



**COUNTY OF PLACER**  
Community Development/Resource Agency

**PLANNING SERVICES  
DIVISION**

Michael J. Johnson, Agency Director

Paul Thompson, Deputy Director

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Honorable Board of Supervisors  
**FROM:** Michael J. Johnson, Director  
Community Development/Resource Agency  
**DATE:** November 8, 2011  
**SUBJECT:** Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision Plan Adoption

**ACTION REQUESTED:**

The Planning Services Division requests that the Board of Supervisors adopt the Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision Plan and certify the Environmental Impact Report prepared for the project.

**BACKGROUND:**

The Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision is envisioned as a regional open space greenway and park system that protects the natural waterways, riparian corridors, natural and cultural resources, and sensitive habitat lands. The Greenway area consists of Dry Creek and its major tributaries including Miners Ravine, Secret Ravine, Strap Ravine, Antelope Creek, Cirby Creek, Clover Valley Creek, and Linda Creek. The Vision Plan includes a coordinated multi-jurisdiction management strategy to address hiking, biking, equestrian trails and public access, habitat preservation, flood control, and water quality.

The Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision is a policy and project recommendation document that provides guidance and direction for the future design, implementation, and management of the Dry Creek Greenway within Placer County, the City of Roseville, the City of Rocklin, and the Town of Loomis. The Greenway Vision identifies shared common visions among these four jurisdictions that pertain to the stewardship and management of resources along Dry Creek and its tributaries.

The vision of the Dry Creek Greenway is for a connected open space system linking the Dry Creek Parkway with Folsom Lake State Recreation Area and the uplands of the watershed. Creation of an off-street trail system along the southern streams within the Greenway will form the final link in a 60- to 70-mile recreational trail loop uniting the Folsom Lake State Recreation Area, the American River Parkway, the Ueda Parkway, the Dry Creek Parkway, and the Dry Creek Greenway. Additionally, establishment of the Greenway will help preserve and enhance the existing water quality, aquatic habitat, riparian habitat, and flood capacity of the creeks. Preservation and enhancement of riparian corridors will also help maintain wildlife migration routes from the Sacramento valley to the Sierra Nevada Mountains.

Various land use designations apply. In the lower watershed, much of the project area (corridors) proposed for the Greenway is designated as open space and park/recreation (in particular those portions of the corridors within a designated 100-year floodplain). In the middle and upper watershed, most of the streams are within private residential land use designations with much less of these areas designated as open space.

The Greenway would create a multifunction open space that includes beneficial uses in the areas of recreation, habitat, floodwater conveyance, water quality, and others. The Greenway vision consists of the following objectives:

- Preserve and enhance riparian and aquatic habitats;
- Conserve and protect significant historic, cultural and scenic resources;
- Connect the Dry Creek Parkway to the Folsom Lake State Recreation Area;
- Provide for the management of Greenway resources;
- Provide active and passive recreation opportunities;
- Preserve floodwater conveyance capacity and reduce property damage due to flooding;
- Work with existing plans and policies;
- Secure funding to sustain and complete the Greenway;
- Function as a local and regional asset; and,
- Facilitate land use planning and management within the Greenway.

The Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision document is not intended to duplicate or replace adopted plans and policies. Rather, it is designed to complement these planning tools by offering a comprehensive set of potential management and implementation strategies to enhance the cohesiveness of the Greenway Vision across jurisdictions.

The Greenway Vision is intended to provide a common framework within which each of the local jurisdictions may work collaboratively to accomplish the regional protection and enhancement of Greenway resources in a manner that is responsive to the local community needs and priorities. As such, the Greenway is intended for consideration and adoption by the County of Placer, and will serve as an advisory and informational document for the cities of Roseville and Rocklin, and the Town of Loomis. The Cities and Loomis have assisted in the preparation of the Plan but will not be adopting the document because of inconsistencies between their local planning and creek management practices. The vision for regional connections and preservation of creek corridors is shared by all of the Planning Team members.

**ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:**

An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared to identify and assess the anticipated environmental impacts of the development of the proposed Dry Creek Greenway within the Dry Creek Watershed in unincorporated Placer County at a programmatic level pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15168. The purpose of the EIR is to allow the County of Placer to evaluate program-level impacts that could occur as a result of adoption of the Greenway Vision, and consider programmatic mitigation measures for those elements in the Unincorporated County. Cities and the Town of Loomis may use the EIR as a reference document for their own environmental reviews of Greenway projects within their jurisdictions.

A programmatic EIR was prepared because the locations of improvements are conceptual and approximate, and therefore the analysis in this EIR is at a program level rather than a project-site specific level. Per the CEQA Guidelines, subsequent activities in the program will require additional environmental review and will be evaluated to determine what type of additional environmental analysis may be required.

**SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT ISSUES:**

The EIR evaluated the existing environmental resources in the vicinity of the Greenway. The environmental analysis (setting, impacts, and mitigation measures) identifies and discusses the following topics that may be of public concern:

- Land Use, including conflicts with adopted environmental plans and goals of the community;

- Biological Resources, including potential impacts to special status species, habitat, and riparian areas;
- Cultural Resources, including existence of sub-surface archeological resources;
- Aesthetics, including the project's impact to the existing visual character of proposed project sites;
- Air Quality, including emissions from the project's construction;
- Noise, including the project's construction-related noise;
- Hydrology and Water Quality, including potential impacts to Dry Creek and its tributaries during project construction; and,
- Public Services, including fire protection and police.

Each environmental section provides a discussion of environmental and regulatory settings, analyzes impacts, and provides mitigation measures.

The analysis in the EIR concluded that the project could result in potentially significant impacts related to land use, paleontological and cultural resources, aesthetic and visual resources, air quality, and public services. However, the analysis concluded that the identified impacts could be mitigated to less than significant levels.

#### **MUNICIPAL ADVISORY COUNCIL REVIEW**

Staff presented the Greenway Plan to the Horseshoe Bar/Penryn, Granite Bay, and West Placer Municipal Advisory Councils for comment and recommendation. On May 24, 2011, the Horseshoe Bar/Penryn MAC unanimously (5:0) recommended adoption of the Vision document. On June 1, 2011, the Granite Bay MAC voted (5:1) to recommend adoption of the Vision document with the opposing member expressing concerns over the eventual cost to fully-implement the Plan. Finally, on August 10, 2011, the West Placer MAC unanimously (4:0) recommended adoption of the Plan.

#### **PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION**

On July 21, 2011, a Planning Commission hearing was held. After hearing an overview of the Greenway Plan and its EIR, the Planning Commission took action to recommend the Board of Supervisors certify the EIR and adopt the Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision document (6:0; Commissioner Brentnall absent).

#### **FISCAL IMPACT:**

There is no fiscal impact resulting from the adoption of the vision document. The plan and environmental document were prepared with funding from a \$250,000 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) grant from the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency. The resulting documents will allow the County and others to pursue state and federal funding to implement the greenway vision in phases as opportunities arise.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

The Planning Services Division recommends that the Board of Supervisors take the following action:

1. Adopt the Resolution Certifying the Final Environmental Impact Report and adopting the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan for the Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision Document, attached as Attachment 1.
2. Adopt the Resolution Adopting the Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision Document, attached as Attachment 2.

**Attached to this report for the Board's information/consideration are:**

**ATTACHMENTS**

- Attachment 1: Resolution Certifying the Final Environmental Impact Report
- Attachment 2: Resolution Adopting the Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision Document
- Attachment 3: (On file with Clerk of the Board) Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report
- Attachment 4: (On File with Clerk of the Board) Dry Creek Greenway Vision Final Plan

cc: Paul Thompson, Deputy Planning Director  
Scott Finley, County Counsel  
Ken Grehm, Director of Public Works Department  
Jill Pahl, Director of Environmental Health Department  
Tom Christofk, Director of Air Pollution Control District  
John Ramirez, Parks Administrator  
Jim Durfee, Director of Facility Services

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

In the matter of:

**A RESOLUTION CERTIFYING THE  
FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, AND  
ADOPTING A STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND A  
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PLAN  
REGARDING THE DRY CREEK GREENWAY  
REGIONAL VISION DOCUMENT**

Reso. No.: \_\_\_\_\_

The following Resolution was duly passed by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Placer at a regular meeting held November 8, 2011, by the following vote on roll call:

Ayes:

Noes:

Absent:

Signed and approved by me after its passage.

Attest:

Clerk of said Board

Chairman, Board of Supervisors

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ann Holman

\_\_\_\_\_  
Robert M. Weygandt

---

This Statement of Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations is made with respect to the Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision document 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 Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision document.

**WHEREAS**, Placer County recognizes that parks and open space are an important part of any community's obligation to its citizens, as well as an attractive amenity, and,

**WHEREAS**, the Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision is a policy and project recommendation document that provides guidance and direction for the future design, implementation, and management of a Greenway within the Dry Creek Watershed, and,

**ATTACHMENT 1**

57

**WHEREAS**, the vision of the Greenway is for a connected open space system linking the Dry Creek Parkway in Sacramento with the Folsom Lake State Recreation Area and the uplands of the watershed, and,

**WHEREAS**, preparation of the document was a collaborative effort identifying shared common visions among the cities of Roseville and Rocklin, Town of Loomis and Placer County that pertain to the stewardship and management of resources along Dry Creek and its tributaries, and,

**WHEREAS**, the Dry Creek Regional Vision provides a concept plan and goals for improving the quality of the Dry Creek watershed and identifies recreational opportunities for this unique natural and cultural resource, and,

**WHEREAS**, implementation of the Plan will involve the following actions:

1. Certification of a Final Environmental Impact Report and adoption of a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan; and,
2. Adoption of the Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision (the "Project"), and

**WHEREAS**, the County issued a Notice of Preparation to prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) in March 2005 (SCH No. 2005042005) for the Project, prepared a Draft EIR and released it for public comment on October 29, 2007, conducted a public hearing to receive public comment on the Draft EIR before the Planning Commission on December 13, 2007, and otherwise received public comments on the Draft EIR in accordance with CEQA until January 14, 2008, and,

**WHEREAS**, the County reviewed and responded to all comments received on the DEIR and prepared a Final EIR (FEIR) which was released to the public in July 2008, and

**WHEREAS**, on July 14, 2011, the Placer County Planning Commission ("Planning Commission") held a public hearing to consider the Project, and the Planning Commission has made recommendations to the Board of Supervisors related thereto, and,

**WHEREAS**, the Board of Supervisors gave full and legal notice of a public hearing to consider and act upon the FEIR for the Project and the Project itself, and the public hearing was duly held on November 8, 2011, and,

**WHEREAS**, the Board has duly considered the FEIR for the Project, which consists of the DEIR and the Final EIR, the appendices thereto, the comments of the public, both oral and written, and all written materials in the record connected therewith, and being fully informed thereon,

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

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

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

(3) The Board hereby certifies the FEIR as complete, adequate and in full compliance with CEQA as a basis for considering and acting upon the Project, 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 FEIR shall be implemented, and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan ("MMRP") is adopted, and will implement all mitigation measures adopted with respect to the Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision. The MMRP is hereby incorporated into the Plan and thereby becomes part of and limitations upon the entitlements associated with the Project.

**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 in accordance with Public Resources Code section 21152(a) and CEQA Guidelines section 15094.

Statement of Findings of Fact  
of the Placer County Board of Supervisors  
for the  
**Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision**

adopted November 8, 2011

---

SCH # 2005042005

---



EXHIBIT A

## I. Overview and Introduction

This Statement of Findings is made with respect to the “Project Approval” (as defined below) for the Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision document and states the findings of the Placer County Board of Supervisors of the County of Placer (the “County”) relating to the potentially significant environmental effects (“Impacts”) of the Project to be developed in accordance with Project Approvals.

The Placer County Planning Department (the “Applicant”) has requested the Board of Supervisors take the following requested actions:

1. Certify an Environmental Impact Report and adopt of a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan.
2. Adopt the Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision document.

The Adoption of the Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision document constitutes the “Project” for purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Sections 21000) (“CEQA”), CEQA Guidelines Section 15378 (“Guidelines”), and these determinations of the Board of Supervisors.

The need for additional recreational facilities and natural resource protection in the Dry Creek Watershed has been identified in the County General Plan, the Granite Bay Community Plan, the Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan, and the Dry Creek-West Placer Community Plan. The Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision is a policy and project recommendation document that provides guidance and direction for the future design, implementation, and management of the Dry Creek Greenway.

The Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision is designed to be developed and used in a manner consistent with the existing goals and policies of the Placer County General Plan, as well as the relevant goals and policies of the community plan areas in which the project is located.

## II. Procedural History

The County issued a notice of preparation to prepare an environmental impact report (“EIR”) in March 2005, prepared a Draft EIR and released it for public comment on October 29, 2007, and took the public comments on the Draft EIR through December 28, 2007, including a public hearing by the Placer County Planning Commission to receive comment on December 13, 2007.

The Final EIR (“FEIR”--all references hereinafter to “FEIR” includes the Draft EIR dated May 2007) was completed in July 2008 and the County took public comments on the FEIR between January 5, 2009 through January 14, 2009. The Planning Commission considered the FEIR on July 14, 2011, and recommended the Board of Supervisors certify the FEIR and approve the Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision document.

The Board of Supervisors gave notice of a public hearing to consider and act upon the FEIR for the Project, and public hearings were duly held before the Board of Supervisors on November 8, 2011.

### **III. Statutory Requirements for Findings**

This statement of findings addresses the environmental effects associated with the proposed Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision ("Project"), located in Placer County. This statement of findings is made pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code Section 21081, 21081.6) and CEQA Guidelines (14 Cal. Code Regulations, Section 15091).

The potentially significant effects of the Project were identified in both the Draft EIR and the FEIR. Public Resources Code Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 require that the lead agency prepare written findings for identified significant impacts, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines states that:

(a) No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The possible findings are:

(1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.

(2) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

(3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

(b) The findings required by subdivision (a)(1) shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.

(c) The finding in subdivision (a)(2) shall not be made if the agency making the finding has concurrent jurisdiction with another agency to deal with identified feasible mitigation measures or alternatives. The finding in subsection (a)(3) shall describe the specific reasons for rejecting identified mitigation measures and project alternatives.

(d) When making the findings required in subdivision (a)(1), the agency shall also adopt a program for reporting on or monitoring the changes which it has either required in the project or made a condition of approval to avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental effects. These measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures.

(e) The public agency shall specify the location and custodian of the documents or other material which constitute the record of the proceedings upon which its decision is based.

The “changes or alterations” referred to in Section 15091(a)(1) above, that are required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effects of the project, may include a wide variety of measures or actions as set forth in Guidelines Section 15370, including:

(a) Avoiding the impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action.

(b) Minimizing impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation.

(c) Rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the impacted environment.

(d) Reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action.

(e) Compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments.

In short, CEQA requires that the lead agency adopt mitigation measures or alternatives, where feasible, to avoid or mitigate significant environmental impacts that would otherwise occur with implementation of the project. Project mitigation or alternatives are not required, however, where they are infeasible or where the responsibility for modifying the project lies with another agency (CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(b)).

### **Legal Effects of Findings**

CEQA Guidelines requires that when a public agency has made the findings required in CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1) relative to an EIR, “the public agency shall adopt a program for monitoring or reporting on the revisions which it has required in the project and the measures it has imposed to mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects.” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15097(a)).

The mitigation measures and/or the standard design features and construction measures are referenced in the Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program (MMRP) adopted concurrently with these findings (Cal. Pub. Res. Code Section 21081.6(a)(1)), and will be effectuated through the process of constructing and implementing the Project. The Placer

County Planning Department will use the MMRP to track compliance with Project mitigation measures. The MMRP will remain available for public review during the compliance period.

#### **IV. Definitions**

The following definitions apply where the subject words or acronyms are used in these findings:

“ACOE” means the United States Army Corps of Engineers.

"Board" means the Board of Supervisors of the County of Placer.

“CDFG” or “DFG” means the State of California, Department of Fish and Game.

“CEQA” means the California Environmental Quality Act (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.).

“Condition” means a condition of approval adopted by the County in connection with approval of the Project.

“Corps” means the United States Army Corps of Engineers.

“County” means County of Placer.

“DEIR” or "Draft EIR" means the Draft Environmental Impact Report dated May 2007 for the Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision.

“DPW” means the County of Placer, Department of Public Works.

“DRC” means the County of Placer, Development Review Committee.

“EIR” means environmental impact report.

“Environmental Health” means the County of Placer, Division of Environmental Health.

“Environmental Review Ordinance” means the Placer County Environmental Review Ordinance, as codified in Chapter 18 of the Placer County Code.

“ERC” means the County of Placer, Environmental Review Committee.

“FEIR” means the Final EIR as prepared for the Project (which includes the Draft EIR dated May 2007 and the Final EIR, dated July 2008).

“FEMA” means the United States Federal Emergency Management Agency.

“General Plan” means the Placer County General Plan, as adopted in 1994 with subsequent amendments.

“MMRP” means the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project.

“NOP” means notice of preparation.

“NMFS” means the National Marine Fisheries Service.

“NPDES” means the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System.

“PCAPCD” means the Placer County Air Pollution Control District.

“PD” means Planned Development combining district as identified in the Placer County Zoning Code.

“Planning Commission” means the County of Placer, Planning Commission.

“Planning Department” means the County of Placer, Planning Department.

“Project” means the Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision.

“RWQCB” means Regional Water Quality Control Board.

“SWPPP” means storm water pollution prevention plan.

“USFWS” means the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

“Zoning Ordinance” means the Placer County Zoning Ordinance, including all amendments thereto.

## **V. Background and Project History**

The Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision is a policy and project recommendation document that provides guidance and direction for the future design, implementation, and management of the Dry Creek Greenway. The Greenway is envisioned as a regional resource for promoting recreation and alternative transportation, providing wildlife habitat and floodwater conveyance, and maintaining or improving water quality.

The Dry Creek Greenway region is located in western Placer County between the Placer-Sacramento County line on the south, the City of Auburn on the north and Folsom Lake on the east. The Dry Creek watershed within Placer County forms the Greenway limits. Included within the watershed are parts of Placer County, portions of the cities of Roseville and Rocklin, and the all of the Town of Loomis. Dry Creek and its tributaries, including Cirby Creek, Linda Creek, Swan Stream, Strap Ravine, Miners Ravine, Secret

Ravine, Antelope Creek, and Clover Valley Creek are the more specific geographic locations for the proposed Greenway components.

The Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision is intended for consideration and adoption by the County of Placer, and would serve as an advisory and informational document for the cities of Roseville and Rocklin, and the Town of Loomis. The cities of Roseville and Rocklin, and the Town of Loomis are not expected to adopt the Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision and therefore would not be subject to the mitigation measures outlined in the Final EIR. The Final EIR prepared for the Project is at the programmatic level. Specific projects (as recommended by the Greenway Vision document or through other plans) will require independent CEQA review by the implementing entity.

The Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision includes a description of resources and components within Roseville, Rocklin, and Loomis. However, these resources and components have been included within the EIR for informational and guidance purposes only. The proposed Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision for consideration and adoption pertains only to those resources and components located within the unincorporated areas of Placer County. Although the Final EIR depicts Greenway Vision components within all four jurisdictions, the components within the unincorporated areas of Placer County are the only areas under environmental review.

The locations of these improvements are conceptual and approximate, and therefore the analysis in the Final EIR is at a program level rather than a project-site specific level.

## **1. Project Objectives and Description**

### **Project Objectives**

The following objectives are identified in the Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision statements:

- Preserve and enhance riparian and aquatic habitats.
- Conserve and protect significant historic, cultural and scenic resources.
- Connect the Dry Creek Parkway to the Folsom Lake State Recreation Area.
- Provide for the management of Greenway resources.
- Provide active and passive recreation opportunities.
- Preserve floodwater conveyance capacity and reduce property damage due to flooding.
- Work with existing plans and policies.
- Secure funding to sustain and complete the Greenway.
- Function as a local and regional asset.
- Facilitate land use planning and management within the Greenway.

## Project Description

The purpose of the Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision is for a multifunction connected open space system linking the Dry Creek Parkway in Sacramento County with the Folsom Lake State Recreation Area and the uplands of the Dry Creek watershed.

The Dry Creek Greenway is located in western Placer County between the Placer-Sacramento County line and the City of Auburn on the north and Folsom Lake on the east. The Greenway encompasses approximately 62 miles of open space corridor. Of these 62 miles, approximately 23.5 miles of corridor are proposed for recreational trails, 12.5 additional miles may include trails if public easements can be acquired, and the remaining 26 miles are proposed to be managed for habitat without public access. The Greenway passes through the cities of Roseville, Rocklin and Loomis as well as unincorporated areas of the County in the Dry Creek-West Placer, Granite Bay and Horseshoe Bar community planning areas.

The Dry Creek Greenway boundaries are an aggregate of existing floodplains as identified by FEMA, valuable riparian habitat as mapped by Placer County, designated open space in the Placer County, City of Rocklin, City of Roseville and Town of Loomis General Plans, and 100 foot set-backs around perennial streams.

Creation of an off-street trail system along the southern streams within the Greenway would form the final link in a sixty to seventy mile recreational trail loop uniting the Folsom Lake State Recreation Area, the American River Parkway, the Ueda Parkway, the Dry Creek Parkway, and the Dry Creek Greenway. Additionally, establishment of the Greenway would help preserve and enhance the existing water quality, aquatic habitat, riparian habitat, and flood capacity of the creeks. Preservation and enhancement of riparian corridors would also help maintain wildlife migration routes from the Sacramento valley to the Sierra Nevada Mountains.

The Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision is intended for consideration and adoption by the County of Placer, and would serve as an advisory and informational document for the cities of Roseville and Rocklin, and the Town of Loomis. The cities of Roseville and Rocklin, and the Town of Loomis are not intending to adopt the Greenway Vision and therefore would not be subject to the mitigation measures outlined in this FINAL EIR. Specific projects (as recommended by the Greenway or through other plans) within these jurisdictions will require independent CEQA review by these jurisdictions.

The Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision consists of statements that identify the shared open space values of the jurisdictions that exist in the Dry Creek watershed within Placer County. In addition to the statements, the document includes potential implementation strategies that serve as a reference for the local jurisdictions to utilize for policy language and project suggestions. The Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision also includes proposed recreation improvements, including the designation of greenway corridors along Dry Creek and its tributaries, off-street trail types and general locations, and connection/staging points (nodes). The locations of these improvements are conceptual and approximate, and therefore the analysis in this Program FINAL EIR is at a program level rather than a project-site specific level.

## VII. Record of Proceedings

In accordance with Public Resources Code section 21167.6, subdivision (e), the record of proceedings for the County's decision on the Project includes, without limitation, the following documents:

The NOP and all other public notices issued by the County in conjunction with the Project;

The Draft EIR (May 2007) for the Project;

All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the comment period on the Draft EIR;

All comments and correspondence submitted to the County with respect to the Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision;

The FEIR (July 2008) for the Project, including comments received and responses to comments on the Draft EIR;

Documents cited or referenced in the Draft and Final EIRs;

The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project;

All findings and resolutions adopted by the County in connection with the Project and all documents cited or referred to therein;

All reports, studies, memoranda, maps, staff reports, or other planning documents relating to the Project prepared by the County, consultants to the County, or responsible or trustee agencies with respect to the County's compliance with the requirements of CEQA and with respect to the County's action on the Project;

All documents submitted to the County (including the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors) by other public agencies or members of the public in connection with the Project;

Any minutes and/or verbatim transcripts of all information sessions, public meetings, and public hearings held by the County in connection with the Project;

Any documentary or other evidence submitted to the County at such information sessions, public meetings and public hearings;

The 1994 Placer County General Plan and all environmental documents prepared in connection with the adoption of the General Plan;

The Placer County Zoning Ordinance and Environmental Review Ordinance (Placer County Code, Chapters 17 and 18), and all other County Code provisions cited in materials prepared by or submitted to the County;

The 1990 Dry Creek-West Community Plan, 1989 Granite Bay Community Plan, 1994 Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan, 2001 Placer County Regional Bikeway Plan and all environmental documents prepared in connection with the adoption of the Community Plans;

Any and all resolutions and/or ordinances adopted by the County regarding the Project, and all staff reports, analyses, and summaries related to the adoption of those resolutions;

Matters of common knowledge to the County, including, but not limited to federal, state, and local laws and regulations;

Any documents cited in these findings, in addition to those cited above; and

Any other materials required for the record of proceedings by Public Resources Code section 21167.6, subdivision (e).

The official custodian of the record is the Planning Director, 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn CA 95603.

## **VIII. General Findings**

### ***Impacts Determined to be Less Than Significant***

Except as stated otherwise in certain cases below, the Board of Supervisors agrees with the characterization in the FEIR with respect to all Impacts initially identified as “less than significant” or “beneficial” and finds that those Impacts have been described accurately and are less than significant or beneficial as so described in the FEIR. This finding applies to Land Use: 4-1, 4-2, 4-3, 4-4; Biological Resources: 5-6; Visual Resources: 7-2; Transportation and Circulation: 8-1, 8-3, 8-4, 8-5, 8-6; Air Quality: 9-2, 9-3, 9-4; Noise: 10-2; Geology and Seismicity: 11-1, 11-3, 11-4; Hydrology and Water Quality: 12-4; Public Services and Utilities: 13-1, 13-2, 13-3, 13-4; and Hazards and Hazardous Materials: 14-3.

In addition, the Board of Supervisors agrees with the characterization in the FEIR with respect to Cumulative Impacts where “no impact” was identified and no mitigation was required.

This finding does not apply to Impacts identified as potentially significant but reduced by mitigation measures to a level characterized in the FEIR as less than significant. Those Impacts and mitigation measures adopted to reduce potential impacts are addressed specifically in the findings below.

## ***Impacts Determined to be Less than Significant After Mitigation***

### **Biological Impacts**

**Impact 5-1:** The project will have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or indirectly through habitat modifications, on species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, by the CDFG or the USFWS; or birds protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA).

**Mitigation Measures:** Mitigation Measure 5-1a, Consultation with the USFWS and NMFS for the project that could potentially impact federally listed plant, animal, and fish species; Mitigation Measure 5-1b, Pre-construction surveys and mitigation for special-status plant and wildlife species, raptors, and birds protected by the MTBA, and consultation with CDFG; Mitigation Measure 5-1c, Obtain a NPDES permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board, development of a SWPPP, and implementation of best management practices (BMP) to address potential storm water impacts associated with development of the site and to protect water quality. Comply with Placer County ordinances for all grading, drainage, and construction of improvements, and comply with SWPPP requirements including the implementation and monitoring of erosion and sediment control measures during construction; and Mitigation Measure 5-1d, Re-evaluate the footprint and design of project components after completion of the required pre-construction surveys and wetland delineations. Data collected during the pre-construction surveys and wetland delineations will be used to determine if adjustments to the project footprint and design features are necessary to completely or better avoid special-status plants, animals and/or jurisdictional wetlands.

**Finding:** Implementation of the mitigation measures identified above and listed in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) will reduce this potentially significant effect to a level that is less than significant.

**Explanation:** Several special-status plant species are known, or have the potential to occur, within the project area. Potential nesting and foraging habitats for raptors, Swainson's Hawk, western burrowing owl, and migratory birds occur in the project area. Construction activity during the breeding season resulting in the loss of or disturbance to nests is considered a potentially significant impact. The federally threatened valley elderberry longhorn beetle has a high potential to occur within the proposed disturbance areas due to the likely presence of their host plant, elderberry shrubs, within the riparian zones within the watershed.

Other federally-listed plant and animal species have the potential to occur within the project area, and should be included in the pre-construction survey assessments for presence. Pre-construction surveys would be required for each phase of the project to assess the project's potential impact to special-status plants and wildlife, raptors, and birds protected by the MBTA.

Generally, mitigation measures propose avoidance of candidate or special-status species during the breeding season and removal of habitat, as appropriate and necessary, during

the non-breeding season. Implementation of mitigation measures 5-1a through 5-1d reduce potentially significant effects.

In addition, Mitigation Measure 5-1c also ensures that the appropriate plans and permits are obtained to protect water quality. The Dry Creek watershed supports populations of special-status fish species including migrating fall-run Chinook salmon and the federally threatened Central Valley steelhead.

**Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant**

**Impact 5-2:** The project may have a substantial adverse effect on oak trees, riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the CDFG or USFWS.

**Mitigation Measures:** Mitigation Measure 5-2a, Native oak tree preservation and mitigation; Mitigation Measure 5-2b, Reduce impacts to wetlands and jurisdictional waters of the United States (WOUS), and provide compensatory mitigation for unavoidable impacts including verification of the wetland delineation by the ACOE, and coverage under a Nationwide Permit, Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement and/or Section 401 Water Quality Certification, if necessary. Consultation with CDFG would also be necessary to determine their jurisdiction over the project wetland features; Mitigation Measure 5-2c, Reduce impacts to riparian areas; and Mitigation Measure 5-1d, Reevaluate the footprint and design of project components after completion of the required pre-construction surveys and wetland delineations. Data collected during the pre-construction surveys and wetland delineations will be used to determine if adjustments to the project footprint and design features are necessary to completely or better avoid special-status plants and animals.

**Finding:** Implementation of the mitigation measures identified above and listed in the MMRP, will reduce the potential effect to a level that is less than significant.

**Explanation:** Whenever practicable, direct impact to native oak trees, including removal, pruning, and soil compaction within the dripline shall be avoided. Oak woodlands and wetlands are considered sensitive habitats in the General Plan and Community Plans, and compensatory mitigation measures provided by Placer County, ACOE, and/or USFWS would be required to reduce any impacts to less than significant. Any impacts to oak woodlands are additionally governed by, and will be mitigated according to SB 1334. Additionally, fill of jurisdictional wetlands would require coverage under a Nationwide Permit from the ACOE.

The specific phases of the project would be designed to reduce impacts to wetland habitats and riparian vegetation located within the project area. Impact minimization measures required may include timing of construction, and erosion and sediment control and specifications regarding construction materials and activities. If feasible, a 300-foot minimum setback will be included from all riparian areas.

**Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant**

**Impact 5-3:** The project may have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands (seasonal wetlands, seasonal wetland swales, seasonal marsh, and ephemeral and intermittent drainages) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means.

**Mitigation Measures:** Mitigation Measure 5-2b, Reduce impacts to wetlands and jurisdictional waters of the U.S., and provide compensatory mitigation at a rate of 3:1 for any impacts to vernal pools and 2:1 for any impacts to other wetlands or waters of the United States, including verification of the wetland delineation by the ACOE and coverage under a Clean Water Act Permit, Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement and/or a Section 401 Water Quality, if necessary; Mitigation Measure 5-1c, Obtain a NPDES permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board, development of a SWPPP, and implementation of BMPs to address potential storm water impacts associated with development of the site and to protect water quality. Comply with Placer County ordinances for all grading, drainage, and construction of improvements, and comply with SWPPP requirements including the implementation and monitoring of erosion and sediment control measures during construction; Mitigation Measure 5-3a, Protect and avoid preserved/avoided wetlands and open space areas during construction; and Mitigation Measure 5-1d, Reevaluate the footprint and design of project components after completion of the required pre-construction surveys and wetland delineations. Data collected during the pre-construction surveys and wetland delineations will be used to determine if adjustments to the project footprint and design features are necessary to completely or better avoid special-status plants and animals. Mitigation Measure 5-3b, Additionally, a minimum of a 100-foot setback will be maintained around any avoided wetlands or waters of the United States.

**Finding:** Implementation of the mitigation measures will reduce the potentially significant impact to less than significant.

**Explanation:** The study area supports Dry Creek and its tributaries, which are considered jurisdictional WOUS and likely are associated with other WOUS including wetlands. WOUS, including wetlands determined to be jurisdictional, are regulated by the ACOE and CDFG, and consequently, impacts resulting from project construction are considered potentially significant. As each individual phase of the project is designed in more detail potential impacts to jurisdictional wetlands would become finalized. All potentially impacted wetlands would be formally delineated and this wetland delineation would require verification by the ACOE. Each of the project components for each phase would be designed to avoid WOUS to the extent practicable. Any remaining loss and/or degradation of WOUS, including wetlands, would be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of the proposed mitigation measures.

**Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant**

**Impact 5-4:** The proposed project may interfere with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or with established resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede use of wildlife nursery sites.

**Mitigation Measure:** Mitigation Measure 5-1c, Obtain a NPDES permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board, development of a SWPPP, and implementation of BMPs to address potential storm water impacts associated with development of the site and to protect water quality. Comply with Placer County ordinances for all grading, drainage, and construction of improvements, and comply with SWPPP requirements including the implementation and monitoring of erosion and sediment control measures during construction.

**Finding:** Implementation of the mitigation measures identified above and listed in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) will reduce this potentially significant effect to a level that is less than significant.

**Explanation:** Due to the nature of the project location along a known migratory route for anadromous fish species, the proposed project has the potential to interfere with the movement of resident or migratory fish species, and may also affect established resident or migratory wildlife corridors. Any potential impacts to fish or wildlife passage associated with the project would be addressed through Mitigation Measures 5-1c, 5-2c, and 5-3a, and no further mitigation is required.

**Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant**

**Impact 5-5:** The proposed project may conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

**Mitigation Measure:** Mitigation Measure 5-2a, Native oak tree preservation and mitigation.

**Finding:** Implementation of the mitigation measure identified above and listed in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) will reduce this potentially significant effect to a level that is less than significant.

**Explanation:** Native trees identified within the project boundaries include, but are not limited to, valley oak, blue oak, Fremont cottonwoods, and native willow trees. While an unknown number of these native trees would require removal during the construction phases of the Dry Creek Greenway, heritage trees and special-status trees would be preserved to the extent possible. Oak trees that must be removed would be mitigated according to the Placer County Tree Preservation Ordinance/Oak Tree Mitigation Guidelines.

**Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant**

## **Cultural Resources Impacts**

**Impact 6-1:** The project could result in Impacts to known prehistoric or historic resources.

**Mitigation Measure 6-1:** Conduct project-level cultural resource investigations.

**Finding:** Implementation of the mitigation measure above and listed in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) will reduce this potentially significant effect to a level that is less than significant.

**Explanation:** For each specific Greenway project that is proposed, a project-level specific cultural resource investigation shall be conducted. If resources are identified within the proposed project area, the investigations will include recommendations and resource specific mitigation. These recommendations may include locating project features to avoid areas containing significant cultural resources.

**Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant**

**Impact 6-2:** The project could result in impacts to unknown prehistoric or historic resources.

**Mitigation Measure 6-2:** Stop work if archeological artifacts, including human remains, are discovered during construction.

**Finding:** Implementation of the mitigation measure identified above and listed in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) will reduce this potentially significant effect to a level that is less than significant.

**Explanation:** It is possible that a potentially significant impact could occur if previously undiscovered archaeological resources are inadvertently exposed during grading and excavation activities. By halting ground disturbing activities until a qualified archaeologist and the Placer County Planning Department and Department of Museums are consulted, this impact can be mitigated to a less than significant level. The Placer County Coroner and Native American Heritage Commission must be contacted if human remains are found. The Placer County Planning Department must grant authorization to resume work, potentially with additional mitigation measures to address the unique or sensitive nature of the site.

**Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant**

**Impact 6-3:** Impacts to paleontological resources.

**Mitigation Measure 6-3:** Retain a qualified professional paleontologist to inspect construction site weekly during grading activities and salvage fossils as necessary.

**Finding:** Implementation of the mitigation measures will reduce the potentially significant impact to less than significant.

**Explanation:** The geologic formations in portions of the Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision project area have the potential to contain paleontological resources (i.e., fossils). Prior to submittal of any Grading or Improvement Plan, a qualified paleontologist will be retained to observe grading activities on a weekly basis during all grading activities, and to salvage fossils as necessary. The paleontologist shall establish procedures for paleontological resource surveillance and shall establish, in cooperation with the project developer, procedures for temporarily halting or redirecting work to permit sampling, identification and evaluation of fossils. If major paleontological resources are discovered, which require temporary halting or redirecting of grading, the paleontologist shall report such findings to the project developer, and to the Placer County Department of Museums and Planning Department.

**Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant**

### **Visual Resource Impacts**

**Impact 7-1:** The project would substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and the surroundings.

**Mitigation Measure 7-1:** Conduct project-specific visual impact analysis for each project or phase implemented as part of the Greenway.

**Finding:** Implementation of the mitigation measure identified above and listed in the MMRP, will reduce the potential effect to a level that is less than significant.

**Explanation:** Due to the narrow width and minimal height that is associated with trail design and use, construction and use of trails is generally expected to have a minimal impact on the existing visual character and quality of project sites and their surroundings. However, exact trail locations must be determined with multiple constraints considered. Site-specific visual assessments for future projects are recommended. This mitigation would lessen impacts to the visual character and quality of sites to a less than significant level.

**Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant**

### **Transportation and Circulation Impacts**

**Impact 8-2:** The project could exceed the Level of Service (LOS) standard established by Placer County.

**Mitigation Measure 8-2:** Prepare and implement a construction traffic management plan for individual projects, as applicable.

**Finding:** Implementation of the mitigation measures identified above and listed in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) will reduce this potentially significant effect to a level that is less than significant.

**Explanation:** Little additional traffic is expected to be generated by the implementation of, and subsequent use of, specific Greenway projects. However, as some Greenway trails may require road crossings, construction activities in these areas may temporarily impede and slow traffic, with the potential to negatively affect LOS. By preparing and implementing a construction traffic management plan as Greenway projects are constructed, this impact would be reduced to less than significant.

**Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant**

### **Air Quality Impacts**

**Impact 9-1:** Construction related emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub> may exceed significance thresholds on a temporary basis during construction.

**Mitigation Measures:** Mitigation Measure 9-1a, Conduct project specific air quality analysis for each project or phase implemented as part of the Greenway; and Mitigation Measure 9-1b, Prepare and implement a construction emission/fugitive dust control plan with approval by Placer County Air Pollution Control District.

**Finding:** Implementation of the mitigation measures identified above and listed in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) will reduce this potentially significant effect to a level that is less than significant.

**Explanation:** Construction activities associated with the development of the project would generate an increase in criteria pollutants and particulate matter from grading, trenching, and earthmoving activities (i.e. dust generation). Diesel fumes associated with the operation of construction equipment would contribute to the release of NO<sub>x</sub> and ROGs. Asphalt paving of the pedestrian/bike trails proposed to be paved would create ROG emissions.

It is expected that only portions of the Greenway trails would be constructed at any one time due to funding availability. Phased trail construction projects may be limited in size and therefore may not exceed PCAPCD significance thresholds. Conducting a project specific analysis of each future Greenway project will identify emission levels based upon the specific project design and construction methods required for project construction.

There are a variety of construction related air quality mitigation measures utilized by PCAPCD that could apply to the potential corridor, trail, and node projects envisioned by the Greenway Vision.

**Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant**

## **Noise Impacts**

**Impact 10-1:** Temporary construction-related noise.

**Mitigation Measures:** Mitigation Measure 10-1a, Restrict hours of construction activity; Mitigation Measure 10-1b, Ensure construction equipment meets Placer County Code per Section 9.36.030 (A)(7); Mitigation Measure 10-1c, Locate stationary noise sources away from noise-sensitive land uses; and Mitigation Measure 10-1d, Locate equipment staging areas (e.g. equipment storage, warm-up areas) as far away from noise sensitive land uses, as is feasible.

**Finding:** Implementation of the mitigation measures identified above and listed in the MMRP, will avoid or substantially reduce the significant effect to a level that is less than significant.

**Explanation:** Development of the Dry Creek Greenway components would result in short-term, construction-related noise impacts that may result in short-term noise levels that exceed the thresholds established in the Placer County General Plan. Construction-related noise is allowed, provided it does not occur outside of specified operating hours. Construction noise exceeding adopted standards and occurring outside of the hours specified would be considered a significant noise impact. Mitigation Measures 10-1a, 10-1b, 10-1c and 10-1d will reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

**Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant**

## **Soils, Geology, and Seismicity Impacts**

**Impact 11-2:** Potential for increased erosion during and after construction.

**Mitigation Measure 11-2:** Comply with applicable grading requirements as outlined in the Placer County Land Development Manual (LDM), including site-specific soil and geologic studies as applicable, all applicable erosion and sediment control requirements as outlined in the County's Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance, and NPDES II requirements.

**Finding:** Implementation of the mitigation measure will reduce the potentially significant impact to less than significant.

**Explanation:** The grading, vegetation removal and other ground disturbance associated with construction of Greenway improvements would increase the susceptibility of soils to water and wind erosion. Soil erosion is considered a potentially significant impact, particularly if it leads to the discharge of sediment-laden water into waterways or onto adjoining properties. In general, the potential for significant soil erosion is limited, since trails and other improvements are proposed to be constructed in areas with relatively level to gently sloping topography.

**Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant**

## **Hydrology and Water Quality Impacts**

**Impact 12-1:** The project could have grading and construction impacts to water quality.

**Mitigation Measures:** Mitigation Measure 12-1a, Obtain coverage under the General Construction Stormwater Permit and prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for site-specific projects; and 12-1b, Conduct grading and construction operations in conformance with applicable County standards as outlined in the Placer County Land Development Manual, including the Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance.

**Finding:** Implementation of the mitigation measures identified above and listed in the MMRP, will avoid or reduce the potentially significant effect to a level that is less than significant.

**Explanation:** Increasing area of disturbed soils leads to increased erosion. For all projects disturbing one acre or more, coverage under the General Permit will be obtained prior to performing any land disturbing activities. As part of the requirements of the General Permit, a SWPPP will be prepared for site specific projects. The SWPPP will be designed to reduce or eliminate pollutant non-storm water discharges to surface waters. The SWPPP will specify the implementation of site-specific Best Management Practices (BMPs) utilizing the best available technology (BAT) economically achievable and best conventional pollutant control technology (BCT).

Construction of project features, including trails, parking, and other amenities, shall be conducted in accordance with the requirements of the Placer County Land Development Manual, including the Grading and Erosion Prevention Ordinance.

### **Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant**

**Impact 12-2:** Post-construction storm water runoff impacts on water quality.

**Mitigation Measure 12-2:** Conduct site-specific analysis.

**Finding:** Implementation of the mitigation measure identified above and listed in the MMRP, will avoid or reduce the potentially significant effect to a level that is less than significant.

**Explanation:** Post-construction storm water runoff from future site specific projects could potentially contain contaminants that can degrade water quality. The use of paved and unpaved trails could increase the types or quantities of non-naturally occurring pollutants in runoff.

Mitigation is proposed that future Greenway projects conduct a site specific analysis and implement its recommendations (including any low impact development design recommendations) to insure that post-construction runoff is reduced and that impacts to water quality are less than significant.

### **Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant**

**Impact 12-3:** Increased runoff leading to localized or downstream flooding.

**Mitigation Measure 12-3:** Conduct a site specific analysis to insure that no substantial increase in water surface elevation results from installation of Greenway features and comply with the County's Land Development Manual and Stormwater Management Manual.

**Finding:** Implementation of the mitigation measure will reduce the potentially significant impact to less than significant.

**Explanation:** Although the Greenway trails and amenities add only a small amount of impervious surfaces to the existing open space areas, their potential locations within the floodplain and/or riparian areas may create additional runoff that could lead to localized or downstream flooding. Mitigation requires that future projects conduct a site specific analysis and implement measures (including low impact development methods) to insure that no substantial increase in water surface elevation results from installation of Greenway features.

Site specific analysis must evaluate the specific projects' impact on peak flow rates at downstream locations, the potential for overloading of the actual or designed capacity of existing storm water and flood-carrying facilities, and the potential for alteration of the 100-year floodplain boundaries. The final project design shall comply with applicable elements of the Placer County Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance and the Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District Storm Water Management Manual. Final design and location should insure that no substantial increase in water surface elevation results from installation of Greenway features.

**Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant**

**Impact 12-5:** Expose people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding.

**Mitigation Measure 12-5:** Install warning signage and install temporary barriers at unsafe and/or impassable locations during potential flood events.

**Finding:** Implementation of the mitigation measure identified above will avoid or reduce the potentially significant effect to a level that is less than significant.

**Explanation:** Due to the seasonal nature of precipitation within the watershed, residents and visitors that would utilize the Greenway during the dry season may become insensitive to wet season flooding hazards along the corridors. Warning signage may be permanent and posted at appropriate flood prone locations throughout the Greenway trail system. Barriers should be temporary and shall be placed at specific hazard points as needed during flood events.

**Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant**

## **Hazards and Hazardous Materials Impacts**

**Impact 14-1:** Exposure of people or the environment to hazards or hazardous materials related to the presence of existing or unknown hazards related to past land uses in or near proposed project sites.

**Mitigation Measure 14-1:** Conduct a site-specific evaluation for proposed individual Greenway projects to determine if proposed sites are on identified hazardous material site lists. If the site is identified as a hazardous material site, relocate the project feature or conduct a Preliminary Site Assessment and perform any required remediation.

**Finding:** Implementation of the mitigation measure will reduce the potentially significant impact to less than significant.

**Explanation:** As Greenway projects are identified in the future for site-specific implementation, exact trail and node locations would be determined. At that time, it would be necessary to determine if project locations would be on or near sites that could potentially expose people to hazardous materials during the construction or use of the Greenway. Mitigation measure 14-1 requires that a site-specific evaluation be conducted to determine if the site is identified as a hazardous materials site. If so identified, the project feature would be moved if feasible, or a Preliminary Site Assessment would be conducted to determine required remediation.

**Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant**

**Impact 14-2:** Temporary construction-related noise.

**Mitigation Measures:** Mitigation Measure 14-2a, Comply with all federal, state, Placer County and fire district requirements for temporary storage of flammable/combustible materials at construction sites; and 14-2b, Comply with all federal, state, Placer County and fire district requirements for reporting releases of hazardous materials.

**Finding:** Implementation of the mitigation measures identified above and listed in the MMRP, will avoid or substantially reduce the significant effect to a level that is less than significant.

**Explanation:** Hazardous materials would not be used in the operation of Greenway facilities. However, construction of the trails and other amenities would involve the use of potentially hazardous materials, including but not limited to, fuels, petroleum products, and asphalt. Construction personnel and people living or working near the sites could be exposed to accidental releases of these materials. The contractor shall comply with all federal, state, Placer County and fire district requirements for temporary storage of flammable/combustible materials at construction sites. They will also comply with all requirements for reporting the release of hazardous materials.

**Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant**

**Impact 14-4:** Exposure of Greenway users to vector borne diseases.

**Mitigation Measures:** Mitigation Measure 14-4a, Conduct a site-specific evaluation for proposed individual Greenway projects to determine if proposed sites require a Vector Prevention and Control program, and if required by the evaluation, create a program subject to approval by the Placer Mosquito Abatement District; and Mitigation Measure 14-4b, Include responsible parties for vector prevention/control implementation and on-going maintenance in any required Control Program.

**Finding:** Implementation of the mitigation measures identified above and listed in the MMRP, will avoid or reduce the potentially significant effect to a level that is less than significant.

**Explanation:** Conduct a site-specific evaluation for proposed individual Greenway projects to determine if a Vector Prevention and Control Program is needed. If a program is determined to be needed, it shall include applicable prevention and control measures, allow for site access, and address vector habitat. This program shall be approved by the Placer Mosquito Abatement District.

Should a Greenway project create a potential vector habitat, the responsible parties for vector prevention and control implementation and maintenance would also be identified in the site-specific Control Program.

**Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant**

## X. Project Alternative Findings

### Feasibility of Project 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 discussed 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). 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 regulator 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)).

Based upon guidance contained in the CEQA Guidelines, two alternatives to the project were analyzed: One modified project alternative and the no project alternative were evaluated in the Final EIR.

### No Project Alternative

**Description:** CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e) requires every EIR to include a “No Project Alternative.” Specifically, “The purpose of describing and analyzing a No Project Alternative is to allow decision makers to compare impacts of approving the proposed project with the impacts of not approving the proposed project. The “no project” analysis “shall discuss the existing conditions at the time the notice of preparation is published ...as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services.”

### Reduced Trails Alternative

**Description:** This alternative is similar to the proposed project with the exception that four sections of “Habitat with Potential Recreation” corridors in the proposed project would change to “Habitat Only” corridors. Under this alternative, the following corridors would change from “Habitat with Potential Recreation” corridors to “Habitat Only”:

1. Clover Valley Creek, from approximately North Clover Valley Road upstream to English Colony Way.
2. Miners Ravine (small section east of Sierra College Boulevard before larger Habitat only section).
3. Strap Ravine, from Sierra College Boulevard east to Granite Bay Community Park (near the intersection of Barton Road and Douglas Boulevard).
4. Swan Stream, from Roseville Parkway to Pastor Drive.

The Final EIR considered the Reduced Trails Alternative to be the environmentally superior alternative.

**Alternatives Findings Conclusion:**

If a project will result in significant environmental impacts that will not be avoided or substantially lessened by mitigation measures, the lead agency must find that the alternatives identified in the Final EIR are “infeasible before it approves the project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3). Moreover, CEQA does not mandate the choice of the environmentally most desirable project if, through mitigation measures along, the agency has reduced the project’s environmental effects to an acceptable level (Laurel Hills Homeowners Ass’n. v. City Council (1978) 83 Cal.App.3d.515,521). In this case all potential impacts of the Project have been either found to be less than significant (Section VIII) or have been reduced to less than significant with the implementation of identified mitigation measures (Section VIII). As a result, the Board is not mandated and elected not to select the Reduced Trails Alternative instead of the Project.

## **XI. Growth Inducement Findings**

**Description:** An EIR must discuss the ways in which a proposed project could foster economic or population growth or the construction of additional housing in the vicinity of the project, and how that growth will, in turn, affect the surrounding environment (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(d)). Included in this are projects which would remove obstacles to population growth (i.e., a major expansion of a wastewater treatment plant, which might allow for more construction in service areas). Increases in the population may tax existing community service facilities, requiring construction of new facilities that could cause significant environmental effects. The Final EIR discusses the characteristics of the proposed project which may encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively.

**Finding:** The Board of Supervisors finds that the project would not directly or indirectly affect growth within Placer County. Planning for both recreational and transportation related trails and bikeways has long been an integral component of multiple local, County, and regional planning efforts.

**Explanation:** Planning and encouragement for an integrated network of recreational and non-motorized transportation trails have long been a part of various adopted plans within

Placer County. These include the Placer County General Plan, the Dry Creek-West Placer Community Plan, the Granite Bay Community Plan, the Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan, the Placer County Regional Bikeway Plan, and the Placer County Regional Transportation Plan 2027. Conceptual alignments of some of the Greenway Vision trails are identified in the Regional Bikeway Plan. The Regional Transportation Plan includes a policy to “support pedestrian/equestrian paths and bicycle trails within open spaces adjacent to creeks, canals, and major traffic corridors” (Placer County Transportation Planning Agency 2005) and includes the Dry Creek Greenway Vision in its discussion on non-motorized transportation.

## **XII. Cumulative Impacts Findings**

The Project is consistent with the 1994 Placer County General Plan EIR as well as the Dry Creek-West Placer, Granite Bay, and Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan EIRs. The Placer County General Plan and EIR were certified and adopted in 1994, the Dry Creek-West Placer Community Plan and EIR in 1990, the Granite Bay Community Plan and EIR in 1989 (amended in 1996), and the Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan and EIR in 1994.

These EIRs assessed cumulative impacts based on an analysis of the adopted general and community plans for jurisdictions within and adjacent to Placer County (e.g., Roseville, Rocklin, Loomis, etc.). The assessment of cumulative impacts set forth in the County General Plan EIR and community plan EIRs sets the context and framework for the evaluation of cumulative impacts associated with the proposed implementation of the Dry Creek Greenway Vision.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

**Cumulative Impacts Finding:** The Board of Supervisors finds that the methodology used to determine cumulative impacts complies with CEQA. Current and future development within the community plan areas as well as surrounding areas would result in cumulative impacts that would be significant. With incorporation of mitigation measures, including standard development policies related to grading, flood control, and habitat protection, cumulative impacts are considered to be less than significant.

Implementation of the Dry Creek Greenway Vision would result in temporary construction impacts that are mitigated to less than significant at this program level evaluation and are not considered to result in cumulative impacts. As described below, construction and operational impacts would not be expected to be cumulatively significant or cumulatively considerable.

### **Cumulative Biological Resources**

**Explanation:** The proposed project design guidelines and mitigation measures discussed in Chapter 5.0 reduce impacts to less than significant. General Plan and community plan policies require a “non-development” buffer zone of 100 feet from the centerline of perennial streams, 50 feet from centerline of intermittent streams, and 50 feet from the

edge of sensitive habitats to be protected including riparian zones. The Greenway project includes strategies to design and locate amenities to ensure that impacts on sensitive habitat are avoided or reduced to the extent feasible, including locating trails outside of riparian corridors when possible.

#### **Cumulative Cultural Resources**

**Explanation:** The Placer County General Plan and individual community plans include policies to protect cultural resources. The inclusion of project Mitigation Measures 6-1 (conduct project-level resource investigations and implement proposed mitigation), 6-2 (stop work if archeological artifacts are discovered during construction), and 6-3 (retain a professional paleontologist during construction), are consistent with plan policies and County mitigation requirements. The project's contribution to cumulative cultural resource impacts would therefore be considered less than significant.

#### **Cumulative Visual Resources**

**Explanation:** The construction and use of Greenway amenities (e.g. trails and connecting nodes features) would be expected to result in minimal impacts on visual resources within the project area. The inclusion of Mitigation Measure 7-1 requiring a site-specific visual impact analysis for individual Greenway projects ensures that the proposed project's cumulative impacts to visual resources would be less than significant.

#### **Cumulative Transportation and Circulation**

**Explanation:** The Greenway amenities would add to the available network of alternative transportation routes. Cumulative impacts to transportation and circulation are considered less than significant.

#### **Cumulative Soils, Geology and Seismicity**

**Explanation:** Construction of Greenway trails and nodes is subject to project level mitigation (Mitigation Measure 11-2) including compliance with the applicable grading and erosion control requirements in the Placer County Land Development Manual. With implementation of this mitigation measure, cumulative impacts to soils and geology are considered less than significant.

#### **Cumulative Hydrology and Water Quality**

**Explanation:** Site locations, grading, and construction of Greenway amenities would have the potential to contribute to impacts related to hydrology and water quality. Construction is subject to project level mitigation (Mitigation Measure 12-1a and 12-1b) including obtaining a General Construction Stormwater Permit and complying with the applicable grading and erosion control requirements in the Placer County Land Development Manual. Mitigation Measures 12-2 and 12-3 also require individual site-specific analysis (and implementing required subsequent mitigation) for storm water runoff and flooding impacts.

With implementation of these mitigation measures, cumulative impacts to hydrology and water quality are considered less than significant.

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

**In the matter of:   A Resolution Adopting  
                          the Dry Creek Greenway  
                          Regional Vision Document**

**Resolution No.:** \_\_\_\_\_

**The following Resolution was duly passed by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Placer  
at a regular meeting held November 8, 2011, by the following vote on roll call:**

**Ayes:**

**Noes:**

**Absent:**

**Signed and approved by me after its passage.**

**Attest:**

**Clerk of said Board**

**Chairman, Board of Supervisors**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Ann Holman**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Robert M. Weygandt**

---

**WHEREAS**, on July 14, 2011, the Placer County Planning Commission (“Planning Commission”) held public hearings to consider the Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision document (“Greenway Plan”), and the Planning Commission has made recommendations to the Board of Supervisors (“Board”) related thereto; and,

**WHEREAS**, on November 8, 2011, the Board held a public hearing to consider the recommendations of the Planning Commission and to receive public input regarding the proposed Greenway Plan; and,

**WHEREAS**, the Board has reviewed the proposed Greenway Plan, considered the recommendations of the Planning Commission, received and considered the written and oral comments submitted by the public thereon, and has adopted Resolution No. 2011-\_\_\_\_ certifying the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision document and

**WHEREAS**, the Board finds the proposed Greenway Plan will serve to protect and enhance the health, safety and general welfare of the residents of the Dry Creek watershed and the County as a whole, and

**WHEREAS**, the Board further finds the proposed Greenway Plan is consistent with the provisions of the General Plan and in compliance with applicable requirements of State law, and

**WHEREAS**, notice of all hearings required has been given and all hearings have been held as required by County ordinance and State law, and

**WHEREAS**, the Board finds that the foregoing recitals setting forth the actions of the County are true and correct,

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF PLACER:** That the Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision document, as shown and described in Exhibit 1 attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference, is hereby adopted, and,

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:** That this Resolution shall take force and become effective immediately.

**\*\* FINAL PLAN \*\***

# **Dry Creek Greenway Regional Vision**

---



Prepared for:  
Department of Planning,  
Placer County  
California

**Full document on file with the Clerk of  
the Board of Supervisors and available  
at the Placer County Planning Division,  
Community Development Resource Agency**

Submitted by:

 **FOOTHILL ASSOCIATES**

© 2004

**EXHIBIT 1**

89

