under Short Term Plus Project Phase 1 conditions; Impacts to roadway segments under Short Term Plus Project Phases 1 and 2 conditions; Impact to roadway segments under Cumulative Plus Project conditions; The proposed project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact to arterial segments under Cumulative Plus Project conditions; Cumulative loss of biological resources in Placer County and the effects of ongoing urbanization in the region; Cumulative impacts to regional air quality; and The project could potentially result in a cumulatively considerable incremental contribution to the global production of greenhouse gases.

While the implementation of the Clustered Development Alternative will not eliminate any of the significant and unavoidable impacts of the Project below the CEQA thresholds of significance identified in the Draft EIR, impacts related to biological resources and air quality would be reduced in intensity in terms of the greater preservation of oak woodlands and the reduced amount of construction emissions, respectively. However, the Clustered Development Alternative includes development of an additional three-story structure in the north-central portion of the project site that would be visible from nearby residences along Golden Eagle Drive. As discussed in the Draft EIR, although the project's proposed landscaping and the required preparation of design guidelines would reduce the visual impact of the project to residents along Golden Eagle Drive, the views of the project structures from said residences would be more pronounced under this Alternative due to the additional three-story structure. Given the relatively high volume of concerns expressed in the Draft EIR public comment letters regarding aesthetics, and the fact that the Clustered Development Alternative would include an additional three-story structure visible to concerned residents along the project boundaries, the County believes that the benefits of this alternative would not supersede the benefits of the proposed project. This coupled with the fact that the significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed project would not be eliminated with implementation of the Clustered Development Alternative, precludes this alternative from being environmentally superior to the proposed project.

To the extent that the project has greater environmental impacts than the Clustered Development Alternative, the County believes they are acceptable, given the great lengths taken to mitigate all environmental impacts to the extent feasible. In sum, the County believes that the benefits of the project as proposed outweigh its environmental costs. (See Laurel Hills, supra, 83 Cal.App.3d at p. 521 (a "public agency may approve [ ] a project once its significant adverse effects have been reduced to an acceptable level - - that is, all avoidable damage has been eliminated and that which remains is otherwise acceptable.").)

6.3 REDUCED DENSITY ALTERNATIVE

The Reduced Density Alternative would include the elimination of 100 independent living units by eliminating Buildings C5 and C6 and reducing Building C2 from three stories to two stories. 15 detached villas would be removed from the western and southern perimeter, and 12 of the 15 would instead be inserted into the old location of Buildings C5 and C6. The net reduction of units under the Reduced Density Alternative is 103. In addition, the lake would be reduced in size. The reduction in residential units and the size of the lake would allow for approximately 10 acres of on-site oak woodlands to be preserved, as compared to the proposed project. It should be noted that the construction of off-site sewer infrastructure would still be required under the Reduced Density Alternative.

Buildout of the Reduced Intensity Alternative would include the development of approximately 760 residential units, which would be 100 less than the proposed project. Therefore, this Alternative would not satisfy Project Objective 1. This alternative would result in less environmental impact to Land Use; Biological Resources; Air Quality; Soils, Geology, and Seismicity; and Hydrology, Water Quality, and Drainage. Further, regarding transportation and circulation, the Reduced Density Alternative would generate approximately 281 fewer vehicles trips, which would reduce emissions of criteria pollutants from commercial uses and automobiles. Therefore, the Reduced Density Alternative would result in fewer impacts related to Air Quality, as compared to the Proposed Project. However, it should be noted that similar to the proposed project, development of the Reduced Density Alternative would result in a *significant and unavoidable* cumulative impact to Air Quality.

Finding: Implementation of the Reduced Density Alternative would not meet one of the five project objectives. In particular, the Reduced Density Alternative would include the development of approximately 760 residential units, which would be less than the proposed project.

The County has determined that specific economic, social, and environmental considerations render the Reduced Density Alternative infeasible. (See CEQA Guidelines, Section 15091, subd. (a)(3).). Under CEQA, "feasible" means "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner in a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors." (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15364.) As explained above, the concept of "feasibility" also encompasses the question of whether a particular alternative or mitigation measure promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project. (*City of Del Mar, supra,* 133 Cal.App.3d at 417.) The Reduced Density Alternative would not promote the basic objectives of the project.

To the extent that the project has greater environmental impacts than the Reduced Density Alternative, the County believes they are acceptable, given the great lengths taken to mitigate all environmental impacts to the extent feasible. In sum, the County believes that the benefits of the project as proposed outweigh its environmental costs. (See Laurel Hills, supra, 83 Cal.App.3d at p. 521 (a "public agency may approve [ ] a project once its significant adverse effects have been reduced to an acceptable level - - that is, all avoidable damage has been eliminated and that which remains is otherwise acceptable.").)

7 STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

As discussed in Section 5 of these CEQA Findings, the Final EIR concludes that the project, even with the incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures and consideration of alternatives, will nonetheless cause direct significant and unavoidable impacts related to the following:

- Impacts related to long-term increases of criteria air pollutants;
- Impacts to roadway segments under Short Term Plus Project Phase 1 conditions;
- Impacts to roadway segments under Short Term Plus Project Phases 1 and 2 conditions;
- Impacts to roadway segments under Cumulative Plus Project conditions;

- Impact to arterial segments under Cumulative Plus Project conditions;
- Cumulative loss of biological resources in Placer County and the effects of ongoing urbanization in the region;
- Cumulative impacts to regional air quality;
- The project could potentially result in a cumulatively considerable incremental contribution to the global production of greenhouse gases; and
- Growth-Inducement.

Placer County, through the Board of Supervisors, has adopted all feasible mitigation measures with respect to these impacts, which further lessens the impacts, but would not reduce them below a level of significance.

Under CEQA, before a project which is determined to have a significant, unmitigated environmental effect can be approved, the public agency must consider and adopt a "statement of overriding considerations" pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15043 and 15093. As the primary purpose of CEQA is to fully inform the decision makers and the public as to the environmental effects of a project and to include feasible mitigation measures and alternatives to reduce any such adverse effects below a level of significance, CEQA nonetheless recognizes and authorizes the approval of projects where not all adverse impacts can be fully lessened or avoided. However, that agency must explain and justify its conclusion to approve such project through the statement of overriding considerations, setting forth the project's general social, economic, policy, or other public benefits that support the agency's informed conclusion to approve the project.

Placer County finds that the Project meets the following stated project objectives – which have substantial social, economic, policy and other public benefits – justifying its approval and implementation, notwithstanding the fact that seven environmental impacts were not fully reduced below a level of significance:

The Project will provide for the following:

- Provide a mixed-use continuing care retirement community (CCRC) of approximately 858 residential units, approximately 28,500 square feet of retail uses, and approximately 190,000 square feet of medical/professional office uses on a single, infill site in close proximity to existing compatible land uses;

- Help realize the County's implementation of the Blueprint project of the Sacramento Area Council of Governments through the provision on a single infill site of: (1) a range of housing types, (2) mix of uses, (3) transportation choices, (4) compact development, (5) use of existing assets, and (6) quality design, all close to medical facilities and other compatible uses;

- Connect through an accessible and interconnected network of trails a mixed-use, continuing care retirement community (CCRC) to the County's Dewitt Center, a regional park, and existing neighborhoods;

- Provide a potential opportunity for on-site affordable workforce housing units; and

- Provide through an economically feasible project a network of road connections to the surrounding Auburn community to provide alternative parallel roadway opportunities for local travelers

In addition, the following benefits are noted:

- The Project will provide land uses that are economically beneficial to the County through property tax revenue and development impact fee revenue for public facilities.

- The Project will provide all necessary on-site infrastructure and contribute fair share funding to upgrade the County's infrastructure.

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 of Supervisors 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, and in the documents found in the Record of Proceedings, as defined in section 4 above.

8 CONCLUSION

The mitigation measures listed in conjunction with each of the findings set forth above, as implemented through the MMRP, have eliminated or reduced, or will eliminate or reduce to a level of insignificance, all adverse environmental impacts, except for that described above in Section 5.

Taken together, the Final EIR, the mitigation measures, and the MMRP provide an adequate basis for approval of the Timberline at Auburn Project.