*United States Army Corps of Engineers*

# PLACER VINEYARDS SPECIFIC PLAN

## Final Environmental Impact Statement

### USACE Action ID: SPK-1999-00737

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Sacramento District
1325 J Street
Sacramento, California 95814-2922
(916) 557-6605

July 2014

# Final Environmental Impact Statement

# Placer Vineyards Specific Plan

## USACE Action ID: SPK-1999-00737

**Prepared for:**

US Army Corps of Engineers
Sacramento District
1325 J Street
Sacramento, California 95814

**Prepared by:**

Impact Sciences, Inc.
555 12th Street, Suite 1650
Oakland, California 94607

**July 2014**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

**Appendix**

Revised Appendix 3.0, PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures

# LIST OF TABLES

# ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|---|---|
| AICP | American Institute of Certified Planners |
| ARB | Air Resources Board |
| BO | Biological Opinion |
| CAAQS | California Ambient Air Quality Standards |
| CAPCOA | California Air Pollution Control Officer's Association |
| CDFW | California Department of Fish and Wildlife |
| CEQA | California Environmental Quality Act |
| CIP | Capital Improvement Program |
| COE | Carbon Dioxide Equivalent |
| CVRWQCB | Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board |
| CWA | Clean Water Act |
| DA | Department of the Army |
| DEIS | Draft Environmental Impact Statement |
| EIR | Environmental Impact Report |
| EIS | Environmental Impact Statement |
| FEIS | Final Environmental Impact Statement |
| GHG | Greenhouse Gases |
| LAFCO | Local Agency Formation Commission |
| LEDPA | Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative |
| LID | Low Impact Development |
| MGD | Million Gallons per Day |
| MOU | Memorandum of Understanding |
| MTP/SCS | Metropolitan Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy |
| NAAQS | National Ambient Air Quality Standards |
| NEPA | National Environmental Policy Act |
| PCAPCD | Placer County Air Pollution Control District |
| PCTPA | Placer County Transportation Planning Agency |
| PCWA | Placer County Water Agency |
| PG&E | Pacific Gas and Electric |
| REO | Regional Environmental Officer |
| ROD | Record of Understanding |
| SACOG | Sacramento Council of Governments |
| SIP | State Implementation Plan |
| SOI | Sphere of Influence |
| SVAB | Sacramento Valley Air Basin |
| SVSP | Sierra Vista Specific Plan |
| USACE | United States Army Corps of Engineers |
| USEPA | United States Environmental Protection Agency |
| USFWS | United States Fish and Wildlife Service |
| VELB | Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle |
| VMT | Vehicle Miles Traveled |
| WAPA | Western Area Power Administration |
| WPWMA | Western Placer Waste Management Authority |
| WRSP | West Roseville Specific Plan |
| WWTP | Wastewater Treatment Plant |

# 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Final Environmental Impact Statement (Final EIS) has been prepared to respond to comments received on the Draft EIS for the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan Project. The Final EIS has been prepared by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Sacramento District in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The USACE is the lead agency under NEPA.

On April 26, 2013, the USACE released the Draft EIS for public review and comment. The comment period closed on June 10, 2013. The Draft EIS evaluated the potential environmental effects of the Proposed Action and six alternatives, including the No Action Alternative and five on-site alternative development plans. Written comments were received from federal, state, and local agencies, as well as from organizations and individuals. The USACE considered the comments received on the Draft EIS.

The Final EIS consists of the entire Draft EIS, and the comments, responses to comments, and revisions to the Draft EIS.

## 1.1 PURPOSE AND INTENDED USES OF THE FINAL EIS

NEPA requires a lead agency that has completed a Draft EIS to consult with and obtain comments from public agencies (cooperating, responsible, and/or trustee agencies) that have legal jurisdiction with respect to the proposed action, and to provide the general public with opportunities to comment on the Draft EIS. The Final EIS is a mechanism for responding to the comments received on the Draft EIS. This Final EIS has been prepared to respond to comments received from agencies, organizations, and members of the public on the Draft EIS for the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan Project, which are reproduced in this document, and to present corrections, revisions, and other clarifications and elaborations to the Draft EIS made in response to these comments.

As described in the Draft EIS, development on the project site would require the filling of wetlands and other jurisdictional waters of the United States as defined by the Clean Water Act (CWA). This discharge of fill material requires approval from the USACE pursuant to Section 404 of the federal CWA, under which the USACE issues or denies DA permits for activities involving a discharge of dredged or fill material into the waters of the United States, including wetlands. The USACE has 22 active permit applications to develop up to 3,746 acres (1,516 hectares) of land within the 5,230-acre (2,117-hectare) Placer Vineyards Specific Plan (PVSP) area and an application for the development of backbone infrastructure, for a total of 23 active permit applications related to the development of the PVSP area. The owners of the remaining properties (comprising 505 acres [204 hectares] within the PVSP area outside of the Special Planning Area [SPA] and 979 acres [396 hectares] within the SPA) are not applying for DA permits at this time. If the USACE approves the 22 individual permits and a Regional General Permit (RGP) for the backbone infrastructure improvements, under the Proposed Action, the Applicants would be allowed to fill approximately 119.3 acres (48.28 hectares) of wetlands and other jurisdictional waters of the United States, and development of urban uses in the area would be a reasonably foreseeable outcome of the approvals. The Draft EIS and this Final EIS will be used to support the USACE's decision

whether to issue permits pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and issue a record of decision (ROD) under NEPA.

## 1.2 PROPOSED ACTION

The Proposed Action would implement the PVSP, which is a proposed specific plan project that includes development of the approximately 5,230-acre (2,117-hectare) site with a mix of land uses. The site includes 3,781 acres (1,530 hectares) of property for which DA permit applications have been submitted, and 1,449 acres of property for which there are no permit applications. The Proposed Action encompasses two possible scenarios that represent the potential low-end and high-end of the range of development densities that could be developed on the project site: the "Base Plan scenario" and "Blueprint scenario." The development footprint under both scenarios would be the same, although the land use designations and acreages would differ. The Proposed Action – Base Plan scenario, which is the specific plan that was approved by Placer County, would allow for the development of approximately 14,132 residential units. In addition, the community would include about 3,361 acres (1,360 hectares) of residential uses, 309 acres (125 hectares) of commercial and office uses, 309 acres (125 hectares) of public/quasi-public uses (such as schools), 211 acres (85 hectares) of parks, 709 acres (287 hectares) of open space, and 332 acres (134 hectares) of major roadways. The Proposed Action – Blueprint scenario, which was also considered by the County but was not eventually adopted, would develop the project site at a higher density consistent with the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) Blueprint and provide for up to 21,631 residential units. **Table 1.0-1,** below presents the range of land uses under both scenarios.

The development footprint within these scenarios would be essentially the same, though the land use designations and acreages would differ. The actual development ultimately achieved within the plan area could be anywhere between these two bookends, and any development within the bookends would be considered consistent with this EIS and any permits issued by the USACE for the Proposed Action. Land use decision-making within these bookends would be under the County's jurisdiction over the life of the plan. Under both scenarios, 979 acres (396 hectares) of land in the western portion of the PVSP site are designated as a Special Planning Area (SPA) and would continue to be used for large lot rural residential development under the PVSP.

**Table 1.0-1**
**Proposed Action – Proposed Range of Land Uses**

| Land Use | Base Plan* | | Blueprint** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Acres | Units | Acres | Units |
| Low Density Residential | 1,001 | 3,519 | 729 | 3,647 |
| Medium Density Residential | 1,176 | 6,474 | 1,170 | 9,873 |
| High Density Residential | 205 | 3,092 | 342 | 6,244 |
| Special Planning Area | 979 | 411 | 979 | 411 |
| *Residential Subtotal* | *3,361* | *13,496* | *3,220* | *20,175* |
| Commercial Mixed Use | 51 | 636 | 95 | 1,456 |
| Commercial | 34 | -- | 34 | -- |
| Town Center Commercial | 43 | -- | 43 | -- |
| Business Park/Power Center | 150 | -- | 142 | -- |
| Office | 33 | -- | 29 | -- |
| *Commercial Subtotal* | *309* | *636* | *342* | *1,456* |
| Public Uses | 51 | -- | 51 | -- |
| Schools | 167 | -- | 199 | -- |
| Religious Facilities | 91 | -- | 116 | -- |
| *Public Uses Subtotal* | *309* | *0* | *366* | *0* |
| Open Space | 709 | -- | 709 | -- |
| Park | 211 | -- | 273 | -- |
| Roads | 332 | -- | 321 | -- |
| *Park, Roads and Open Space Subtotal* | *1,252* | -- | *1,303* | -- |
| **Total** | **5,230** | **14,132** | **5,230** | **21,631** |

*Source: Placer Vineyards Specific Plan – July 2007; Placer Vineyards Specific Plan – Blueprint – July 2—7*
* *Based on Table 3-3, Land Use Property Summary, from the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan – Errata to the Placer Vineyards "Base Plan" Specific Plan - July 16, 2007*
** *Based on Table 3-3, Land Use Property Summary, from the Placer Vineyards Blueprint Specific Plan - July 2007*

## 1.3 PROJECT BACKGROUND

Placer County first identified development of the project site in 1990. Following the adoption of the West Placer Community Plan in 1990, Placer County identified the remaining area to the west of the West Placer Community Plan as appropriate for urban development. In its 1994 General Plan, Placer County noted that this area could develop following adoption and implementation of a comprehensive Specific Plan, and the County amended the boundaries of the Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan to include this land.

Consistent with the direction provided by the Placer County 1994 General Plan, the Applicants sponsored preparation of the PVSP for this 5,230-acre (2,117-hectare) area. The purpose of the PVSP was to

comprehensively plan the development of the remaining unplanned area in southwestern Placer County for the establishment of a new self-sufficient community that not only included residential and commercial uses but also other public uses, including a mixed-use Town Center that provides for civic and community activities. In July 2007, the County Board of Supervisors approved the PVSP.

In May 2006, property owners within the plan area (Applicants) submitted 24 applications to the USACE under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act for the development of backbone infrastructure and individual properties within the PVSP area (participating properties). Since then, one application has become inactive and there are now a total of 23 applications, that include 22 applications for the development of individual properties and one application that covers the construction of the backbone infrastructure needed to support the development of the proposed mixed-use residential community.

## 1.4 PROJECT PURPOSE AND NEED

The USACE has determined that the project purpose is:

> *to construct a large-scale, regional mixed-use residential project in western Placer County.*

The Applicants' stated need for the Proposed Action is described as follows.

> *The project is proposed as a large scale residential community because the primary purpose of the Project is to accommodate projected population growth in Placer County and provide a coordinated development envelope consisting of residential, commercial, recreational, public/quasi-public land uses, required infrastructure and open space to accommodate a population range of approximately 30,000 to 50,000 persons. The project is intended to assist in meeting the region's future needs for residential opportunities through comprehensive planning.*

The project is proposed as a mixed-use community with adequate employment-generating non-residential uses in order to provide a balance of jobs, housing, and other amenities. The commercial component of this community is important and necessary so that the County has sufficient tax revenues to provide services to the project. A large-scale residential-only development would not be fiscally sustainable because the tax revenue from property taxes alone would be insufficient to provide the needed County services. This is especially the case for the project site and its vicinity in western Placer County where a high proportion of the property tax revenues go to the local school district and the County share is relatively small. In addition, there are no nearby existing retail centers to serve the Placer Vineyards area, so early development of a commercial center is important from a service standpoint as well as for fiscal reasons.

Placer County identified this area for urban development (PVSP EIR 2007). This was based on a number of important planning factors, including that (1) the cities and areas surrounding the Plan area are experiencing rapid growth in jobs, creating the need for additional housing in southwestern Placer County; (2) the area is contiguous to existing urban development to the south (Sacramento County) and new development to the north (Roseville); (3) the region is planning improvements to the transportation network that could accommodate the level of growth associated with the Specific Plan; and (4) the Plan area is better suited to concentrated new growth than other locations, as it would create less sprawl.

For purposes of this EIS, western Placer County is defined as the portion of Placer County west of Interstate 80 (I-80) and State Route 65.

## 1.5 AGENCY ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The USACE is serving as the lead agency for NEPA compliance.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) is participating as a cooperating agency. The U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS) was invited to participate as a cooperating agency but did not accept.

The following agencies and entities also have discretionary authority or legal jurisdiction over part or all of the Proposed Action, or special expertise relevant to the Proposed Action.

- United States Fish and Wildlife Service
- California Department of Transportation
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
- Placer County

## 1.6 SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

As discussed earlier in the section, based on their ability to meet the purpose and need of the Proposed Action and their feasibility as determined by the application of screening criteria, five on-site "focused avoidance" alternatives were determined to be reasonable alternatives to the Proposed Action and were carried forward in the Draft EIS for detailed evaluation along with the No Action Alternative. Since the USACE is reviewing permits for individual properties, each alternative focuses avoidance within an individual property. The alternatives are briefly described below.

### 1.6.1 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, the project site would be developed in a manner that avoids activities in jurisdictional waters of the United States, including wetlands, thereby avoiding the need for a permit issued s under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. However, local approvals from the County and the state may still be required. The No Action Alternative may require authorization from the USFWS under the federal Endangered Species Act because avoidance of jurisdictional waters may not completely avoid impacts to federally listed species.

The No Action Alternative would involve development of portions of the approximately 5,230-acre (2,117-hectare) project site, resulting in a reduced extent of residential and commercial uses. Avoidance of Section 404 triggers would reduce the total development footprint to approximately 3,297 acres (1,334 hectares), comprising approximately 2,410 acres (975 hectares) of residential uses (with an estimated 8,441 units at buildout), 221 acres (89 hectares) of commercial and office uses, 211 acres (85 hectares) of public and quasi-public uses, 124 acres (50 hectares) of parks, and 332 acres (134 hectares) of roads. About 1,933 acres (782 hectares) would be preserved as open space. The proposed land uses under the No Action Alternative are shown in **Table 1.0-2**, below. Even though, compared to the

Proposed Action, the demand for water, sewer, and other utilities would be reduced under the No Action Alternative, all of the off-site infrastructure improvements would still be required.

**Table 1.0-2**
**No Action Alternative – Land Use Summary (in acres and units)**

| Land Use | Proposed Action – Base Plan Scenario | | Proposed Action – Blueprint Scenario | | No Action Alternative | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Acres | Units | Acres | Units | Acres | Units |
| Low Density Residential | 1,001 | 3,519 | 729 | 3,647 | 590 | 2,064 |
| Medium Density Residential | 1,176 | 6,474 | 1,170 | 9,873 | 721 | 3,819 |
| High Density Residential | 205 | 3,092 | 342 | 6,244 | 121 | 1,814 |
| Special Planning Area | 979 | 411 | 979 | 411 | 979 | 411 |
| *Residential Subtotal* | *3,361* | *13,496* | *3,220* | *20,175* | 2,410 | 8,108 |
| Commercial Mixed Use | 51 | 636 | 95 | 1,456 | 27 | 333 |
| Commercial | 34 | -- | 34 | -- | 56 | -- |
| Town Center Commercial | 43 | -- | 43 | -- | -- | -- |
| Business Park/Power Center | 150 | -- | 142 | -- | 109 | -- |
| Office | 33 | -- | 29 | -- | 31 | -- |
| *Commercial Subtotal* | *309* | *636* | *342* | *1,456* | *221* | *333* |
| Public Uses | 51 | -- | 51 | -- | 42 | -- |
| Schools | 167 | -- | 199 | -- | 118 | -- |
| Religious Facilities | 91 | -- | 116 | -- | 52 | -- |
| *Public Uses Subtotal* | *309* | *0* | *366* | *0* | 211 | 0 |
| Open Space | 709 | -- | 709 | -- | 1,933 | -- |
| Park | 211 | -- | 273 | -- | 124 | -- |
| Roads | 332 | -- | 321 | -- | 332 | -- |
| *Park, Roads and Open Space Subtotal* | *1,252* | *0* | *1,303* | *0* | *2,388* | *0* |
| **Total** | **5,230** | **14,132** | **5,230** | **21,631** | **5,230** | **8,441** |

## 1.6.2 Alternative 1

Alternative 1 involves an alternative land use plan that would avoid wetlands on Property 1B, a 56-acre (23-hectare) property located in the eastern portion of the project site. This alternate land use plan for this property would avoid a group of three large vernal pools (totaling approximately 2 acres [0.8 hectare] of jurisdictional wetlands) and the drainage swale that crosses the northeast corner of the site. The alternate site plan designates the area around the three pools, including a 100-foot (30-meter) buffer, as open space. The alternative also shifts the proposed East Town Center Drive to the south in order to avoid bisecting the group of vernal pools. As a result, approximately 21 acres (8 hectares) of the property would remain in open space compared to about 4 acres (2 hectares) under the Proposed Action (both scenarios).

The acreage assigned to religious facilities would decrease from between 9 and 17 acres (4 and 7 hectares) under the Proposed Action scenarios to just 1 acre (0.4 hectare) under this alternative and the acreage for residential development would decrease from 34 acres (14 hectares) under the Proposed Action to 30 acres (12 hectares) under this alternative. The total number of housing units that would be constructed on the property under this alternate land use plan would however remain the same as the Proposed Action. This would be achieved by developing other portions of the project site at a higher density. The land uses for Property 1B under Alternative 1 are shown in **Table 1.0-3**.

**Table 1.0-3**
**Alternative 1 – Property 1B Site Land Use Summary (in acres)**

| Land Use | Proposed Action-Base Plan | Proposed Action - Blueprint | Alternative 1 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Low Density Residential | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| Medium Density Residential | 18 | 14 | 22 |
| High Density Residential | 6 | 11 | 8 |
| *Residential Subtotal* | *34* | *25* | *30* |
| Commercial | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Religious Facilities | 9 | 17 | 1 |
| *Public Uses Subtotal* | *9* | *17* | *1* |
| Open Space | 4 | 3.5 | 21 |
| Park | 2 | 4 | 1 |
| Roads | 7 | 6.5 | 4 |
| *Park, Roads and Open Space Subtotal* | *13* | *14* | *26* |
| **Total** | **56** | **56** | **56** |

## 1.6.3 Alternative 2

Alternative 2 involves an alternative land use plan that would modify the proposed land uses and provide additional avoidance of wetlands on the 101-acre (41-hectare) Property 3 which is located in the northeastern portion of the project site.

The land use plan for Property 3 under the Proposed Action (both scenarios) would avoid the complex of wetlands in the northeastern portion of the property but would make alterations to a swale complex located along the property's southern boundary. This swale complex involves approximately 2 acres (0.8 hectare) of wetlands. Alternative 2 would shift the proposed A Street to the north in order to provide a 100-foot (30-meter) buffer between the southerly swales and adjacent development.

Compared to the Proposed Action, Alternative 2 designates over half the parcel for commercial uses and eliminates all residential uses from the property. The proposed land uses for Property 3 under Alternative 2 are shown in **Table 1.0-4**, below.

**Table 1.0-4**
**Alternative 2 – Property 3 Site Land Use Summary (in acres)**

| Land Use | Proposed Action - Base Plan | Proposed Action - Blueprint | Alternative 2 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Medium Density Residential | 26.5 | 0 | 0 |
| High Density Residential | 7 | 17 | 0 |
| *Residential Subtotal* | *33.5* | *17* | *0* |
| Commercial Mixed Use | 0 | 18 | 0 |
| Commercial | 25 | 25 | 63.5 |
| *Commercial Subtotal* | *25* | *43* | *63.5* |
| Religious Facilities | 4 | 0 | 2 |
| *Public Uses Subtotal* | *4* | *0* | *2* |
| Open Space | 26 | 26.5 | 31.4 |
| Park | 4 | 6 | 0 |
| Roads | 8 | 8 | 3.6 |
| *Park, Roads and Open Space Subtotal* | *38* | *41* | *35* |
| **Total** | **100.5** | **100.5** | **100.5** |

## 1.6.4 Alternative 3

Alternative 3 involves an alternative land use plan that would avoid a large cluster of wetlands (totaling approximately 3.4 acres [1.4 hectares] of jurisdictional wetlands) on Property 16, a 94-acre (38-hectare) property located in the southwestern portion of the project site. This alternate land use plan for this property would increase the acres of open space to about 65 acres (26 hectares) and would provide a 100-foot (30-meter) buffer between the development area and the wetlands to be avoided. The residential acreage under this alternative would be reduced by about 40 acres (16 hectares) and acreage for religious facilities would be eliminated. Even though the acreage for residential uses would be substantially reduced under Alternative 3, the total number of residential units would be the same as the Proposed Action Base Plan scenario. This would be achieved by building the residential units at a higher density in other portions of the project site. The proposed land uses for Property 16 under Alternative 3 are shown in **Table 1.0-5**, below.

**Table 1.0-5**
**Alternative 3 – Property 16 Site Land Use Summary (in acres)**

| Land Use | Proposed Action - Base Plan | Proposed Action - Blueprint | Alternative 3 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Low Density Residential | 43 | 26.5 | 0 |
| Medium Density Residential | 20 | 32.5 | 23.6 |
| High Density Residential | 0 | 4.5 | 0 |
| *Residential Subtotal* | *63* | *63.5* | *23.6* |
| Religious Facilities | 5.5 | 5.5 | 0 |
| *Public Uses Subtotal* | *5.5* | *5.5* | *0* |
| Open Space | 16 | 16 | 65.3 |
| Park | 4 | 4.5 | 1.5 |
| Roads | 5.5 | 4.5 | 3.6 |
| *Park, Roads and Open Space Subtotal* | *25.5* | *25* | *70.4* |
| **Total** | **94** | **94** | **94** |

## 1.6.5 Alternative 4

Alternative 4 would modify the land use plan to provide additional wetland avoidance (totaling 0.13 acre [0.05 hectare] of jurisdictional wetlands) on Property 17, a 20-acre (8-hectare) property in the southwestern portion of the project site. The wetlands avoided under Alternative 4 would be a continuation of the avoidance area under Alternative 3, and therefore it is anticipated that Alternative 4 would not be implemented in the event that Alternative 3 is not approved for implementation. The proposed land uses for Property 17 under Alternative 4 are shown in **Table 1.0-6**.

**Table 1.0-6**
**Alternative 4 – Property 17 Site Land Use Summary (in acres)**

| Land Use | Proposed Action- Base Plan | Proposed Action - Blueprint | Alternative 4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Low Density Residential | 12 | | 10.7 |
| Medium Density Residential | 7.5 | 11.5 | 7.5 |
| High Density Residential | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| *Residential Subtotal* | *19.5* | *19.5* | *18.2* |
| Open Space | 0 | 0 | 1.3 |
| Park | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Roads | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *Park, Roads and Open Space Subtotal* | *0* | *0* | *1.3* |
| **Total** | **19.5** | **19.5** | **19.5** |

### 1.6.6 Alternative 5

Alternative 5 involves an alternative land use plan that would avoid a cluster of wetlands totaling approximately 1.2 acres (0.5 hectare) on Property 23, a 93-acre (38-hectare) property located in the western portion of the project site. The alternate land use plan for this property would increase the acres of open space from about 35 acres (14 hectares) to 50 acres (20 hectares) in order to avoid additional wetlands and provide an adequate buffer between development and avoidance areas. The residential area under the alternative would be reduced to 43 acres (17 hectares), although the number of residential units would remain the same as the Proposed Action. The proposed land uses for Property 23 under Alternative 5 are shown in **Table 1.0-7**.

**Table 1.0-7**
**Alternative 5 – Property 23 Site Land Use Summary (in acres)**

| Land Use | Proposed Action-Base Plan | Proposed Action - Blueprint | Alternative 5 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Low Density Residential | 49.5 | 23.5 | 37.6 |
| Medium Density Residential | 8.5 | 31.5 | 4.9 |
| High Density Residential | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *Residential Subtotal* | *58* | *55* | *42.5* |
| Public Uses | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Schools | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Religious Facilities | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| *Public Uses Subtotal* | *0* | *4* | *0* |
| Open Space | 22.5 | 22.5 | 41.9 |
| Park | 5 | 4.5 | 1.9 |
| Roads | 7 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| *Park, Roads and Open Space Subtotal* | 34.5 | 33.5 | *50* |
| **Total** | 92.5 | 92.5 | 92.5 |

### 1.6.7 Combined Alternatives 1 through 5

Combined Alternatives 1 through 5 would involve a land use plan that would be the same as the Proposed Action (either scenario) for all properties that make up the PVSP site except for Properties 1B, 3, 16, 17, and 23, where the land use plans presented under Alternatives 1 through 5 would also be implemented. As a result, filling of an additional 8.5 acres (3.4 hectares) of wetlands on Properties 1B, 3, 16, 17, and 23 would be avoided.

This alternative, which alters the development footprint and the amount of development on only five of the PVSP properties, can be combined with either of the two Proposed Action scenarios. While Properties 1B, 3, 16, 17, and 23 would be developed per this combined alternative, the remainder of the PVSP site

could be developed either at Base Plan densities per the Proposed Action Base Plan or at Blueprint densities per the Proposed Action Blueprint scenario. As with Alternatives 1 through 5, the total number of dwelling units that are developed within the PVSP site would remain the same under this alternative (14,132 dwelling units under the Base Plan and 21,631 dwelling units under the Blueprint scenario) because the reduction in the number of units developed on Properties 1B, 3, 16, 17, and 23 (about 84 units) would be offset by developing other portions of the project site at slightly higher densities.

## 1.7 NEPA REQUIREMENTS FOR RESPONDING TO COMMENTS

NEPA requires the Final EIS to include and respond to all substantive comments received on the Draft EIS (40 CFR § 1503.4). Lead agency responses may include the need to:

- modify the proposed action or alternatives
- develop and evaluate new alternatives
- supplement, improve, or modify the substantive environmental analyses
- make factual corrections to the text, tables, or figures contained in the Draft EIS
- explain why no further response is necessary

Additionally, the Final EIS must discuss any responsible opposing view that was not adequately discussed in the Draft EIS and must indicate the lead agency's response to the issue raised.

## 1.8 REQUIREMENTS FOR DOCUMENT CERTIFICATION AND FUTURE STEPS IN PROJECT APPROVAL

The Final EIS is being distributed to agencies, stakeholder organizations, and individuals who commented on the Draft EIS. The Final EIS will be available for public review for 30 days after a notice is published in the Federal Register. Comments on the Final EIS should be sent to:

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District
Regulatory Division
Attn: Will Ness
1325 J Street, Room 1480
Sacramento, California 95814-2922
Fax: (916) 557-6877

Email: DLL-CESPK-RD-EIS-Comments@usace.army.mil

The USACE will circulate the Final EIS for a minimum of 30 days before taking action on the permit applications and issuing its ROD. The ROD will state the decision, identify all alternatives considered, specify the environmentally superior alternative, identify relevant factors considered in the decision, and summarize any mitigation and monitoring measures adopted.

## 1.9 ORGANIZATION AND FORMAT OF THE FINAL EIS

This Final EIS is organized in the following manner:

- **Chapter 1.0, Introduction** – describes the purpose and content of the Final EIS.
- **Chapter 2.0, Comments on the Draft EIS and Responses to Comments** – contains a list of all agencies, organizations, and individuals who submitted comments on the Draft EIS during the public review period, copies of the comment letters submitted on the Draft EIS, and the USACE's responses to the comments.
- **Chapter 3.0, Errata** – presents corrections and revisions to the text of the Draft EIS based on issues raised by comments, clarifications, corrections, or minor changes to the Proposed Action. Changes in the text are shown by ~~strikeouts~~ where text is removed and by <u>underline</u> where text is added.
- **Chapter 4.0, References** – lists the references cited in the above chapters.
- **Chapter 5.0, List of Preparers** – identifies the USACE and consultant staff involved in the preparation of this Final EIS.

## 1.10 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

**Table 1.0-8** presents a summary of the environmental effects of the Proposed Action and alternatives, and for effects determined to be significant, it also presents feasible mitigation measures that would avoid or reduce the significant effects.

**Table 1.0-8**
**Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Aesthetics** | | | | | | |
| **Impact AES-1: Effect on Scenic Vistas**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*No mitigation is feasible.* | **SU** | **SU** | **SU** | **SU** | **SU** | **SU** |
| **Impact AES-2: Effect on Scenic Resources**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*No mitigation is required.* | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |
| **Impact AES-3: Degradation of Visual Character** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** |
| **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.2-6a: Revegetation (*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**<br><br>*All areas containing natural vegetation or landscape material that are disturbed during utility line and roadway construction shall be revegetated upon completion of work utilizing plant materials similar to those disturbed. Revegetated areas shall be actively maintained until fully established, in accordance with the standards and provisions contained in the County's Landscape Design Guidelines.* | | | | | | |

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.2-6b: Screening and Lighting (*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**<br><br>*All permanent utility line-related structures extending above ground shall be screened where feasible using a combination of berms, mounds, landscape material, decorative fencing/walls, or other screening feature approved by the Placer County Development Review Committee, consistent with the Placer County Design Guidelines and the Placer County Landscape Design Guidelines. In addition, any proposed roadway and utility pump station lighting shall be directed downward using cut-off fixtures to minimize lighting effects on adjacent areas and the night sky.*<br><br>**Timing:** Before approval of building permits for all phases<br><br>**Enforcement:** Placer County Planning and Public Works Departments | | | | | | |
| **Impact AES-4: Effects from New Sources of Light and Glare**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*Implement **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.2-6b*** | LTS(am) | LTS(am) | LTS(am) | LTS(am) | LTS(am) | LTS(am) |
| **Impact AES-5: Indirect Effects on Aesthetics from Off-Site Infrastructure Not Constructed as Part of the Project**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*No authority to implement **Mitigation Measures 4.2-6a** and **4.2-6b**.* | **SU** | **SU** | **SU** | **SU** | **SU** | **SU** |

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Agricultural Resources** | | | | | | |
| **Impact AG-1: Conversion of Important Farmland** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** |

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.4-1a: Open Space/Agricultural Land Mitigation**
**(*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*A Project Level Open Space, Agricultural Land and Biological Resource Mitigation Plan for implementing the Open Space, Agricultural Land and Biological Resource Mitigation Strategy must be approved by the County at the time of the approval of any improvement plans for subdivision improvements or off-site infrastructure, recordation of a final map (not including a large lot final map that results in no disturbance of any existing natural condition) or issuance of any project-level discretionary approval for non-residential land uses that do not require a tentative subdivision map. A Project Level Open Space, Agricultural Land, and Biological Resource Mitigation Plan may cover a development project or group of projects and must include any required off-site infrastructure unless covered by a separate project level mitigation plan for that infrastructure improvement. A tentative map may have more than one Project Level Open Space, Agricultural Land, and Biological Resource Mitigation Plan if the development authorized by the map is intended to occur in phases.*

*Each Project Level Open Space, Agricultural Land and Biological Resource Mitigation Plan shall include all of the following:*

1. *Identification and quantification of land cover and wetland take and applicable mitigation requirements as required under this mitigation strategy.*
2. *Identification and quantification of proposed mitigation with sufficient detail to allow for County evaluation, including plans for any restoration, enhancement, and/or creation of wetlands.*
3. *Identification of any conservation or mitigation bank credits or assignment of excess mitigation from other projects in the Specific Plan.*
4. *Draft conservation easements and draft management and monitoring plans, if applicable.*
5. *Proposed funding for long-term management, if applicable.*

**Timing:** Before approval of final maps

**Enforcement:** Placer County Planning Department

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Impact AG-2: Compatibility with Adjacent Agricultural Uses**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*No mitigation is required.* | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |
| **Impact AG-3: Indirect Effects on Agricultural Resources from Off-Site Infrastructure Not Constructed as Part of the Project**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*No mitigation is required.* | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Air Quality** | | | | | | |
| **Impact AQ-1: Emissions Associated with Construction** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** |

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.8-1a: Construction Activities Emissions Reduction Measures**

***(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)***

*Construction contractors shall be required to submit a construction emission/dust control plan for approval by the PCAPCD prior to any ground disturbance. At a minimum, this plan shall include the following measures:*

- *Water exposed earth surfaces as necessary to eliminate visible dust emissions (at least one water truck will be available for every three pieces of earthmoving equipment);*
- *Suspend grading operations when wind is sufficient to generate visible dust clouds;*
- *Pave, use gravel cover or spray a dust control agent on all haul roads;*
- *Wash down all earthmoving construction equipment daily, and wash down all haul trucks leaving the site;*
- *Cover all trucks delivering or exporting soil, sand, and other loose materials to ensure that all trucks hauling such materials maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard;*
- *Institute measures to reduce wind erosion when site preparation is completed;*
- *Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff onto public roadways;*
- *Provide graveled, paved or grass-covered areas for construction employee vehicle parking; and*
- *The site contractor shall retain a CARB certified individual to routinely perform Visible Emissions Evaluations (VEE) to ensure compliance with Rule 228, Fugitive Dust. Fugitive dust shall not exceed 40 percent opacity and shall not go beyond property boundaries at any time. The designee's duties shall include holiday and weekend periods when work may not be in progress.*

*Immediately following any mass grading phase, the following dust control measures shall be implemented:*

- *Apply soil stabilizers or commence reestablishing ground cover to construction areas within 96 hours of completing grading activities;*
- *Develop and implement a wind erosion monitoring program for areas which will remain inactive for extended periods; this program should at a minimum provide for weekly monitoring of inactive sites to assess the effectiveness of wind erosion controls.*

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.8-1b: Construction Activities Emissions Reduction Measures** ***(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)*** | | | | | | |
| *Contractors shall be required to reduce NOx and ROG emissions by complying with the construction vehicle air pollutant control strategies developed by the PCAPCD. Contractors shall include in the construction contracts the following requirements or measures shown to equally effective:*<br>• *Construction equipment operators shall shut off equipment when not in use to avoid unnecessary idling. Generally, vehicle idling should be kept below 10 minutes.*<br>• *Contractor's construction equipment shall be properly maintained and in good working condition.*<br>• *The site contractor shall retain a CARB certified individual to routinely evaluate project related off-road and heavy-duty on-road equipment emissions for compliance with Rule 202, Visible Emissions.*<br>• *The prime contractor shall ensure that emissions from all off-road diesel powered equipment used in the Specific Plan area do not exceed 40 percent opacity for more than 3 minutes in any 1 hour. Any equipment found to exceed the 40 percent opacity shall be repaired immediately, and the County of Placer and the PCAPCD shall be notified within 48 hours of identification of non-compliant equipment. A visual survey of all in-operation equipment shall be made at least weekly, and a monthly summary of the visual results shall be submitted to the County of Placer and the PCAPCD throughout the duration of construction in the Specific Plan area, except that a monthly summary shall not be required for any 30-day period in which no construction activity occurs. The monthly summary shall include the quantity and type of vehicles surveyed as well as the dates of each survey. The PCAPCD and/or other officials may conduct periodic site inspections to determine compliance. Nothing in this section shall supersede other PCAPCD or state rules or regulations.*<br>• *The prime contractor shall submit to the PCAPCD a comprehensive inventory (i.e., make, model, year, emission rating) of all heavy-duty off-road equipment (50 horsepower or greater) that will be used an aggregate of 40 hours or more for the construction project. PCAPCD personnel, with assistance from the California Air Resources Board, will conduct initial Visible Emissions Evaluations of all heavy-duty equipment on the inventory list.* | | | | | | |

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.8-1c: Construction Activities Emissions Reduction Measures** ***(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)*** | | | | | | |
| *The project shall provide a plan, for approval by the Placer County Air Pollution Control District, demonstrating that the heavy-duty (less than 50 horsepower) off-road vehicles to be used for any construction projects undertaken within the Specific Plan area over its planning lifetime, including owned, leased and subcontractor vehicles, will achieve a project-wide fleet-averaged 20 percent NOx reduction and 45 percent particulate reduction compared to the most recent annual CARB off-road construction fleet average for western Placer County. Acceptable options for reducing emissions may include use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as they become available. Contractors can access the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District's web site to determine if their off-road fleet meets the requirements listed in this measure.* | | | | | | |
| *(See http://www.airquality.org/ceqa/Construction_Mitigation_Calculator.xls)* | | | | | | |
| **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.8-1d: Construction Activities Emissions Reduction Measures** ***(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)*** | | | | | | |
| *Construction contractors shall be required to use low-VOC architectural coatings and asphalt in compliance with District Rules and Regulations. Contractors shall also be required to fuel stationary construction equipment with low-sulfur fuels, and use existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or clean fuel generators in place of temporary diesel power generators whenever feasible.* | | | | | | |

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.8-1e: Construction Activities Emissions Reduction Measures** ***(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)*** | | | | | | |
| *Construction contractors shall be required to provide management of construction traffic. Contractors shall include in the construction contracts the following requirements:*<br>• *Contractors shall provide temporary traffic control during all phases of construction activities to improve traffic flow (i.e., flag person);*<br>• *Contractors shall configure construction parking to minimize traffic interference;*<br>• *Contractors shall endeavor to schedule construction activities that affect traffic flow to off-peak hours (e.g., between 7:00 PM and 6:00 AM and between 10:00 AM and 3:00 PM);*<br>• *Contractors shall reroute construction traffic off congested streets; and*<br>*Contractors shall provide dedicated turn lanes for movement of construction equipment on- and off-site.*<br>**Timing:** Before the approval of grading plans and throughout project construction, as appropriate for all project phases.<br>**Enforcement:** Placer County Planning and Public Works Departments; Placer County Air Pollution Control District | | | | | | |

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Impact AQ-2: Criteria Pollutant Emissions Associated with Occupancy/Operation** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** |

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.8-3a: Operational Emissions Reduction Measures**

***(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)***

*The following guidelines shall be used by the County during review of future project-specific submittals for non-residential development within the Specific Plan area in order to reduce generation of air pollutants with intent that specified measures be required where feasible and appropriate:*

- *Include in all new parking lots tree plantings designed to result in 50 percent shading of parking lot surface areas within 15 years. Incorporated by reference in this measure are the City of Sacramento Parking Lot Tree Shading Design and Maintenance Guidelines dated June 17, 2003 (see EIR Appendix U). Also, see Specific Plan Policy 6.25;*
- *Equip HVAC units with a PremAir or similar catalyst system, if reasonably available and economically feasible at the time building permits are issued. Catalyst systems are considered feasible if the additional cost is less than 10 percent of the base HVAC unit cost;*
- *Install two 110/208 volt power outlets for every two loading docks;*
- *Promote passive solar building design and landscaping conducive to passive solar energy use (i.e., building orientation in a south to southwest direction where feasible, encouraging planting of deciduous trees on western sides of structures, landscaping with drought-resistant species, and including groundcovers rather than pavement to reduce heat reflection). Landscaping plans shall prohibit the use of liquidambar and eucalyptus trees that produce smog-forming compounds (high emission factors for isoprenes); and*
- *Implement the following, or equivalent measures, as determined by the County in consultation with the APCD:*
  - *Establish building guidelines that encourage the use of low-absorptive coatings on all building surfaces and Energy Star roofing products on all roofs, if reasonably available and economically feasible, at the time building permits are issued;*
  - *Establish paving guidelines that require businesses, if feasible, to pave all privately owned parking areas with a substance with reflective attributes (albedo = 0.30 or better) similar to cement concrete. The use of a paving substance with reflective attributes similar to concrete is considered feasible under this measure if the additional cost is less than 10 percent of the cost of applying a standard asphalt product; and*
  - *Power all off-road equipment used at office, industrial, and commercial uses by the lowest-emission technology reasonably available at the time building permits are issued.*

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.8-3b: Operational Emissions Reduction Measures *(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)*** | | | | | | |
| *The following measures shall be used singularly or in combination to accomplish an overall reduction of 10 to 20 percent in residential energy consumption relative to the requirements of State of California Title 24:*<br>• *Use of air conditioning systems that that are more efficient than Title 24 requirements;*<br>• *Use of high-efficiency heating and other appliances, such as water heaters, cooking equipment, refrigerators, and furnaces;*<br>• *Installation of photovoltaic rooftop energy systems; and*<br>• *Establishment of tree-planting guidelines that require residents to plant trees to shade buildings primarily on the west and south sides of the buildings. Use of deciduous trees (to allow solar gain during the winter) and direct shading of air conditioning systems shall be included in the guidelines.* | | | | | | |
| **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.8-3c: Operational Emissions Reduction Measures *(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)*** | | | | | | |
| *Promote a reduction in residential emissions through implementation of the following measure:*<br>• *Prohibit any wood-burning fireplaces, woodstoves, or similar wood-burning devices. Homes may be fitted with UL rated natural gas burning appliances if desired. This prohibition shall be included in any CC&Rs that are established.* | | | | | | |
| **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.8-3d: Operational Emissions Reduction Measures *(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)*** | | | | | | |
| *For all projects, use the lowest-emitting architectural coatings during construction. When zero-VOC coatings are commercially available, they should be used. When only low-VOC coatings are available, they shall be used in lieu of higher-emitting formulations. Design review submittals shall include information concerning the coatings products proposed for use in the project.* | | | | | | |

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.8-3e: Operational Emissions Reduction Measures** ***(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)*** | | | | | | |
| *Bicycle usage shall be promoted by requiring the following:*<br>• *All non-residential projects shall provide bicycle lockers and/or racks;*<br>• *All apartment complexes or condominiums without garages shall provide at least two Class I bicycle storage spaces per unit;*<br>• *Require residential neighborhoods to be interconnected, with easy access to commercial and recreational land uses. All neighborhoods shall have access to the Class I bicycle trails without having to travel on an arterial street. All schools and public parks (except neighborhood tot lots) shall be connected with a Class I bicycle trail through the open space and greenbelts;*<br>• *A pedestrian/bikeway (P/B) Master Plan shall be developed for the entire Specific Plan area. This master plan shall be consistent with the guidelines established in the Placer County Regional Bikeway Plan and in the Specific Plan; and*<br>• *As each residential phase is constructed, each subdivision shall install its share of the overall P/B network, and ensure that the layout of each residential phase does not interfere with completion of the overall P/B network. Residential areas adjacent to open space corridors shall provide reasonable access to the Class I P/B trails located in the corridors. These Class I corridors shall provide linkages with the comprehensive network of other trails throughout the Specific Plan area. The P/B Master Plan shall provide linkages from all residential neighborhoods to all commercial areas. Non-vehicular access shall consist of a network of convenient linkages of Class I, II and III trails.* | | | | | | |

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.8-3f: Operational Emissions Reduction Measures**

***(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)***

*Transit usage and ride sharing shall be promoted by requiring participation in the development of a regional transit system at such time as a system is established and setasides of land for park-and ride facilities. Fair share participation may consist of dedication of right-of-way, easements, capital improvements, and/or other methods of participation deemed appropriate. In addition, future project design shall ensure that an adequate number of developers in the Specific Plan area provide reservations for future installations of bus turnouts and passenger benches and shelters, to be installed at such time as transit service is established and as demand and service routes warrant. The two transit centers shall be connected with the Class I bicycle trail. The Specific Plan shall provide for set-asides of land for two separate park-and-ride facilities. Construction of the park-and-ride facilities shall be phased over the buildout period of the project, with the first 50 spaces in place prior to issuance of the 3,000th residential building permit. Prior to issuance of the 6,000th residential building permit another 50 spaces shall be provided, followed by 50 more prior to the 9,000th residential building permit. Forty-three more spaces shall be provided prior to issuance of the 12,000 residential building permit for a total of 193 spaces to be constructed (equal to 0.1 percent of the anticipated daily trip generation of the project). A public transit development fee shall be required for all development projects. The amount of this fee shall be based upon the traffic generation potential of each project. A dial-a-ride transportation system shall be established to reduce individual vehicle trips and establish data for the eventual formation of a transit system within the Specific Plan area.*

*An Air Quality and Transportation System Management (TSM) Plan shall be prepared for the Specific Plan to implement all feasible means of reducing Specific Plan area emissions. This plan shall provide for eventual public transit and implementation of trip reduction strategies that coordinate with surrounding areas. A Transportation Management Association (TMA) shall be established that shall be funded by the developer and all businesses located within the Specific Plan area. The TSM plan shall be updated annually by TMA staff to demonstrate compliance with all air quality requirements, and to incorporate the latest state-of-the-art techniques and strategies to reduce emissions. Initially, the TMA shall provide each home and business with an information packet that will contain, at a minimum, the following information:*

- *Commute options: to inform Specific Plan area occupants of the alternative travel amenities provided, including ridesharing and public transit availability/schedules;*
- *Maps showing Specific Plan area pedestrian, bicycle, and equestrian paths to community centers, shopping areas, employment areas, schools, parks, and recreation areas;*
- *Instructions on how to use TMA services that will facilitate trip reduction opportunities; and*
- *Information regarding PCAPCD programs to reduce countywide emissions.*

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.8-3g: Operational Emissions Reduction Measures**

***(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)***

*All projects requiring issuance of residential and non-residential building permits shall participate in an off-site mitigation program coordinated through the PCAPCD to offset NOx and ROG emissions not mitigated through on-site measures.*

*The PCAPCD, on behalf of Placer County, will determine air quality mitigation fees using calculation methodology established in practice and routinely applied to other, similar, contemporaneous land use development projects. The off-site mitigation program, coordinated through the PCAPCD, is designed to offset the project's long-term ozone precursor emissions. Monetary incentives shall be provided to sources of air pollutant emissions within the project's general vicinity that are not required by law to reduce their emissions. Therefore, the reductions are real, quantifiable and implement provisions of the 1994 State Implementation Plan. The off-site mitigation program reduces emissions within the region that would not otherwise be eliminated and thereby "offsets" the project's increase to regional emissions.*

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.8-3h: Operational Emissions Reduction Measures**

***(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)***

*School districts shall be encouraged to incorporate the following measures into the design, construction, and operation of elementary, middle and high school buildings and facilities:*

- *Install bicycle lockers and racks at all appropriate locations;*
- *Post signage prohibiting the idling of diesel vehicles for longer than 5 minutes;*
- *Construct at least one bus stop at a convenient location to be used for either fixed route service within the Specific Plan area or commuter service;*
- *Provide a community notice board and information kiosk with information about community events, ride-sharing, and commute alternatives;*
- *Provide preferential parking for carpools and hybrid vehicles (vehicles with self-charging electric engines); and*
- *Incorporate solar water heating systems and HVAC PremAir or similar catalyst systems in building design.*

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.8-3i: Operational Emissions Reduction Measures *(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)*** | | | | | | |
| *The following measures shall be incorporated into the design, construction, and operation of public park areas:*<br>• *The pedestrian/bikeway (P/B) master plan shall provide at least one Class I linkage to all school sites;*<br>• *Additional Class I and II linkages shall be provided so as to provide convenient access to/from the park sites;*<br>• *Install bicycle lockers and racks at all appropriate locations;*<br>• *Provide a community notice board and information kiosk with information about community events, ride-sharing, and commute alternatives;* | | | | | | |
| **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.8-3j: Operational Emissions Reduction Measures *(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)*** | | | | | | |
| *Prohibit open burning throughout the Specific Plan area. Include this prohibition in any project CC&Rs that are established.* | | | | | | |
| **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.8-3k: Operational Emissions Reduction Measures *(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)*** | | | | | | |
| *The County may substitute different air pollution control measures for individual projects, that are equally effective or superior to those proposed herein, as new technology and/or other feasible measures become available in the course of buildout of the Specific Plan area.*<br>**Timing:** Before the approval of grading plans and throughout project construction, as appropriate for all project phases.<br>**Enforcement:** Placer County Planning and Public Works Departments; Placer County Air Pollution Control District | | | | | | |
| **Impact AQ-3: CO Hotspots**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*No mitigation is required.* | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Impact AQ-4: Exposure to Toxic Air Contaminants**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*No mitigation is required.* | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |
| **Impact AQ-5: Exposure to Objectionable Odors**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*No mitigation is required.* | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |
| **Impact AQ-6: Indirect Effects on Air Quality from Off-Site Infrastructure Not Constructed as Part of the Project**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*No authority to implement mitigation measures.* | **SU** | **SU** | **SU** | **SU** | **SU** | **SU** |

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Biological Resources** | | | | | | |
| **Impact BIO-1: Loss and Degradation of Functions and Services of the Waters of the U.S. through Direct Removal, Filling, Hydrological Interruption or Other Means**<br><br>**NA**<br>*No mitigation is required.*<br><br>**PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*Mitigation described below.* | LTS | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** |

**Mitigation Measure BIO-1:** **Wetland Compensatory Mitigation**

**(*Applicability – Proposed Action, Alternatives 1 through 5, and Combined Alternatives 1 through 5*)**

*The Applicants shall prepare and present to the USACE a detailed mitigation plan that incorporates permittee-responsible preservation and/or restoration at an off-site location or purchase of constructed wetland creation/restoration credits and preservation credits by the Applicants. The USACE will evaluate the specifics of this plan to determine the actual mitigation requirements based on a number of factors, including but not limited to functions, location (watershed), change in surface area, uncertainty, or risk of failure, and temporal loss of function. The final mitigation requirements will be incorporated into the permit conditions. The purchase of credits from an approved in-lieu fee provider may also be a permissible mitigation option.*

**Timing:** Before approval of grading or improvement plans or any ground-disturbing activities for any project development phase containing wetland features.

**Enforcement:** U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District; Placer County Planning Department

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Impact BIO-2: Effects on Listed Vernal Pool Invertebrates and Their Habitat** | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) |

**Mitigation Measure BIO-2a:** **Secure Take Authorization for Federally Listed Vernal Pool Invertebrates (*Applicability – No Action*)**

*No project construction shall proceed in areas supporting potential habitat for federally listed vernal pool invertebrates or within adequate buffer areas (generally 250-feet from habitat) until a biological opinion (BO) and incidental take permit has been issued by USFWS.*

**Mitigation Measure BIO-2b:** **Secure Take Authorization for Federally Listed Vernal Pool Invertebrates and Implement Permit Conditions (*Applicability – Proposed Action, Alternatives 1 through 5 , and Combined Alternatives 1 through 5*)**

*No project construction shall proceed in areas supporting potential habitat for federally listed vernal pool invertebrates or within adequate buffer areas (generally 250-feet from habitat) until a biological opinion (BO) and incidental take permit has been issued by the USFWS. The USACE will consult with the USFWS under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act and if the USACE determines DA permits will be issued for impacts to habitat on the project site, the BO conditions shall be incorporated into the terms and conditions of the DA permits. The Applicants shall abide by permit conditions (including conservation and minimization measures) intended to be completed before on-site construction.*

*The Applicants will not be required to complete this mitigation measure for direct or indirect impacts that have already been mitigated to the satisfaction of the USFWS through another BO or mitigation plan.*

**Timing:** Before the approval of any grading or improvement plans, before any ground-disturbing activities within 250 feet of said habitat, and on an ongoing basis throughout construction as applicable for all project phases.

**Enforcement:** U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; Placer County Planning Department

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Impact BIO-3: Effects on Federally Listed Plant Species**<br><br>**NA**<br>*No mitigation is feasible.* | **SU** | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) |

**Mitigation Measure BIO-3: Mitigate for Loss of Federally Listed Plant Species**

**(*Applicability –Proposed Action, Alternatives 1 through 5, and Combined Alternatives 1 through 5*)**

- *Prior to any ground disturbance on lands that contain suitable habitat for federally listed plant species and that have not been surveyed for federally listed plant species, a protocol survey will be completed by a qualified biologist during the blooming season to determine whether the species are present within the area of ground disturbance. If the species are not discovered, no further action is required.*
- *In the event that the species are discovered within the area to be disturbed and the population(s) cannot be avoided, the Applicants will comply with the conditions in the Biological Opinion (BO) issued by the USFWS.*

**Timing:** Before the approval of any grading or improvement plans, before any ground-disturbing activities within 250 feet of said habitat, and on an ongoing basis throughout construction as applicable for all project phases.

**Enforcement:** U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; Placer County Planning Department

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Impact BIO-4: Effects on Federally Listed Amphibian and Reptile Species** | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) |

**Mitigation Measure BIO-4a:** **Secure Take Authorization for Federally Listed Giant Garter Snake (*Applicability – No Action*)**

*No project construction shall proceed in areas supporting potential habitat for federally listed giant garter snake until a BO and incidental take permit has been issued by USFWS.*

**Mitigation Measure BIO-4b:** **Secure Take Authorization for Federally Listed Giant Garter Snake and Implement Permit Conditions (*Applicability – Proposed Action, Alternatives 1 through 5, and Combined Alternatives 1 through 5*)**

*If a BO is required, no project construction shall proceed until a BO has been issued by the USFWS. The USACE will consult with the USFWS and incorporate the BO conditions into the terms and conditions of the DA permits. The Applicant(s) will abide by permit conditions (including conservation and minimization measures) intended to be completed before on-site construction.*

**Timing:** Before the approval of any grading or improvement plans or any ground-disturbing activity within 100 feet of Giant Garter Snake habitat as applicable for all project phases.

**Enforcement:** U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; California Department of Fish and Wildlife; Placer County Planning Department

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Impact BIO-5: Effects on Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle** | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) |
| **Mitigation Measure BIO-5a:** **Secure Take Authorization for Federally Listed VELB (*Applicability – No Action*)**<br>*No project construction shall proceed in areas supporting habitat for federally listed valley elder berry longhorn beetle until a BO and incidental take permit has been issued by USFWS.*<br>**Mitigation Measure BIO-5b:** **Secure Take Authorization for Federally Listed VELB and Implement Permit Conditions (*Applicability – Proposed Action, Alternatives 1 through 5, and Combined Alternatives 1 through 5)***<br>*If a BO is required, no project construction shall proceed until a BO has been issued by the USFWS. The USACE will consult with the USFWS and incorporate the BO conditions into the terms and conditions of the DA permits. The Applicant(s) will abide by permit conditions (including conservation and minimization measures) intended to be completed before on-site construction.*<br>**Enforcement:** U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; California Department of Fish and Wildlife; Placer County Planning Department | | | | | | |
| **Impact BIO-6: Effects on Delta Smelt**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*No mitigation is required.* | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Impact BIO-7: Effects on State Special-Status Plant and Wildlife Species**<br><br>**NA**<br>*No mitigation is required.*<br><br>**PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*Mitigation described below.* | LTS | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) |

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.4-4: Western Pond Turtle**

***(Applicability – Proposed Action, Alternatives 1 through 5, and Combined Alternatives 1 through 5)***

*Construction shall be designed to avoid impacts to potential habitat for western pond turtle, if feasible. If construction is required in areas of potential habitat, then a focused survey for this species shall be conducted prior to approval of engineering plans. The survey is required to determine the presence or absence of this species on the properties surveyed. If pond turtles are found on the properties surveyed, locations of these occurrences shall be mapped.*

*A detailed mitigation/conservation plan that provides for "no net loss" of individuals of the species or its habitat shall be developed upon confirming the presence of this species on the properties surveyed. If this species is not found on the properties surveyed, no further studies are necessary.*

*The replacement of western pond turtle habitat required by this measure shall be entirely included within **Mitigation Measure 4.4-1**, to the extent that the mitigation area includes areas appropriate for western pond turtle. As an alternative to these measures, once the Placer County Conservation Plan is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.*

**Timing:** Before the approval of grading and improvement plans, before any ground-disturbing activities, and during project construction as applicable for all project phases.

**Enforcement:** U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; California Department of Fish and Wildlife; Placer County Planning Departments

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Impact BIO-8: Effects on Protected Raptor Species and Other Nesting Birds** | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.4-5: Burrowing Owl**

***(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)***

*When construction is proposed during the burrowing owl breeding season (April- September), a focused survey for burrows shall be conducted within 30 days prior to the beginning of construction activities by a qualified biologist in order to identify any active burrows. If active nests are found, no construction activities shall take place within 500 feet of the nest until the young have fledged. Burrows that must be removed as a result of Specific Plan implementation shall be removed during the non-breeding season (October to March). If no active nests are found during the focused survey, no further mitigation will be required.*

*If burrows are removed as a result of implementation and there is suitable habitat on-site, on-site passive relocation shall be required. Owls will be encouraged to move from occupied burrows to alternate natural or artificial burrows that are beyond 50 meters from the impact zone and that are within or contiguous to a minimum of 6.5 acres of foraging habitat for each pair of relocated owls. Relocation of owls should only be implemented during the non-breeding season. On-site habitat shall be preserved in a conservation easement and managed to promote burrowing owl use of the site.*

*If there is not suitable habitat on-site, off-site passive relocation shall be required. Off-site habitat must provide suitable burrowing owl habitat. Land shall be purchased and/or placed in a conservation easement in perpetuity and managed to maintain suitable habitat. Off-site mitigation shall use one of the following ratios:*

1. *Replacement of occupied habitat with occupied habitat: 1.5 times 6.6 (9.75) acres per pair or single bird.*
2. *Replacement of occupied habitat with habitat contiguous to currently occupied habitat: 2 times 6.5 (13.0) acres per pair or single bird.*
3. *Replacement of occupied habitat with suitable unoccupied habitat: 3 times 6.5 (19.5) acres per pair or single bird.*

*The replacement of burrowing owl habitat required by this measure could be partially or entirely included within **Mitigation Measure 4.4-1**, to the extent that the mitigation area includes areas appropriate for burrowing owl.*

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.4-6: Swainson's Hawk**

***(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)***

*Swainson's hawk foraging habitat shall be mitigated through implementation of* ***Mitigation Measure 4.4-1****. Additionally, the applicant shall be required to obtain a CESA take permit for any active nest tree that may be removed as part of any proposed construction under the Specific Plan. Additional mitigation measures for the loss of active nest trees shall include the planting of suitable nest trees at a 15:1 ratio on suitable foraging habitat areas within west Placer County.*

*The replacement of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat required by this measure shall be entirely included within* ***Mitigation Measure 4.4-1****. As an alternative to this measure, once the Placer County Conservation Plan is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.*

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.4-8: Other Bird Species, including Raptors, Loggerhead shrike and Tricolored blackbird**

**(*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

***Non Raptor Species:*** *If construction activities are proposed during the tricolored blackbird breeding season (May to August), a focused survey for nesting colonies shall be conducted within 30 days prior to the beginning of construction activities by a qualified biologist in order to identify active nests within the construction area. If active nests are found, no construction activities shall take place within 500 feet of the nesting colony until the young have fledged. Vegetation that must be removed as a result of construction shall be removed during the non-breeding season (September to April). If no active nests are found during the focused survey, no further mitigation will be required.*

*This measure would ensure that tricolored blackbird nests are avoided when active, so that eggs and young would be protected. Once the blackbirds have fledged their nests, the nests can be removed without harm to the birds. As an alternative to this measure, once the Placer County Conservation Plan is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.*

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Raptor Species:** *When construction is proposed during the raptor breeding season (March to early September), a focused survey for raptor nests shall be conducted within 30 days prior to the beginning of construction activities by a qualified biologist in order to identify active nests on-site. If active nests are found, no construction activities shall take place within 500 feet of the nest until the young have fledged. Trees containing nests shall be removed during the non-breeding season (late September to March). If no active nests are found during the focused survey, no further mitigation will be required. This measure will ensure that active nests are not moved or substantially disturbed during the breeding season, so that raptor eggs and young are not destroyed or abandoned as a result of construction. As an alternative to this measure, once the Placer County Conservation Plan is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.*<br><br>**Timing:** Before the approval of grading and improvement plans, before any ground-disturbing activities, and during project construction as applicable for all project phases.<br><br>**Enforcement:** U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; California Department of Fish and Wildlife; Placer County Planning Departments | | | | | | |

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Impact BIO-9: Effects on Special-Status Bats** | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) |

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.4-9: Roosting Bats**

***(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)***

*Prior to construction, a qualified biologist shall survey any affected structures for evidence of bat roosts (e.g., bat guano). If roosts are found, they shall be removed in April, September, or October in order to avoid the hibernation and maternity seasons. Appropriate exclusion methods will be used, as needed, during habitat removal.*

*The initial assessment will involve looking for bats or bat signs such as guano, urine staining, and culled food parts, and will identify those specific locations that represent potential habitat (i.e., which specific buildings, trees, bridges could support roosting bats). If no potential habitat is identified or no potential habitat will be affected (i.e., removed), no further measures are required.*

*Bat habitat can be removed with minimal impact to the resident bat population if it is done outside of the hibernation season (November through March) and outside of the maternity season (May through August). During the removal period, a roost exit survey shall be conducted prior to habitat removal. If bats are detected, standard humane exclusion methods shall be implemented (e.g., placing plastic over roost entrance areas such that bats can exit the roost but not return). Exclusion shall be conducted for two nights prior to habitat removal and habitat removal shall occur immediately following implementation of these exclusion measures. If there is a delay, then the exclusion measures shall be repeated. During the maternity season (May through August), habitat removal may occur following a roost exit survey that confirms no bats are present; however, if bats are detected they may not be excluded until the end of the maternity season. During the hibernation season (November through March), bats do not exit the roost, so exit surveys cannot be used to assess presence and removal shall be delayed to the end of this time period.*

*If bats must be excluded, the project proponent shall work with a qualified biologist to determine if any additional steps (such as installation of alternative roost habitat in the form of bat boxes) are appropriate for the particular habitat. Determination of these additional measures will depend on the species present and their specific ecological preferences/requirements. Other steps could include improvement of other avoided bat habitat or design of new project elements such as bridges to be "bat-friendly." As an alternative to this measure, once the Placer County Conservation Plan is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.*

**Timing:** Before the approval of grading and improvement plans, ground-disturbing activities, project construction, and during project operation as applicable.

**Enforcement:** California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Placer County Planning Departments

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Impact BIO-10: Effects on Wildlife Movement** | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) |
| **Mitigation Measure BIO-10:** **Wildlife Movement Protection Policies** **(*Applicability –Proposed Action, and All Alternatives*)**<br><br>*To protect the long-term habitat of the stream channels and the transmission line corridors designated by the Specific Plan as Open Space and their potential use by wildlife as movement corridors, the Applicant(s) shall ensure that movement corridors are not obstructed and human intrusion into the corridor is minimized. These measures shall include, but not be limited to: the use of either bridges or culverts large enough that wildlife have enough space to pass through road crossings without having to travel over the road surface, the implementation of bank stabilization measures, and/or restoration and revegetation of stream corridor habitat that has been damaged due to the project's construction. Furthermore, the recreational trails shall be lined by post and cable fence and signage shall be used to direct trail users to stay within the designated trail corridor and discourage access to the riparian habitat by humans and pets. The trails shall be closed after dark and exterior lighting on the trail shall be minimized to the extent acceptable to the County.*<br><br>**Timing:** Before the approval of grading and improvement plans, ground-disturbing activities, project construction, and during project operation as applicable.<br><br>**Enforcement:** California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Placer County Planning Departments | | | | | | |
| **Impact BIO-11: Loss of Riparian Habitat**<br><br>**NA**<br>*No mitigation is required.*<br><br>**PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*Mitigation described below.* | LTS | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) |

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.4-12a and**

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.4-12b: Riparian Habitat**

***(Applicability – Proposed Action, Alternatives 1 through 5, and Combined Alternatives 1 through 5)***

*Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a Streambed Alteration Agreement shall be obtained from CDFW, pursuant to Section 1600 et seq. of the California Fish and Game Code, for each stream crossing and any other activities affecting the bed, bank, or associated riparian vegetation of the stream. If required, the project applicant shall coordinate with CDFW in developing appropriate mitigation, and shall abide by the conditions of any executed agreements. All stream crossings shall be performed using a "jack and bore" construction technique, unless otherwise specified by CDFW. Streambed Alteration Agreement measures to protect the channel bank of a stream from erosion and related effects of construction shall be included in all related construction contracts. As an alternative to this measure, once the Placer County Conservation Plan is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.*

*For each riparian tree removed, one 15-gallon tree, one depot-40 seedling for each inch, and three 1-gallon shrubs will be planted within existing riparian or improved drainage corridors in the Specific Plan Area. The replacement ratios exceed 1:1 in order to ensure that over the long-term the value of new riparian habitat equals or exceeds the value of the habitat that was lost. The replacement of riparian trees required by this measure shall be entirely included within* ***Mitigation Measure 4.4-1****, to the extent that the mitigation area includes areas appropriate for such habitat.*

*As an alternative to this measure, once the Placer County Conservation Plan is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.*

**Timing:** Before the approval of grading and improvement plans, ground-disturbing activities, project construction, and during project operation as applicable.

**Enforcement:** California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Placer County Planning Departments

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Impact BIO-12: Effects on Special Status Fish Species**<br><br>**NA**<br>*No mitigation is required.*<br><br>**PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*Mitigation described below.* | LTS | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) |

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.4-30: Fish Habitat**

**(*Applicability – Proposed Action, Alternatives 1 through 5, and Combined Alternatives 1 through 5*)**

*Implement **Mitigation Measures 4.4-12a and 4.4-12b**. As an alternative to this measure, once the Placer County Conservation Plan is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.*

*A qualified fish biologist shall be present on-site during any dewatering activities at construction sites to minimize impacts to special-status species (i.e., prevent stranding of special-status species). Individual fish collected during dewatering shall be identified and released in an uninterrupted waterway adjacent to the area of disturbance. As an alternative to this measure, once the Placer County Conservation Plan is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.*

*Chinook salmon and steelhead resources shall be protected from potential construction-related activities by adherence to a construction window, whereby construction activities would be precluded from October 15 through June 15. This window corresponds to the time when both adult and juvenile Chinook salmon and steelhead are expected to migrate through the area. Further measures to protect salmon resources include use of Best Management Practices (BMPs) to minimize and localize siltation and other water quality impacts and to provide for riparian restoration activities. Such BMPs may include the use of cofferdams and other structures during dewatering and construction activities. Water quality monitoring shall also be performed to ensure that state and federal water quality standards are met. As an alternative to this measure, once the Placer County Conservation Plan is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.*

**Timing:** Before the approval of grading and improvement plans, ground-disturbing activities, project construction, and during project operation as applicable.

**Enforcement:** California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Placer County Planning Departments

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Impact BIO-13: Effects on Fish Habitat from Water Diversions**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*No mitigation is required.* | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |
| **Impact BIO-14: Indirect Effects to Biological Resources from Off-Site Infrastructure Not Constructed as Part of the Project**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*No mitigation is feasible.* | **SU** | **SU** | **SU** | **SU** | **SU** | **SU** |

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Cultural Resources** | | | | | | |
| **Impact CR-1: Possible Destruction of or Damage to Known Prehistoric and Historic-Era Cultural Resources during Construction** | **SU** | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) |

**Mitigation Measure CR-1:** **Prepare, Execute, and Implement a Programmatic Agreement with Historic Property Management Plan and Project-Specific Historic Property Treatment Plans**
**(*Applicability – Proposed Action, Alternatives 1 through 5, and Combined Alternatives 1 through 5*)**

*For all action alternatives that require federal permitting and authorization, the USACE shall satisfy the requirements of Section 106 of the NHPA through the development and execution of a PA. The PA shall be prepared and executed (signed) prior to issuance of any federal permit or authorization for any aspect or component of the specific plan project. Determination of the project- or phase-specific APE, and the related inventory, evaluation of eligibility, determination of effect to historic properties, shall be performed as appropriate prior to permit issuance and any subsequent ground-disturbing work in the APE for any federal permitting or authorization of individual development phases. Implementation of treatment measures for identified historic properties may be performed during construction and ground-disturbing work provided that no ground-disturbing work is performed in the vicinity of resources subject to adverse effects and within an appropriate radius of the resource as determined by the USACE, prior to completion of all treatment measures. The exact radius in which construction shall not occur shall be determined based upon the nature of the resource the potential for outlying undiscovered elements of that resource.*

**Timing:** During all ground-disturbing activities for all project phases.

**Enforcement:** Placer County Planning Department

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Impact CR-2: Potential to Damage Undiscovered Historic Properties or Human Remains during Construction** | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) |

**Mitigation Measure CR-2:** **Discovery of Cultural Resources during Construction (*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*Should any cultural resources, such as structural features, bone or shell, artifacts, human remains, or architectural remains, be encountered during any subsurface development activities, work shall be suspended within 100 feet (30 meters) of the find. The Placer County and the USACE staff shall be immediately notified. At that time, the County and the USACE shall coordinate any necessary investigation of the site with qualified archaeologists as needed, to assess the resource (i.e., whether it is an "historical resource" or a "unique archaeological resource" or a "historic property") and provide proper management recommendations should potential impacts to the resources be found to be significant or adverse. Possible management recommendations for important resources could include resource avoidance or, where avoidance is infeasible in light of project design or layout to avoid significant (adverse) effects, data recovery excavations. The contractor shall implement any measures deemed feasible and necessary by County and USACE staff, in consultation with the archaeologists and California State Historic Preservation Officer, as appropriate, to avoid or minimize significant (adverse) effects to the cultural resources. In addition, pursuant to Section 5097.98 or the State Public Resources Code, and Section 7050.5 of the State Health and Safety Code, in the event of the discovery of human remains, the County Coroner shall be immediately notified. If the remains are determined to be Native American, guidelines of the Native American Heritage Commission shall be adhered to in the treatment and disposition of the remains. Procedures to be followed will be detailed in the HPMP developed in concert with the PA for this project.*

**Timing:** During all ground-disturbing activities for all project phases.

**Enforcement:** Placer County Planning Department

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Impact CR-3: Indirect Effects on Cultural Resources from Off-Site Infrastructure Not Constructed as Part of the Project**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*No authority to implement* ***Mitigation Measures CR-1*** *and* ***CR-2.*** | NE - Native American archaeological resources<br>UK - historic sites | NE - Native American archaeological resources<br>UK - historic sites | NE - Native American archaeological resources<br>UK- historic sites | NE - Native American archaeological resources<br>UK - historic sites | NE - Native American archaeological resources<br>UK- historic sites | NE -Native American archaeological resources<br>UK - historic sites |
| **Environmental Justice, Population, and Housing** | | | | | | |
| **Impact EJ-1: Disproportionate Adverse Environmental Effects on Minority or Low-income Populations**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*No mitigation is required.* | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Impact EJ-2: Impacts to Population and Housing**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*No mitigation is required.* | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |
| **Impact EJ-3: Indirect Effects on Environmental Justice, Population, and Housing from Off-Site Infrastructure Not Constructed as Part of the Project**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*No mitigation is required.* | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Geology, Soils, and Minerals** | | | | | | |
| **Impact GEO-1: Hazard associated with Seismic Ground-shaking** | LTS(am) | LTS(am) | LTS(am) | LTS(am) | LTS(am) | LTS(am) |

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.5-1a: Site-Specific Geotechnical Reports**
**(*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*New development within the Specific Plan area shall submit a geotechnical report prepared by a California Registered Civil or Geotechnical Engineer to the Department of Public Works for review prior to improvement plans approval. The report shall meet all relevant requirements of the most recently adopted version of the Uniform Building Code 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, corrosiveness, expansive/unstable soils), and*
- *Slope stability.*

*If the geotechnical report indicates the presence of critically expansive or other soils problems which, if not corrected, would lead to structural defects, a certification of completion of the requirements of the report will be required for subdivisions and other entitlements, prior to issuance of building permits. The certification may be completed on a lot-by-lot basis, tract basis, or other defined project basis. This shall also be noted in the covenants, conditions, and restrictions and on the information sheet filed with the final subdivision map(s). It shall be 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.*

**Timing:** During all ground-disturbing activities for all project phases.

**Enforcement:** Placer County Planning Department

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Impact GEO-2: Hazard associated with Slope Failure**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*Implement **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.5-1a.*** | LTS(am) | LTS(am) | LTS(am) | LTS(am) | LTS(am) | LTS(am) |
| **Impact GEO-3: Potential Structural Damage due to Expansive Soils**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*Implement **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.5-1a.*** | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) |
| **Impact GEO-4: Effect on Mineral Resources**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*No mitigation is required.* | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Impact GEO-5: Indirect Effects Associated with Geology, Soils, and Minerals from Off-Site Infrastructure Not Constructed as Part of the Project**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*No authority to implement* ***PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.5-4a*** *through* ***4.5-4f.*** | **SU** | **SU** | **SU** | **SU** | **SU** | **SU** |

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.5-4a: Erosion Control**

**(*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*New development within the Specific Plan area shall prepare and submit to the Department of Public Works a preliminary grading and erosion control (winterization)/ground instability plan prepared by a California Registered Civil Engineer. Erosion and ground instability mitigation measures shall include conformance to the Uniform Building Code and Placer County grading ordinances. The preliminary grading plan shall include methods to control soil erosion and ground instability.*

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.5-4b: Erosion Control**

**(*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*A Notice of Intent (NOI) and supporting documents shall be submitted to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall be prepared for inclusion with the construction plans and for regulation of construction activities. The SWPPP shall include Best Management Practices (BMPs) which address source reduction and sediment capture and retention. BMPs shall be developed in accordance with the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practices Handbook for Construction and New Development/Redevelopment (or other similar source).*

*Uncemented silty soils are prone to erosion. According to requirements, as set forth in Section 402 (p) of the Clean Water Act as amended in 1987, and as administered by the SWRCB, erosion control measures (appropriate Best Management Practices) shall be implemented during construction which conform to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, Storm Drain Standards, and local standards, consistent with Best Management Practices contained in the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practices Handbook for Construction and New Development/Redevelopment (or other similar source).*

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.5-4c: Erosion Control**

**(*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*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 Department of Public Works for review and approval for each new development phase within the Specific Plan. The plans shall show all conditions for each phase, 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, that could be affected by planned construction, shall be shown in the plans. All landscaping and irrigation facilities within sight distance areas at intersections shall be included in the improvement plans. The applicant shall pay plan check and inspection fees. The cost of the above-noted landscape and irrigation facilities shall be included in the estimates used to determine these fees. It shall be the applicant's responsibility to obtain all required agency signatures on the plans and to secure department approvals. If the Design/Site Review process and/or Design Review Committee 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 Department of Public Works prior to acceptance by the County of site improvements.*

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.5-4d: Erosion Control (*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**<br><br>*All proposed grading, drainage improvements, and vegetation and tree removal shall be shown on the improvement plans and all work shall conform to provisions if the Placer County Grading Ordinance (Ref. Article 15.48, formerly Chapter 29, 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 Design Review Committee. All cut/fill slopes shall be at 2:1 (horizontal:/vertical) unless a soils report supports a steeper slope and the Department of Public Works concurs with said recommendation.*<br><br>*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. Erosion control shall be provided where roadside drainage is off of the pavement, to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works.*<br><br>*A letter of credit or cash deposit shall be submitted to the Department of Public Works 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.*<br><br>*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 Design Review Committee/Department of Public Works for a determination of substantial conformance to the project approvals prior to any further work proceeding. Failure of the Design Review Committee/Department of Public Works to make a determination of substantial conformance may serve as grounds for appropriate punitive action by the appropriate hearing body, including the revocation of a site-specific project approval in extreme circumstances. In determining what constitutes appropriate punitive action in this context, the hearing body shall be guided by the penalty options set forth in Article 15.48 and Article 17.62 of the Placer County Code.* | | | | | | |

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.5-4e: Erosion Control (*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**<br><br>*Stockpiling and/or vehicle staging areas shall be identified prior to any discretionary entitlement and shown on improvement plans and located as far as practical from existing dwellings and protected resources in the area.*<br><br>**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.5-4f: Erosion Control (*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**<br><br>*New development with ground disturbance exceeding 1 acre that is subject to construction stormwater quality permit requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program shall obtain such permit from the State Regional Water Quality Control Board (SRWQCB) and shall provide to the Department of Public Works evidence of a state-issued Waste Discharge Identification (WDID) number or filing of a Notice of Intent and fees prior to start of construction.*<br><br>**Timing:** During all ground-disturbing activities for all project phases.<br><br>**Enforcement:** Placer County Planning Department | | | | | | |
| **Hazards and Hazardous Materials** | | | | | | |
| **Impact HAZ-1: Exposure to Soil or Groundwater Contamination from Past Uses** | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) |
| **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.12-1: Underground Storage Tank Removal and Remediation (*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**<br><br>*The two USTs shall be removed and soil samples shall be collected and analyzed. In the event soil or water contamination has occurred above regulatory clean-up thresholds, remediation shall be performed consistent with State and County regulations. All required remediation shall be completed prior to recordation of any final small lot subdivision map on Property #7 (now Properties #4 and #7).* | | | | | | |

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.12-3: Destruction of Wells** ***(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)*** *Prior to recordation of any final small lot subdivision map on Property #7 (now Property #4), the open well shall be abandoned/destroyed according to California Well Standards, California Department of Water Resources Bulletin 74-90 Section 23, and Placer County Environmental Health Services requirements.* **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.12-6a: Additional Soil Sampling** ***(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)*** *Additional sampling shall be performed on sites #10-1 and #10-2. If test results show that regulatory clean-up thresholds are exceeded, remediation shall be required to meet state and County regulations. All remediation shall be completed prior to recordation of any final small lot subdivision map on Property #10.* **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.12-6b: Additional Soil Sampling** ***(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)*** *Prior to recordation of any final maps on Property #10, unused wells on-site shall be destroyed according to California Well Standards, California Department of Water Resources Bulletin 74-90 Section 23, and according to Placer County Division of Environmental Health Services requirements.* **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.12-7a: Additional Soil Sampling** ***(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)*** *Additional sampling shall be performed on sites #11-1 and #11-2. If test results show that levels of concern are exceeded, remediation shall be required to meet state and County regulations. All remediation shall be completed prior to recordation of any final small lot subdivision map on Property #11.* **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.12-7b: Additional Soil Sampling** ***(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)*** *Prior to recordation of any final maps on Property #11, unused wells on-site shall be destroyed according to California Well Standards, California Department of Water Resources Bulletin 74-90 Section 23, and according to Placer County Division of Environmental Health Services requirements.* | | | | | | |

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.12-8: Additional Soil Sampling (*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)*** *Disposal of refrigerators, tires, batteries, and similar materials by licensed waste haulers at approved waste disposal facilities shall be completed prior to recordation of any final maps on Property #15A (now Property # 22).* **PVSP Mitigation Measure 4.12-9: Additional Soil Sampling (*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)*** *Additional sampling shall be performed on sites #15-1, #15-2, #15-3, #15-4, #15-5, #15-6, #15-7, #15-8, #15-9, #15-10, #15-11, #15-12, and #15-13. If test results show that levels of concern or regulatory clean-up thresholds are exceeded, remediation shall be required to meet state and County regulations. All remediation shall be completed prior to recordation of any final small lot subdivision map on Property #15A (now Property # 22).* **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.12-13: Identify and Remediate Septic Systems (*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)** *Site-specific evaluation by a California Registered Environmental Assessor II shall be conducted at each identified existing and former dwelling area to identify surface indications and locations of septic tanks or cesspools prior to demolition of existing residences. Identified septic tanks shall be destroyed according to Placer County Division of Environmental Health criteria prior to recordation of final small lot subdivision map for the affected property.* *Surface conditions shall be evaluated by a California Registered Environmental Assessor II when the dwellings are vacated, and prior to demolition of the structures, regarding the possibility of previous site uses which may have included hazardous materials that could have been disposed of in on-site wastewater disposal systems.* *Tank or cesspool destruction shall be monitored by a California Registered Environmental Assessor II regarding the likelihood of hazardous materials disposal in the systems. Any required remediation work shall be completed in accordance with state and County regulations prior to recordation of final small lot subdivision map for the affected property.* | | | | | | |

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.12-17: Identify and Remediate Potential Hazardous Contamination**

**(*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*Prior to submittal of a small lot tentative subdivision map or plans for industrial/commercial development, properties not previously evaluated with a current Phase I Environmental Site Assessment may be required to complete a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, as determined by Environmental Health Services. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment shall be conducted by a qualified professional. If past commercial uses are disclosed that could have resulted in persistent contamination then soil sampling shall be conducted within former commercial areas. In these instances, prior to setting conditions for subdivision or industrial/commercial development soil sampling shall be conducted according to guidelines developed by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Phase II Environmental Site Assessment and/or Preliminary Endangerment Assessment with DTSC, or equivalent protocol. Sampling and site investigation shall be conducted by a California registered environmental professional, performed with oversight from Placer County Environmental Health Services, and with applicable permits.*

*As a result of soil investigation, a limited and confined area of contamination may be identified and found to be suitable for simple removal. If this is the case, remediation will be required to meet state and County regulations and be completed prior to recordation of the small lot tentative subdivision final map or equivalent final Placer County approval for commercial/industrial projects.*

*As a result of soil investigation, unconfined and/or widespread residual concentrations of chemicals or other contaminants maybe identified at levels where they individually or in combination meet or exceed U.S. EPA, CalEPA Preliminary Remediation Goals, or equivalent screening levels, thereby indicating the need for risk assessment. Any indicated Risk Assessment shall be completed prior to improvement plans or equivalent approval. Risk assessments shall include a DTSC Preliminary Endangerment Assessment or no further action determination, or equivalent.*

*Any remedial action indicated by a risk assessment shall be completed and certified prior to recordation of the small lot tentative subdivision final map or equivalent final Placer County approval for commercial/industrial projects. Remediation shall include a DTSC Remedial Action Workplan, or equivalent, and can include a range of activities, including restrictions on use, soil excavation, and disposal off-site, or encapsulation in appropriate areas away from sensitive receptors in the Specific Plan area.*

**Timing:** Before approval of grading plans and during construction activities for all project phases.

**Enforcement:** Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board; Placer County Planning Department

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Impact HAZ-2: Hazards from Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials or Wastes**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*No mitigation is required.* | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |
| **Impact HAZ-3: Hazard associated with Adjacent Natural Gas Pipeline**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*No mitigation is required.* | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |
| **Impact HAZ-4: Risk related to Use of Recycled Water**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*No mitigation is required.* | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |
| **Impact HAZ-5: Risk of Exposure to Electromagnetic Fields from Transmission Lines**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*No mitigation is required.* | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Impact HAZ-6: Indirect Effects Associated with Hazards and Hazardous Materials from Off-Site Infrastructure Not Constructed as Part of the Project**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*No authority to implement* ***PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.12-21a*** *through* ***4.12-21f.*** | **SU** | **SU** | **SU** | **SU** | **SU** | **SU** |

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.12-21a: Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

**(*Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*Any USTs that are encountered during off-site utility line/roadway survey or construction, or wastewater treatment or storage facility construction shall be removed and soil samples shall be collected and analyzed. If a UST is subject to UST regulation, then a UST removal permit from Environmental Health Services shall be obtained. In the event soil or water contamination has occurred above regulatory clean-up thresholds, remediation shall be performed consistent with State and County regulations.*

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.12-21b: Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

**(*Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*Prior to any utility, roadway, or wastewater treatment or storage facility construction on properties not previously evaluated in a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment shall be conducted by a Registered Environmental Assessor. If contaminant concentrations are found to be at or above regulatory clean-up thresholds, the site shall undergo remediation in accordance with state and County standards.*

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.12-21c: Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

**(*Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*Any unused well encountered during construction of off-site utilities, roadways, or wastewater treatment and storage facilities shall be destroyed according to California Well Standards, California Department of Water Resources Bulletin 74-90 Section 23, and local requirements.*

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.12-21d: Hazards and Hazardous Materials**
**(*Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*Surveys of any structures that are planned for demolition during off-site utility line, roadway, or wastewater treatment or storage facility construction shall be conducted by a Certified Asbestos Consultant licensed with the California Department of Occupational Safety and Health to determine if friable Regulated Asbestos Containing Materials or non-friable asbestos containing materials are present within the structure demolition areas. Any regulated asbestos materials found in the investigated areas shall be removed and disposed of by a California licensed asbestos abatement contractor.*

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.12-21e: Hazards and Hazardous Materials**
**(*Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*Site-specific evaluation by a California Registered Environmental Assessor II shall be conducted at each identified existing and former dwelling area that may be affected by off-site utility line, roadway, or wastewater treatment and storage facility construction to identify surface indications and locations of septic tanks or cesspools prior to demolition of existing residences. Identified septic tanks shall be destroyed under permit of either the County Environmental Health Services Division or the Public Works Department. Surface conditions shall be evaluated by a California Registered Environmental Assessor II when the dwellings are vacated, and prior to demolition of the structures, regarding the possibility of previous site uses which may have included hazardous materials that could have been disposed of in on-site wastewater disposal systems. Tank or cesspool destruction shall be monitored by a California Registered Environmental Assessor II regarding the likelihood of hazardous materials disposal in the systems. Any required remediation work shall be completed in accordance with State and County regulations prior to recordation of final small lot subdivision maps for the affected property.*

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.12-21f: Hazards and Hazardous Materials**
**(*Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*Disposal of auto parts, debris, household waste and similar materials by licensed waste haulers at approved waste disposal facilities shall be completed prior to any construction within off-site utility corridors.*

**Timing:** Before approval of grading plans and during construction activities for all project phases.

**Enforcement:** Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board; Placer County Planning Department

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Hydrology and Water Quality** | | | | | | |
| **Impact HYDRO-1: Effect related to On- or Off-Site Flood Hazards** | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) |

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3.2-1a: Site-Specific Drainage**

**(*Applicability - Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*New development applications shall be accompanied by a site-specific project drainage report that is consistent with the approved Master Project Drainage Study. The project drainage report shall be reviewed and approved by the Placer County Public Works Department during the Subsequent Conformity Review Process and prior to improvement plan approval for new development. The drainage report shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and shall be in conformance with the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual and Placer County Code. The project applicant shall be financially responsible for all stormwater drainage facility maintenance requirements. The project drainage report shall include, at a minimum, written text addressing existing conditions, the effects of project improvements, all appropriate calculations, a watershed map, potential increases in downstream flows and volumes, proposed on-site improvements, and drainage easements, if necessary, to accommodate flows from the site. The drainage report shall demonstrate compliance with all mitigation measures included in this Revised Draft EIR.*

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3.2-1b: Site-Specific Drainage**

**(*Applicability - Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*New development within the Specific Plan area shall reduce post-development stormwater runoff peak flows and volumes to pre-development levels for the 2-, 10-, 25- and 100-year storm events through the construction of regional retention and detention facilities for the Curry Creek and Steelhead Creek watersheds. Retention/detention facilities in the Steelhead Creek watershed shall incorporate gates, as described in the Master Project Drainage Study, to control flows during a Sankey Gap spill. A protocol shall be established by Placer County in cooperation with the Sacramento Area Flood Control District for monitoring of the Sankey Gap spill and for operation of the gates. Responsibility for the operation and maintenance of the gates shall be assumed by the County Service Area that will serve the Specific Plan area. Construction of regional retention and detention facilities shall be prior to or concurrent with the initial development of the Specific Plan area. Runoff from development within the Dry Creek watershed shall not be detained or retained. Retention and 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 Department of Public Works. Retention and detention facilities shall be designed to be consistent with the Master Project Drainage Study for the Specific Plan.*

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3.2-1c: Site-Specific Drainage (*Applicability - Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**<br><br>*Drainage facilities, for purposes of collecting runoff on individual lots, 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, to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works. These facilities shall be constructed with subdivision improvements, and easements provided as required by the Department of Public Works. Maintenance of these facilities shall be provided by a new County Service Area (CSA), an expanded CSA #28, or other responsible entity.*<br><br>**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3.2-1d: Site-Specific Drainage (*Applicability - Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**<br><br>*The location, size, and ownership of any canals in the Specific Plan area shall be described in the project drainage report and shown on improvement plans. The Department of Public Works shall be provided with a letter from the agency controlling the canal describing any restrictions, requirements, easements, etc. relative to project construction. Said letter shall be provided to the Department of Public Works prior to the approval of improvement plans.*<br><br>**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3.2-1e: Site-Specific Drainage (*Applicability - Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**<br><br>*New development in the Specific Plan area within the Dry Creek watershed shall be subject to the one-time payment of drainage improvement and flood control fees pursuant to the Dry Creek Watershed Interim Drainage Improvement Ordinance (Ref. Article 15.32, formerly Chapter 4, Subchapter 20, Placer County Code). The actual fees to be paid will be those in effect at the time the payment occurs.*<br><br>**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3.2-1f: Site-Specific Drainage (*Applicability - Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**<br><br>*New development in the Specific Plan area within the Dry Creek Watershed shall be subject to payment of annual drainage improvement and flood control fees pursuant to the Dry Creek Watershed Interim Drainage Improvement Ordinance (Ref. Article 15.32, formerly Chapter 4, Subchapter 20, Placer County Code). The applicant shall cause the subject property to become a participant in the existing Dry Creek Watershed County Service Area for purposes of collecting these annual special assessments.* | | | | | | |

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3.2-1g: Site-Specific Drainage**

**(*Applicability - Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*New development shall not alter the post-development mitigated drainage shed boundaries identified in the Master Project Drainage Study in a way that would increase the peak flow runoff or runoff volume.*

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3.2-1h: Site-Specific Drainage**

**(*Applicability - Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*Prior to any improvement plan approval (including plans for backbone infrastructure), the Master Project Drainage Study shall be submitted to the Placer County Department of Public Works for review and approval. The Master Project Drainage Study shall be in conformance with the requirements of Section 5 of the Land Development Manual and the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal. The report shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and shall include all drainage elements outlined in this Revised Draft EIR. The drainage facilities shall be designed for future, fully developed, unmitigated flows from upstream development. Regional detention and retention basis, regional water quality basins, as well as regional drainage channel improvements shall be incorporated with appropriate design information along with appropriate phasing information.*

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3.2-1i: Site-Specific Drainage**

**(*Applicability - Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*New development in the Specific Plan area within the Steelhead Creek (NEMDC) tributary shall be subject to payment of fair share stormwater volume mitigation fees to the County of Sacramento. The current fees range from $325.00 to $629.00 per acre. (Fee Schedule for Zone 11C) and are adjusted annually. The actual fees to be paid will be those in effect at the time the payment occurs. Prior to improvement plan approval, the applicant shall provide evidence to the Placer County Department of Public Works that the fees have been paid to Sacramento County.*

**Timing:** Before the approval of each building permit.

**Enforcement:** Placer County Planning Department

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Impact HYDRO-2: Effects on Culvert Capacity** | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) |

**PVSP Mitigation Measure 4.3.2-2a: Design of Culverts**

**(*Applicability - Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*New development applications shall be accompanied by a site-specific project drainage report that is consistent with the approved Master Project Drainage Study. The project drainage report shall be reviewed and approved by the Placer County Public Works Department during the Subsequent Conformity Review Process and prior to improvement plan approval for new development. The drainage report shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and shall be in conformance with the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual and Placer County Code. The project applicant shall be financially responsible for all stormwater drainage facility maintenance requirements. The project drainage report shall include, at a minimum, written text addressing existing conditions, the effects of project improvements, all appropriate calculations, a watershed map, potential increases in downstream flows and volumes, proposed on-site improvements, and drainage easements, if necessary, to accommodate flows from the site. The drainage report shall demonstrate compliance with all mitigation measures included in this Revised Draft EIR and adopted by the Board of Supervisors.*

**PVSP Mitigation Measure 4.3.2-2b: Design of Culverts**

**(*Applicability - Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*New development within the Specific Plan area shall upsize any existing undersized culverts within the Specific Plan area conveying increased flows from the proposed development. All existing culverts conveying development flow shall be identified with pre- and post-development flow quantities and capacities. All culvert analysis (existing and upsized) shall be designed in conformance with the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual to accommodate the 2-, 10-, 25- and 100-year storms. Flow consideration for debris clogging and sediment transport shall be provided. In addition to the 100-year event, 200-year events shall be evaluated for potential impacts to collector roadways, detention pond failure, and other life-safety impacts.*

**PVSP Mitigation Measure 4.3.2-3a: Design of Culverts**

**(*Applicability - Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*No grading or other disturbance shall occur within the post-project 100-year floodplain limit as identified in the Master Project Drainage Study except, as necessary to construct and maintain drainage improvements. The post-project 100- year floodplain shall be designated as a development setback line on improvement plans and final subdivision maps unless greater setbacks are required by other mitigation measures or conditions of approval.*

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**PVSP Mitigation Measure 4.3.2-3b: Design of Culverts**

**(*Applicability - Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*New development applications shall be accompanied by a site-specific project drainage report that is consistent with the approved Master Project Drainage Study. The project drainage report shall be reviewed and approved by the Placer County Public Works Department during the Subsequent Conformity Review Process and prior to improvement plan approval for new development. The drainage report shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and shall be in conformance with the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual and Placer County Code. The project applicant shall be financially responsible for all stormwater drainage facility maintenance requirements. The project drainage report shall include, at a minimum, written text addressing existing conditions, the effects of project improvements, all appropriate calculations, a watershed map, potential increases in downstream flows and volumes, proposed on-site improvements, and drainage easements, if necessary, to accommodate flows from the site. The drainage report shall demonstrate compliance with all mitigation measures included in this Revised Draft EIR.*

**PVSP Mitigation Measure 4.3.2-3c: Design of Culverts**

**(*Applicability - Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*New development applications within the Specific Plan area shall identify the limits of existing and proposed floodplains in the site-specific project drainage report. Channel/swale construction and/or improvements with new development shall be designed in accordance with the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual and provide sufficient freeboard for the 100-year event and shall be identified with floodplain delineations.*

**PVSP Mitigation Measure 4.3.2-3d: Design of Culverts**

**(*Applicability - Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*The developer shall construct flood warning devices (e.g., rain gauges, stream gauges with radio transmitters) within floodplains as indicated in the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual and Placer County Code. The flood warning devices shall be shown on the improvement plans.*

**PVSP Mitigation Measure 4.3.2-3e: Design of Culverts**

**(*Applicability - Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*The Master Project Drainage Study shall demonstrate that the proposed development will not increase the 100-year floodplain water surface elevation.*

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**PVSP Mitigation Measure 4.3.2-3f: Design of Culverts**

**(*Applicability - Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*The low dam, intake structure, pump, and pipeline withdrawing water from Dry Creek shall be removed in its entirety, and the streambed returned to a natural condition, at the time irrigation of existing pastureland located within Property Group #5 of the Specific Plan area ceases. Upon removal of the dam, an effective combination of erosion and sediment control shall be implemented which may include measures such as covering exposed areas with mulch, temporary seeding, soil stabilizers, binders, fiber rolls or blankets, temporary vegetation or permanent seeding. In addition, best management practices (BMPs) shall be implemented during construction to reduce or eliminate sedimentation and reduce erosion in result of dam removal activities. BMPs may include sediment control practices such as filtration devices and barriers (e.g., fiber rolls, straw bale barriers, and gravel inlet filters) and/or settling devices (e.g., sediment traps or basins). BMPs shall be developed in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local agencies. Additionally, the dam removal shall be done in accord with all applicable federal, state, and local requirements and/or permit conditions existing at the time of removal. Prior to removal of the structure, a drainage report shall be prepared demonstrating that the removal of the structure will not adversely increase flows downstream.*

**PVSP Mitigation Measure 4.3.2-11a: Design of Culverts**

**(*Applicability - Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*Prior to any development pursuant to the Specific Plan within the Dry Creek Drainage Shed, the developer shall submit to the Placer County Department of Public Works project-specific drainage reports, calculations and plans addressing up-gradient and project flows within the Dry Creek drainage shed for review and approval. Placer County Storm Water Management Manual and the Placer County Code require developments to not cause adverse impacts to upstream or downstream properties.*

**PVSP Mitigation Measure 4.3.2-11b: Design of Culverts**

**(*Applicability - Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*The Master Project Drainage Study and project-specific drainage reports shall design for conveyance of future, fully developed, unmitigated flows from upstream development outside of the Specific Plan area.*

**Timing:** Before the approval of each building permit.

**Enforcement:** Placer County Planning Department

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Impact HYDRO-3: Effects on Flood Capacity**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*Implement **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3.2-3a** through **4.3.2-3e.*** | **SU(m)** | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) |
| **Impact HYDRO-4: Effects from Construction within a Floodplain**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*No mitigation is required.* | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |
| **Impact HYDRO-5: Exposure to Flood Hazards related to Dam or Levee Failure**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*No mitigation is required.* | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |
| **Impact HYDRO-6: Water Quality Effects during Construction**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*No mitigation is required.* | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |
| **Impact HYDRO-7: Water Quality Effects from Project Occupancy and Operation** | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) |

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3.4-1a: Stormwater Management Standards (*Applicability - Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**<br><br>*Prior to submission of applications for new development within the Specific Plan area, the precise location and preliminary design of the regional water quality detention/sedimentation basins, as described in the Master Project Drainage Study shall be submitted to Placer County for review and approval. This plan shall also include the method or methods for funding the long-term maintenance of regional water quality maintenance measures. Finally, the plan shall also include sanctions available to enforce the implementation and maintenance of measures, should measures fail or not be maintained over time.*<br><br>**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3.4-1b: Stormwater Management Standards (*Applicability - Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**<br><br>*Plans for construction of backbone infrastructure shall include construction of regional basins in sequence and location determined by the Master Project Drainage Study required by **Mitigation Measure 4.3.4-1a**.*<br><br>**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3.4-1c: Stormwater Management Standards (*Applicability - Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**<br><br>*Plans for construction of backbone infrastructure shall include SWPP plans prepared in conformance with the requirements of **Mitigation Measure 4.5-4b**.*<br><br>**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3.4-1d: Stormwater Management Standards (*Applicability - Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**<br><br>*Prior to improvement plan approval for new development other than that for backbone improvements, each applicant shall include site specific plans for accomplishment of long-term reductions in water quality impacts. The applicant shall also propose a method of financing the long-term maintenance of such facilities, such as a County Service Area or the expansion of CSA #28, in conformance with **Mitigation Measure 4.3.4-1a**. Such plans shall conform to all mitigation measures set forth in this Revised Draft EIR and adopted by the Board of Supervisors.* | | | | | | |

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3.4-1e: Stormwater Management Standards**

**(*Applicability - Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*New development shall submit a site-specific BMP plan showing the on-site locations and effectiveness of the BMP facilities proposed for long-term water quality impact reduction during the Subsequent Conformity Review process and prior to improvement plan approval. Storm drain inlet cleaning shall occur semi-annually (at a minimum) and parking lots shall include the installation of oil/sand/grit separators or as otherwise approved by the Placer County Department of Public Works. The plan shall include a method for financing the long-term maintenance of the proposed facilities and BMPs. The plan shall conform to the Master Project Drainage Study required by* ***Mitigation Measure 4.3.4-1a*** *and the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbook for Construction and New Development/Redevelopment (or other similar source approved by the Department of Public Works). BMPs shall reflect improvements in techniques and opportunities made available over time and shall also reflect site-specific limitations. The County shall make the final determination as to the appropriate BMPS for each project.*

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3.4-1f: Stormwater Management Standards**

**(*Applicability - Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*Storm drainage from all new development impervious surfaces (including roadways) shall be collected and routed through specially designed catch basins, vaults, filters, etc. for entrapment of sediment, debris and oils/greases as approved by the Placer County Department of Public Works. Maintenance of these facilities shall be provided by the project owners/permittees unless and until a County Service Area is created and said facilities are accepted by the County for maintenance. Contractual evidence of a monthly parking lot sweeping and vacuuming and catch basin cleaning program shall be provided to the Placer County Department of Public Works upon request. Prior to improvement plan or final subdivision map approval, easements shall be created and offered for dedication to the County for maintenance and access to these facilities in anticipation of possible County maintenance.*

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3.4-1g: Stormwater Management Standards**

**(*Applicability - Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*New development (including roadways) within the Specific Plan area shall design water quality treatment facilities (BMPs) such that the treatment of runoff occurs, at a minimum, before discharge into any receiving waters, or as otherwise determined by the Placer County Department of Public Works.*

**Timing:** Before the approval of each building permit.

**Enforcement:** Placer County Planning Department

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Impact HYDRO-8: Effect on Groundwater Recharge**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*Implement **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3.4-1.*** | LTS(am) | LTS(am) | LTS(am) | LTS(am) | LTS(am) | LTS(am) |
| **Impact HYDRO-9: Effects on Groundwater Basin**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*No mitigation is required.* | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |
| **Impact HYDRO-10: Indirect Effects to Hydrology and Water Quality from Off-Site Infrastructure Not Constructed as Part of the Project**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*No authority to implement **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.3.4-7a** through **4.3.4-7c.*** | **SU** | **SU** | **SU** | **SU** | **SU** | **SU** |
| **Land Use and Planning** | | | | | | |
| **Impact LU-1: Result in Incompatible Land Uses**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*No mitigation is required.* | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Impact LU-2: Physically Divide an Established Community**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*No mitigation is required.* | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |
| **Impact LU-3: Conflict with General Plan**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*No mitigation is required.* | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |
| **Impact LU-4: Conflict with SACOG Blueprint**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*No mitigation is feasible.* | **SU** | **SU**<br>(Base Plan only) | **SU** | **SU** | **SU** | **SU** |
| **Impact LU-5: Indirect Effects on Land Use and Planning from Off-Site Infrastructure Not Constructed as Part of the Project**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*No mitigation is required.* | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Noise** | | | | | | |
| **Impact NOISE-1: Construction Noise and Vibration** | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) |
| **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.9-3: Construction Noise Reduction** ***(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)*** *The hours of operation of noise-producing equipment shall comply with Placer County's "Standard Construction Noise Condition of Approval." Effective mufflers shall be fitted to gas- and diesel- powered equipment to reduce noise levels as much as possible.* **Timing:** During all phases of project construction. **Enforcement:** Placer County Planning Department | | | | | | |
| **Impact NOISE-2: Noise from Project Operations** | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) |
| **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.9-2: Commercial Noise Controls** ***(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)*** *When specific uses are proposed, they shall be reviewed for their potential to produce significant noise impacts and, as required, noise studies shall be conducted to determine the most effective and practical mitigation measures. Mitigation measures shall be applied to assure that new stationary sources do not exceed adopted noise standards. Mitigation measures shall be consistent with the Noise Element of the Placer County General Plan, including use of setbacks, barriers, and other standard noise mitigation measures.* **Timing:** During design review and before the approval of all plans, where applicable for all project phases. **Enforcement:** Placer County Planning Department | | | | | | |

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Impact NOISE-3: Increase in Traffic Noise at Buildout (Year 2025)**<br><br>**NA**<br>*No mitigation is required.*<br><br>**PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*Mitigation described below.* | LTS | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) |
| **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.9-4: Traffic Noise Attenuation (*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**<br><br>*Site-specific acoustical analyses shall be conducted when actual roadway design and tentative subdivision map design are proposed and grading is established to determine setbacks and any other measures (e.g., berms, site design, location of structures, noise walls/barriers) required to reduce traffic noise to level that meet County and Specific Plan noise standards, and Specific Plan design standards.*<br><br>**Timing:** During design review and before the approval of all plans, where applicable for all project phases.<br><br>**Enforcement:** Placer County Planning Department | | | | | | |
| **Impact NOISE-4: Aviation Noise**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*No mitigation is required.* | **SU** | **SU** | **SU** | **SU** | **SU** | **SU(m)** |

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Impact NOISE-5: Indirect Effects on Noise from Off-Site Infrastructure Not Constructed as Part of the Project**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*No authority to implement* ***PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.9-3.*** | **SU** | **SU** | **SU** | **SU** | **SU** | **SU** |
| **Public Services** | | | | | | |
| **Impact PUB-1: Demand for Law Enforcement Services** | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) |

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.11.3-1: Funding for Law Enforcement Services**

***(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)***

*The staffing ratios contained in Table 4.11-2 shall be maintained for the Specific Plan area. The applicants shall be required to establish a special benefit assessment district or other funding mechanism to assure adequate funding for the ongoing maintenance and operation of law enforcement services, with funding responsibilities imposed on residential and commercial properties within the Specific Plan area, including the costs for services required to satisfy the staffing standards set forth above and General Plan standards now in existence or as later amended. The funding mechanism shall be subject to the prior review and approval of Placer County.*

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.11.3-2a: Funding for Law Enforcement Services**

***(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)***

*The project developer(s) shall comply with Placer County Policy 4.H.4, which requires that all future development either fund or develop law enforcement facilities. The project developer(s) shall dedicate land for development of a 19,000-square foot substation prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map. Said development shall be consistent with the requirements of the County, the needs of the County Sheriff's Department and the County Facilities Services Department. Compliance with Policy 4.H.4 shall include formation of a County Service Area (CSA), Community Facilities District (CFD), or expansion of CSA #28 for the construction of an equipped Sheriff's substation prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map.*

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.11.3-2b: Funding for Law Enforcement Services**<br>***(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)***<br>*The project developer(s) shall enter into a Development Agreement with Placer County prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map for facilities, staffing, and the purchase and scheduled replacement of the number of equipped vehicles needed as determined by the Sheriff in the same frequency and manner currently used by the County in its patrol vehicle replacement program. All patrol vehicles shall include the necessary equipment to accomplish the mission of the Placer County Sheriff's Department or as otherwise required by the Sheriff.*<br>**Timing:** Before approval of improvement plans for all project phases.<br>**Enforcement:** Placer County Planning Department | | | | | | |
| **Impact PUB-2: Demand for Fire Protection Services** | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) |
| **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.11.2-1: Funding for Fire Protection Services**<br>**(*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**<br>*The staffing ratios contained in Table 4.11-1 shall be maintained for the Specific Plan area during all phases of development concurrent with demand. The applicants shall be required to establish a special benefit assessment district or other funding mechanism to assure adequate funding for the ongoing maintenance and operation of fire protection and related services, with funding responsibilities imposed on residential and commercial properties within the Specific Plan area, including the costs for services required to satisfy Placer County Fire Department staffing requirements set forth above. The funding mechanism shall be subject to the prior review and approval of Placer County, and shall be approved by the affected landowners prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map. It shall be maintained until such time as the County determines that property tax revenues are adequate to maintain the required staffing.*<br>**Timing:** Before approval of improvement plans for all project phases.<br>**Enforcement:** Placer County Planning Department | | | | | | |

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Impact PUB-3: Demand for School Facilities**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*No mitigation is required.* | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |
| **Impact PUB-4: Demand for Library Services** | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) |

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.11.12-1a: Funding for Library Services**

***(Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action, and All Alternatives)***

*Formation of a County Service Area (CSA), Community Facilities District (CFD), or expansion of CSA #28, or other financing mechanism acceptable to the County shall be required prior to recordation of the first final small lot subdivision map to ensure that immediate funding for adequate library infrastructure consistent with County standards is in place. The Specific Plan developers shall enter into a Development Agreement to ensure a fair share contribution to adequate library facilities, and that such facilities are available prior to demonstrated need.*

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.11.12-1b: Funding for Library Services**

***(Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action, and All Alternatives)***

*Completion of one or more branch libraries to provide a minimum of 0.4 square foot per capita, dedication of land, and stocking with books and other materials necessary for a functioning library with a minimum of 2.2 volumes per capita and otherwise meeting the standards of the Auburn-Placer County Library Long-Range Plan, including any subsequent amendments, shall occur concurrent with demand.*

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.11.12-1c: Funding for Library Services** ***(Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action, and All Alternatives)*** *Project developers shall be required to establish a special benefit assessment district or other funding mechanism to ensure adequate funding of the Specific Plan's fair share for the ongoing operation and maintenance of library facilities. Such funding mechanism shall be established prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map to ensure that immediate funding for adequate library operations and maintenance is in place.* **Timing:** Before approval of improvement plans for all project phases. **Enforcement:** Placer County Planning Department | | | | | | |
| **Impact PUB-5: Indirect Effects on Public Services from Off-Site Infrastructure Not Constructed as Part of the Project** **NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5** *No mitigation is required.* | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |
| **Transportation and Traffic** | | | | | | |
| **Impact TRA-1: Increased Traffic at City of Roseville Intersections** **NA** *No mitigation is required.* **PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5** *Mitigation described below.* | LTS | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** |

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-12: Pay fair share of the cost of improvements to Placer County roadway system *(Applicability – Proposed Action, Alternatives 1 through 5, and Combined Alternatives 1 through 5)*** | | | | | | |
| *Implement **Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a**.* | | | | | | |
| **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a:** | | | | | | |
| *Developers of property within the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan area shall be responsible for the project's fair share of all feasible physical improvements necessary and available to reduce the severity of the project's significant transportation-related impacts, as identified in this traffic analysis, consistent with the policies and exceptions set forth in the Transportation and Circulation Element of the 1994 Placer County General Plan as amended. The project's contribution toward such improvements, which the County recognizes will not be sufficient to mitigate all transportation-related impacts to less than significant levels, may take any, or some combination, of the following forms:*<br>1. *Construction of roads and related facilities within and adjacent to the boundaries of the Specific Plan area, which may be subject to fee credits and/or reimbursement, coordinated by the County, from other fee-paying development projects with respect to roads or other facilities that would also serve fee-paying development projects other than Placer Vineyards;*<br>2. *Construction of roads and/or road improvements or other transportation facilities outside the boundaries of the Specific Plan area but within unincorporated Placer County, subject in some instances to future reimbursement, coordinated by the County, from other fee-paying development projects where the roads or improvements at issue would also serve fee-paying development projects other than Placer Vineyards;*<br>3. *The payment of impact fees to Placer County in amounts that constitute the Specific Plan's fair share contributions to the construction of transportation facilities to be built or improved within unincorporated Placer County, consistent with the County's CIP;*<br>4. *The payment of impact fees to the South Placer Regional Transportation Authority (SPRTA) in amounts that constitute the Project's fair share contribution to the construction of transportation facilities funded through fees collected by the SPRTA for Tier 1 and/or Tier 2 projects;*<br>5. *The payment of other adopted regional impact fees that would provide improvements to roadways, intersections and/or interchanges that are affected by multiple jurisdictions (e.g., Walerga/Fiddyment/Baseline);* | | | | | | |

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6. *The payment of impact fees to Placer County in amounts that constitute the Specific Plan's fair share contributions to the construction of transportation facilities and/or improvements within the City of Roseville, Sacramento County and/or Sutter County needed in whole or in part because of the Specific Plan, to be made available to the City of Roseville, Sacramento County, and/or Sutter County, if and when those jurisdictions and Placer County enter into an enforceable agreement consistent with Placer County General Plan Policy 3.A.15(c). At the time of issuance of building permits for individual development projects within the Specific Plan area, the County shall collect fair share fee payments for improvements or facilities addressed by its CIP as it exists at that time;*<br>7. *Developers of property within the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan area shall pay impact fees to Placer County in amounts that constitute the Specific Plan's fair share contributions to the construction of transportation facilities and/or improvements on federal or state highways or freeways needed in part because of the Specific Plan, to be made available to Caltrans if and when Caltrans and Placer County enter into an enforceable agreement consistent with State law and Placer County General Plan Policy 3.A.15; and*<br>8. *In pursuing a single agreement or multiple agreements with the City of Roseville, Sacramento County, Sutter County, and Caltrans, Placer County shall negotiate in good faith with these other jurisdictions to enter into fair and reasonable arrangements with the intention of achieving, within a reasonable time period after approval of the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan, commitments for the provision of adequate fair share mitigation payments from the Specific Plan for its out-of-jurisdiction traffic impacts and its impacts on federal and state freeways and highways.*<br>**Timing:** Before approval of the first subdivision map.<br>**Enforcement:** Placer County Planning Department | | | | | | |
| **Impact TRA-2: Increased Traffic at Placer County Intersections and Roadway Segments** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** |
| **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-13a: Pay fair share of the cost of improvements to Placer County intersections *(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)***<br>*Implement **Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a**.* | | | | | | |

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-13b: Pay fair share of the cost of improvements to Placer County intersections** ***(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)*** | | | | | | |
| *Consistent with* ***Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a****, the proposed project shall contribute its fair share toward the following improvements:*<br>*i. A third northbound and southbound through lane, a second eastbound and westbound through lane, a second northbound, an eastbound and westbound left turn lane and a free eastbound right turn lane to improve the intersection of Walerga Road and PFE Road to LOS "F" (V/C 1.19 ) in the PM peak hour.*<br>*ii. A third northbound and southbound through lane to improve the intersection of Walerga Road and Town Center Drive to LOS "B" (V/C ratio 0.61) in the AM peak hour and LOS "C" (V/C 0.73) in the PM peak hour*<br>*iii. Conversion of the northbound right turn lane into a free right turn lane to improve the intersection of Watt Avenue and Dyer Lane to LOS "E" (V/C 0.94) in the AM peak hour and LOS "F" (V/C 1.03) in the PM peak hour.*<br>*iv. Convert the northbound right turn lane into a free right turn lane to improve the intersection of East Dyer Lane and Baseline Road to LOS "E" (V/C 0.92) in the AM peak hour.*<br>**Timing:** Before approval of the first subdivision map.<br>**Enforcement:** Placer County Planning Department | | | | | | |
| **Impact TRA-3: Increased Traffic at Sacramento County Roadway Segments** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** |
| **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-15a: Pay fair share of the cost of improvements to Sacramento County roadway segments** ***(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)*** | | | | | | |
| *Implement* ***Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a****.* | | | | | | |

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-15b: Pay fair share of the cost of improvements to Sacramento County roadway segments *(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)*** | | | | | | |
| *Consistent with **Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a**, the proposed project shall contribute its fair share toward the following improvements in Sacramento County:*<br>1. *Widen Watt Avenue to six lanes from the Placer County line to Antelope Road, to reduce the V/C from 1.75 to 1.17 (LOS "F").*<br>2. *Widen Watt Avenue to eight lanes from Antelope Road to Elkhorn Blvd, to provide LOS "E."*<br>3. *Widen Sorento Road to four lanes from the Placer County line to Elverta Road, to provide LOS "A."*<br>4. *Widen Elwyn Avenue to four lanes from the Placer County line to Elverta Road, to provide LOS "A."*<br>5. *Widen 16th Street to four lanes from the Placer County line to Elverta Road, to provide LOS "B."*<br>6. *Widen Dry Creek Road to four lanes from the U Street to Ascot Avenue, to provide LOS "C."* | | | | | | |
| **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 6.7-15a: Pay fair share of the cost of improvements to Watt Avenue *(Applicability – Blueprint scenario; Alternatives A through D)*** | | | | | | |
| *Consistent with **Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a**, construct Watt Avenue to eight lanes (or a one-way couplet) from Antelope Road to Don Julio Boulevard, to provide LOS "D" (V/C 0.90).*<br>**Timing:** Before approval of the first subdivision map.<br>**Enforcement:** Sacramento County Planning Department | | | | | | |

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Impact TRA-4: Increased Traffic at Sacramento County Intersections** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** |

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-16a: Pay fair share of the cost of improvements to Sacramento County intersections**
***(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)***

*Implement **Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a**.*

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-16b: Pay fair share of the cost of improvements to Sacramento County intersections**
***(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)***

*Implement **Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a**.*

*Consistent with **Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a**, the proposed project shall contribute its fair share toward the following improvements in Sacramento County:*

1. *Construct a second left turn lane on the eastbound approach to improve the intersection of Sorento Road and Elverta Road to LOS "F" conditions (V/C 1.11) during the AM peak hour.*
2. *Construct a second left turn lane on the eastbound approach to improve the intersection of Elwyn Avenue and Elverta Road to LOS "E" conditions (V/C 0.94) during the PM peak hour.*
3. *Construct a second left turn lane on the eastbound approach to improve the intersection of Palladay Road and Elverta Road to LOS "F" conditions (V/C 1.07) during the PM peak hour.*
4. *Construct a second through lane on the northbound and southbound approaches, and a right turn lane on the eastbound and westbound approaches to improve the intersection of 16th Street and Elverta Road to LOS "B" conditions (V/C 0.66) during the AM peak hour and to LOS "C" conditions (V/C 0.77) during the PM peak hour.*
5. *Construct a third through lane on the eastbound and westbound approaches at the Watt Avenue and Elverta Road intersection to provide LOS "F" conditions (V/C 1.11) during the PM peak hour.*
6. *Construct a third through lane on the northbound and southbound approaches at the Walerga Road and Elverta Road intersection to provide LOS "F" conditions (V/C 1.16) during the AM peak hour.*

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

7. *Construct a third through lane on the northbound and southbound approaches, and second left turn lane on the westbound approach at the Watt Avenue and Antelope Road intersection to provide LOS "C" (V/C 0.80) conditions during the PM peak hour.*
8. *Construct a second through lane on the northbound approach at the Dry Creek Road and Elkhorn Boulevard intersection to provide LOS "E" conditions (V/C 0.99) during the PM peak hour.*
9. *Construct a fourth through lane on the northbound and southbound approaches at the Watt Avenue and Elkhorn Boulevard intersection to provide LOS "E" (V/C 0.94) in the AM peak hour and LOS "F" conditions (V/C 1.14) during the PM peak hour.*
10. *Construct a second left turn lane and a second right turn lane on the westbound approach at the Walerga Road and Elkhorn Boulevard intersection to provide LOS "E" conditions (V/C 0.94) during the PM peak hour.*
11. *Construct a third through lane on the northbound approach and a second westbound right turn lane at the Watt Avenue and Air Base Drive intersection to provide LOS "E" conditions (V/C 0.91) during the PM peak hour.*
12. *Construct a second left turn lane on the westbound approach at the Watt Avenue and Roseville Road intersection to provide LOS "F" conditions (V/C 1.24) during the PM peak hour.*

**Timing:** Before approval of the first subdivision map.

**Enforcement:** Sacramento County Planning Department; Placer County Planning Department

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Impact TRA-5: Increased Traffic along Sutter County Roadway Segments** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** |

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-17a: Pay fair share of the cost of improvements to Sutter County roadway segments *(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)***

*Implement **Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a**.*

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-17b: Pay fair share of the cost of improvements to Sutter County roadway segments *(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)***

*Consistent with **Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a**, the proposed project shall contribute its fair share toward the following improvements in Sutter County:*

1. *Widen Pleasant Grove Road to four lanes from Riego Road to the Sacramento County line.*

**Timing:** Before approval of the first subdivision map.

**Enforcement:** Sutter County Planning Department; Placer County Planning Department

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Impact TRA-6: Increased Traffic at Sutter County Intersections** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** |
| **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-18a: Pay fair share of the cost of improvements to Sutter County intersections (*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**<br><br>*Implement **Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a**.*<br><br>**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-18b: Pay fair share of the cost of improvements to Sutter County intersections (*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**<br><br>*Consistent with **Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a**, the proposed project shall contribute its fair share toward the following improvements in Sutter County:*<br><br>*i. Construct a second left turn lane on the southbound approach, to improve the intersection of Pleasant Grove Road (North) and Riego Road to LOS "D" (VC ratio 0.83) in the AM peak LOS "D" conditions (V/C 0.87) in the PM peak.*<br><br>*ii. Construct a second left turn lane on the northbound and westbound approaches, to improve the intersection of Pleasant Grove Road (South) and Riego Road to LOS "C" (VC ratio 0.78) in the AM peak LOS "D" conditions (V/C 0.87) in the PM peak.*<br><br>**Timing:** Before approval of the first subdivision map.<br><br>**Enforcement:** Sutter County Planning Department; Placer County Planning Department | | | | | | |
| **Impact TRA-7: Increased Traffic at City of Roseville Intersections** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** |
| **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-14a:Pay fair share of the cost of improvements to City of Roseville intersections (*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**<br><br>*Implement **Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a**.* | | | | | | |

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-14b: Pay fair share of the cost of improvements to City of Roseville intersections (*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**<br><br>*Consistent with **Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a**, the proposed project shall contribute its fair share toward construction of a third southbound and northbound through lanes to the intersection of Fiddyment Road and Baseline Road to improve operations from LOS "E" to LOS "D." 4.7-14c Consistent with **Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a**, participate in the City of Roseville ITS/TDM program on a fair share basis as determined by the County in consultation with the City of Roseville.*<br><br>**Timing:** Before approval of the first subdivision map.<br><br>**Enforcement:** City of Roseville Planning Department; Placer County Planning Department | | | | | | |
| **Impact TRA-8: Increased Traffic on State Highway Segments** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** |
| **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-19a: Pay fair share of the cost of improvements to state highway segments (*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**<br><br>*Implement **Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a**.* | | | | | | |
| **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-19b: Pay fair share of the cost of improvements to state highway segments (*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**<br><br>*Consistent with **Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a**, the proposed project shall contribute its fair share toward the following improvements on State highway.*<br><br>1. *Widen Hwy 70/99 to six lanes from Riego Road to Elkhorn Boulevard.*<br>2. *Widen Hwy 65 to six lanes from Blue Oak Boulevard to Galleria Boulevard.*<br>3. *Widen Interstate 80 to 12 lanes from Longview Drive to Watt Avenue.*<br>4. *Widen Interstate 80 to 10 lanes from Antelope Road to Douglas Boulevard.*<br>5. *Consider construction of additional lanes on Interstate 80 from Auburn Boulevard to Madison Avenue or other improvements.*<br><br>**Timing:** Before approval of the first subdivision map.<br><br>**Enforcement:** Caltrans; Placer County Planning Department | | | | | | |

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Impact TRA-9: Increased Demand for Local Transit Service** | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) |
| **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-10a: Transit Funding** ***(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)*** *A Community Service Area (CSA) shall be established to fund the cost of transit services listed in this section, and any related capital costs for buses, passenger amenities, and facilities.* **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-10b: Bus Shelters** ***(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)*** *Bus shelters shall be placed along major roadways at 0.5-mile intervals serving Medium-Density, High-Density, Commercial and Office land use designations.* **Timing:** Before approval of the first subdivision map. **Enforcement:** Placer County Planning Department | | | | | | |
| **Impact TRA-10: Increased Demand for Local Bicycle Facilities** **NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5** *No mitigation is required.* | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |
| **Impact TRA-11: Impact to the Riego Road Railroad Crossing** **NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5** *No mitigation is required.* | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Impact TRA-12: Construction Impacts** | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) |
| **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-1: Construction Traffic Management Plan *(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)***<br><br>*Prepare and implement construction traffic management plans for on-site and off-site construction activities for all development projects, including coordination with appropriate agencies, and implement a community relations program during construction period. The purpose of the construction traffic management plan is to minimize adverse Level of Service or neighborhood traffic impacts during the various phases of construction.*<br><br>**Timing:** Before approval of the first subdivision map.<br><br>**Enforcement:** Placer County Planning Department | | | | | | |
| **Impact TRA-13: Indirect Effects on Transportation and Traffic from Off-Site Infrastructure Not Constructed as Part of the Project**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*No mitigation is required.* | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Utilities** | | | | | | |
| **Impact UTIL-1: Availability of Potable Water Supplies to Meet Demand** | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) |

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.11.7-1a: Water Supply**

**(*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*Prior to approval of any small lot tentative subdivision map for a proposed residential project of more than 500 dwelling units, the County shall comply with Government Code Section 66473.7. Prior to approval of any small lot tentative subdivision map for a proposed residential project of 500 or fewer units, the County need not comply with Section 66473.7, or formally consult with PCWA or other public water system, but shall nevertheless make a factual showing or impose conditions similar to those required by Section 66473.7 in order to ensure an adequate water supply for development authorized by the map. Prior to recordation of any final small lot subdivision map, or prior to County approval of any similar project-specific discretionary approval or entitlement required for nonresidential uses, the applicant shall demonstrate the availability of a long-term, reliable water supply from a public water system for the amount of development that would be authorized by the final subdivision map or project-specific discretionary nonresidential approval or entitlement. Such a demonstration shall consist of a written certification from the water service provider that either existing sources are available or that needed improvements will be in place prior to occupancy.*

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.11.7-1b: Conservation Strategies**

**(*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*The Specific Plan proponents shall, comply with PCWA water conservation strategies as described in PCWA's Urban Water Management Plan.*

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.11.7-1c: Conveyance Capacity (*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**<br><br>*Prior to approval of any small lot tentative subdivision map or similar project level discretionary approval for land uses that do not require a tentative subdivision map, the Placer County Water Agency (PCWA) shall perform an analysis of the remaining wheeling capacity in the City of Roseville's system. This analysis shall consider all of the previously committed demand to Morgan Creek, Placer Vineyards, Regional University or other projects within southwest Placer County that rely on water conveyed through City of Roseville facilities and/or pursuant to the wheeling agreement between the City of Roseville and PCWA, as amended from time to time. The analysis shall be submitted to both the County and the City of Roseville. The County shall confirm with PCWA that uncommitted capacity remains to wheel the required amount of PCWA-supplied water to the Specific Plan area prior to approval of discretionary actions. In the event sufficient uncommitted capacity does not exist, the County shall not grant the proposed tentative subdivision map or other project level discretionary approval until the County determines that a water supply not dependent on water from PCWA that is wheeled thru the Roseville system becomes available for the area at issue.*<br><br>**Timing:** Before approval of the first subdivision map.<br><br>**Enforcement:** Placer County Planning Department | | | | | | |
| **Impact UTIL-2: Availability of Recycled Water Supplies to Meet Demand**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*No mitigation is required.* | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |
| **Impact UTIL-3: Capacity of Water Treatment and Supply Facilities** | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) |

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.11.6-2a: Capacity Verification**

**(*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*Commitments from the wastewater treatment provider to receive anticipated flows from the Specific Plan area at the DCWWTP and/or the SRWTP shall be secured by Placer County prior to County approval of improvement plans for wastewater collection and transmission infrastructure. The County shall comply with General Plan Policy 4.D.2, which requires written certification from the service provider that either existing services are available or needed improvements will be made prior to occupancy to meet wastewater demands of the Specific Plan area.*

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.11.6-2b: Financial Participation**

**(*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*Specific Plan proponents shall participate financially through connection fees and other financial mechanisms in the construction of additional wastewater treatment capacity sufficient to accommodate projected flows and treatment at the DCWWTP and/or the SRWTP. In addition, Specific Plan proponents shall prepare, or shall provide a fair share contribution toward the preparation of any additional CEQA analysis that may be required for plant modifications and/or expansions.*

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.11.6-2c: Discharge Permits**

**(*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*For each increment of new development within the Specific Plan area, the County shall confirm that all necessary permits (e.g., NPDES) are in place for either the DCWWTP or the SRWTP to discharge additional treated effluent in the amounts associated with the new development. This shall include a determination that development timing will not impede other development for which entitlements have been issued. The requirement for such a showing shall be made a condition of any small lot tentative map approval associated with the new development and shall be verified by the County prior to recordation any final map associated with the new development. Where no small lot tentative map and final map are required prior to non-residential development having the potential to increase wastewater flows, the requirement for such verification, to be demonstrated no later than the time of issuance of building permits, shall be made a condition of approval of project-level discretionary approvals analogous to issuance of small-lot tentative maps.*

**Timing:** Before approval of the first subdivision map.

**Enforcement:** Placer County Planning Department

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Impact UTIL-4: Increased Demand for Solid Waste Services** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** | **SU(m)** |

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.11.5-1a: Construction Debris**

**(*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*Contractors shall be required to provide on-site separation of construction debris to assure a minimum 50 percent diversion of this material from the landfill.*

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.11.5-1b: Fair Share Payment for Expansion of Solid Waste Facilities**

**(*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*Projects in the Specific Plan area shall contribute a fair share amount toward expansion of the MRF (including accommodation of a greenwaste program for Placer Vineyards) and landfill to the Western Placer Waste Management Authority. A mechanism for ensuring that this is implemented shall be described in the Development Agreement for the Specific Plan.*

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.11.5-1c: Greenwaste Program**

**(*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*A source-separated greenwaste program shall be implemented within the Specific Plan area, subject to review and approval by the Western Placer Waste management Authority.*

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.11.5-2d: Recycling Centers**

**(*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*The Specific Plan proponents shall present a plan for County approval that meets the requirements of Placer County Code Section 8.16.080. The plan shall ensure the development and continuous operation and maintenance of recycling centers within the Specific Plan area. Recycling centers shall accept all types of recyclable waste, shall be fenced and screened from view, and shall be located in commercial or industrial areas dispersed throughout the Specific Plan area. The first recycling center shall be established upon issuance of the 1500$^{th}$ residential building permit.*

**Timing:** Before approval of the first subdivision map.

**Enforcement:** Placer County Planning Department

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Impact UTIL-5: Increased Demand for Electricity, Natural Gas, and Telecommunications** | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) | LTS(m) |

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.11.10-1a: Infrastructure Capacity**

**(*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*The Specific Plan applicants and subsequent developers shall work closely with PG&E and SMUD to ensure that development of electrical and natural gas infrastructure with the capacity to service the entire Specific Plan area is located and provided concurrently with roadway construction and in accordance with PUC regulations. The applicant(s) shall grant all necessary easements for installation of electrical and natural gas facilities, including utility easements along existing and future on-site major arterial roads for the development of area-wide utility corridors. Coordination with SMUD and/or PG&E shall occur, and any required agreements shall be established prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map.*

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.11.5-1b: Energy Efficiency Measures**

**(*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*Projects in the Specific Plan area shall contribute a fair share amount toward expansion of the MRF (including accommodation of a greenwaste program for Placer Vineyards) and landfill to the Western Placer Waste Management Authority. A mechanism for ensuring that this is implemented shall be described in the Development Agreement for the Specific Plan.*

**Timing:** Before approval of the first subdivision map.

**Enforcement:** Placer County Planning Department

| Resource Topic/Impact | No Action (NA) | Proposed Action (PA) | Alternative 1 (A1) | Alternative 2 (A2) | Alternative 3/4 (A3/A4) | Alternative 5 (A5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Impact UTIL-6: Indirect Effects on Utilities from Off-Site Infrastructure Not Constructed as Part of the Project**<br><br>**NA, PA, A1, A2, A3, A4, A5**<br>*No mitigation is required.* | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS | LTS |

*Significant effects that cannot be reduced to less than significant are indicated in bold*

*NE: No effect*
*LTS: Less than significant, no mitigation*
*LTS(m): Less than significant after mitigation*
*LTS(am): Less than significant, additional mitigation applied*
*SU: Significant effect, no mitigation feasible*
*SU(m): Significant residual effect after mitigation*

# 2.0 COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

## 2.1 INTRODUCTION

As described in **Chapter 1.0, Introduction**, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) received comments from agencies, organizations, and members of the public Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIS). All comments on the Draft EIS received from the public and agencies have been numbered, and the numbers assigned to each comment are indicated on the written communications that follow. All agencies and organizations who commented on the Draft EIS are listed in **Table 2.0-1, Index to Comments,** below. Those comments and the USACE's responses to those comments are also included in this chapter.

**Table 2.0-1**
**Index to Comments**

| Comment Letter | Letter Date | Agency/Individuals |
|---|---|---|
| **Federal Agencies** | | |
| A | June 10, 2013 | U.S. Environmental Protection Agency<br>Angeles Herrera |
| **Organizations and Individuals** | | |
| B | May 29, 2013 | Harry Schaedler, Real Estate Broker |
| C | June 10, 2013 | Cox, Castle & Nicholson LLP<br>R. Clark Morrison on behalf of Placer Vineyards Development Group LLC |
| D | June 10, 2013 | Kassouni Law<br>Timothy V. Kassouni on behalf of Hodel Family Enterprises, L.P. |
| E | June 10, 2013 | Sierra Club/Sierra Foothills Audubon Society<br>Terry Davis and Ed Pandolfino |
| F | June 17, 2013 | Miwok Maidu United Auburn Indian Community<br>Gene Whitehouse |

## 2.2 RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL COMMENTS

This chapter contains the comment letters received on the April 2013 Draft EIS for the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan. Following each comment letter are responses to individual comments. It is recommended that reviewers use the index to comments presented above to locate comments from specific agencies or persons and the responses to those comments.

Letter A

**UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**
**REGION IX**
**75 Hawthorne Street**
**San Francisco, CA 94105**

JUN 10 2013

James Robb
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District
1325 J Street, Room 1350
Sacramento, California 95814-2922

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan, Placer County, California (CEQ# 20130100)

Dear Mr. Robb:

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, Council on Environmental Quality regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act. We appreciate efforts by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) to coordinate with our agency throughout the environmental review process.

In response to Public Notice 199900737, issued for this project on March 13, 2007, EPA initiated the 404(q) elevation process by submitting "3a" and "3b" letters on May 1, 2007 and May 31, 2007, respectively, due to concerns over potential impacts to Aquatic Resources of National Importance. We provided comments on the Administrative DEIS (ADEIS) on August 12, 2012. As requested in EPA's comments on the ADEIS, the Corps included information in the DEIS on cumulative air impacts from other reasonably foreseeable projects within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin. The disclosure of quantitative measures of cumulative air impacts (to the degree that information is available) enables a better understanding of long term health impacts, and facilitates stronger mitigation planning. Given the many planned development projects in the region, mitigation will be a challenge, and we encourage coordination with the air districts on this matter. 1

According to the DEIS, the Proposed Action would directly impact approximately 119.3 acres of Waters of the U.S., including 27.7 acres of vernal pools. Impacts from the Proposed Action, combined with cumulative impacts, would total more than half the acreage impacted from 1990-2010 in the study area (western Placer County, northern portion of Sacramento County, and western portion of Sutter County). In the DEIS, the Corps considers the loss and degradation of functions and services of Waters of the U.S. to be a potentially significant impact, since the applicants have not provided a mitigation strategy that complies with Clean Water Act regulations. Given the extreme historical losses of vernal pools and other Waters of the U.S. in California, the EPA agrees that the level of degradation that could occur in the absence of adequate mitigation would be significant and should be avoided.

We have rated the DEIS as Environmental Objections – Insufficient Information (EO-2) (see enclosed EPA Rating Definitions) based on significant impacts to aquatic resources and the potential inability of any of the action alternatives to both comply with the 2008 Compensatory Mitigation Rule and achieve no net loss of wetland functions. Please find our detailed comments attached, which provide

recommendations to address these issues as well as our concerns with: (1) project need and range of alternatives, (2) impacts to air quality, (3) flooding risk, (4) scope of the hazardous materials assessment, (5) disclosure of potential long-term benefits of "smart growth" development, and (6) opportunities to create a more environmentally sustainable project.

We appreciate the opportunity to review this DEIS, and are available to discuss our comments. If you have any questions, please contact Jen Blonn, the lead reviewer for this project. Ms. Blonn can be reached at 415-972-3855 or blonn.jennifer@epa.gov.

1

Sincerely,

Angeles Herrera, Associate Director
Communities and Ecosystems Division

Enclosures:
Summary of the EPA Rating System
EPA Detailed Comments

Cc via email:
Mike McKeever, Sacramento Area Council of Governments

2

# SUMMARY OF EPA RATING DEFINITIONS*

This rating system was developed as a means to summarize the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) level of concern with a proposed action. The ratings are a combination of alphabetical categories for evaluation of the environmental impacts of the proposal and numerical categories for evaluation of the adequacy of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

## ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT OF THE ACTION

***"LO" (Lack of Objections)***

The EPA review has not identified any potential environmental impacts requiring substantive changes to the proposal. The review may have disclosed opportunities for application of mitigation measures that could be accomplished with no more than minor changes to the proposal.

***"EC" (Environmental Concerns)***

The EPA review has identified environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment. Corrective measures may require changes to the preferred alternative or application of mitigation measures that can reduce the environmental impact. EPA would like to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

***"EO" (Environmental Objections)***

The EPA review has identified significant environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to provide adequate protection for the environment. Corrective measures may require substantial changes to the preferred alternative or consideration of some other project alternative (including the no action alternative or a new alternative). EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

***"EU" (Environmentally Unsatisfactory)***

The EPA review has identified adverse environmental impacts that are of sufficient magnitude that they are unsatisfactory from the standpoint of public health or welfare or environmental quality. EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts. If the potentially unsatisfactory impacts are not corrected at the final EIS stage, this proposal will be recommended for referral to the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ).

## ADEQUACY OF THE IMPACT STATEMENT

***Category "1" (Adequate)***

EPA believes the draft EIS adequately sets forth the environmental impact(s) of the preferred alternative and those of the alternatives reasonably available to the project or action. No further analysis or data collection is necessary, but the reviewer may suggest the addition of clarifying language or information.

***Category "2" (Insufficient Information)***

The draft EIS does not contain sufficient information for EPA to fully assess environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment, or the EPA reviewer has identified new reasonably available alternatives that are within the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which could reduce the environmental impacts of the action. The identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussion should be included in the final EIS.

***Category "3" (Inadequate)***

EPA does not believe that the draft EIS adequately assesses potentially significant environmental impacts of the action, or the EPA reviewer has identified new, reasonably available alternatives that are outside of the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which should be analyzed in order to reduce the potentially significant environmental impacts. EPA believes that the identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussions are of such a magnitude that they should have full public review at a draft stage. EPA does not believe that the draft EIS is adequate for the purposes of the NEPA and/or Section 309 review, and thus should be formally revised and made available for public comment in a supplemental or revised draft EIS. On the basis of the potential significant impacts involved, this proposal could be a candidate for referral to the CEQ.

*From EPA Manual 1640, Policy and Procedures for the Review of Federal Actions Impacting the Environment.

**U.S. EPA DETAILED COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE PLACER VINEYARDS SPECIFIC PLAN, PLACER COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, JUNE 10, 2013**

**Waters of the U.S. (WUS)**

The Proposed Action would directly impact approximately 119.3 acres of WUS, including 27.7 acres of vernal pools (page 3.4-34). Impacts from the Proposed Action, combined with cumulative impacts, would total approximately 242.03 acres of impacts to WUS, which is greater than half the acreage impacted from 1990-2010 in the study area (western Placer County, northern portion of Sacramento County, and western portion of Sutter County; impact data from pages 3.4-34, 4.0-16, and 4.0-17). Such further degradation of the aquatic environment would warrant substantial mitigation.

The proposed project is located within an area planned for development under the draft Placer County Conservation Plan (PCCP). EPA strongly supports the development of the PCCP; however, we also recognize the uncertainty regarding whether the PCCP will come to fruition. We appreciate the analysis in the DEIS of ways in which the project could potentially align with the PCCP, and we believe that the best mitigation would come about as the result of the project fulfilling its compensation and preservation requirements under the auspices of the PCCP. However, since the PCCP is not approved, we believe the Corps must evaluate the proposed development in the context of a stand-alone project.

EPA fully recognizes the biological benefits of large, continuous, natural areas, as discussed within the proposed mitigation strategy. As a stand-alone project, the mitigation must comply with the 2008 Compensatory Mitigation Rule, and should be consistent with the South Pacific Division's Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) for establishing mitigation ratios. The DEIS states that, based on the Corps' evaluation, the applicants' proposed mitigation strategy would not adequately mitigate impacts and would result in a net loss of wetland area and function (page 3.4-39). The Corps would require a revised mitigation strategy and incorporate final mitigation requirements into permit conditions (Mitigation Measure Bio-1). EPA agrees with the Corps' determination that the currently proposed mitigation strategy is inadequate. We also believe, however, that the DEIS should have documented the availability of appropriate mitigation for this project and provided more details on a mitigation strategy that would comply with the applicable regulations. Without such information at this stage in the project, EPA is unable to evaluate compliance with the 404(b)(1) Guidelines. 2

We are available to assist the Corps and the project proponents in determining compliance with the 404(b)(1) Guidelines, including the Mitigation Rule. For further coordination on issues pertaining to 404 permitting and WUS, please contact Paul Jones, EPA Wetlands Office, at (415) 972-3470 or jones.paul@epa.gov.

**Recommendations for the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS):**

- Ensure that the preferred alternative avoids and minimizes impacts to WUS to the greatest extent practicable through avoidance measures, such as those included in Alternatives 1 through 5.
- Provide more detailed information on where and how the applicants would meet their mitigation requirements under both PCCP and "stand-alone" conditions. The FEIS should examine whether sufficient compensatory mitigation and preservation lands

1

are available to offset impacts. It is unclear what is available and practicable to the applicants absent an approved regional conservation strategy such as the PCCP.

- Provide details on proposed ratios and types of mitigation. Ensure that mitigation ratios are consistent with the SOP, and that mitigation ratios proposed under the draft PCCP are not relied upon before the PCCP is approved.
- Revise Table 4.0-2 so that it includes a column for total mitigation without preservation. The current total mitigation column is misleading because it includes preservation acres, which primarily fulfill requirements from U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Biological Opinions under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, and are not mitigation for impacts to WUS. 2
- To the extent possible, include stream setbacks consistent with the draft PCCP in order to minimize secondary impacts. This would have the added benefit of increasing integration with PCCP mitigation requirements. We recommend including in the FEIS a discussion of the best management plans and low impact development options that would be employed to minimize impacts and maintain water quality.

**Project Need**

Implementation of the Proposed Action would result in construction of 14,132 to 21,631 residential units. This increase in housing would fulfill 86% to 131% of Sacramento Area Council of Government's (SACOG) housing needs projection through the year 2035 (page 3.7-8). Information on other reasonably foreseeable development projects in the cumulative impacts study area is provided in Section 4.2.4, and demonstrates that numerous other residential units are planned. The outstanding need for the full number of housing units proposed under this project does not appear to be documented in the DEIS. 3

**Recommendation for the FEIS:**

Augment section 1.4 (Project Need) to provide data on outstanding housing needs in the project vicinity. Please include a total estimate of planned housing units in the study area and compare it to SACOG's housing needs forecast.

**Range of Alternatives**

The DEIS includes a Proposed Action, a No Action Alternative, and Alternatives 1 through 5. Alternatives 1 through 5 are modified versions of the Proposed Action, and they have smaller footprints to avoid additional WUS. The Proposed Action includes a lower-density (Base Plan) and a higher-density (Blueprint) development scenario, and both scenarios share the same footprint. "The number of units that would be built under Alternatives 1 through 5 would be the same as the Proposed Action....[T]o the extent that the number of units to be built on a property would be reduced due to the revised footprint, the same number of units would be built on another property by increasing the density...[T]he total number of units for the [Placer Vineyard Specific Plan] as a whole would still remain 14,132 (or 21,634 units if Alternatives 1 through 5 are combined with the Blueprint scenario)" (page 2.0-49). 4

An option that combines Alternatives 1 through 5 is introduced on page 2.0-47 and would avoid filling 9.2 acres of wetlands relative to the Proposed Action (page 2.0-47). This option, however, is not assessed for all impact categories. It is unclear whether the combination of Alternatives 1 through 5 is considered to be a reasonable alternative, and it does not appear to be included in the

404(b)(1) Alternatives Analysis (Appendix 3.4). Further, page 3.11-20 indicates that an option that combines Alternatives 1 though 5 is only considered under the Base Plan scenario. It is unclear whether the Blueprint scenario could be viable for an alternative that combines Alternatives 1 though 5 (or a subset thereof) in order to minimize impacts to WUS and still align the project with the Regional Blueprint Plan. 4

**Recommendations for the FEIS:**

- Either ensure that "combined Alternatives 1 through 5" (with Base Plan and Blueprint scenarios) is fully assessed as a separate alternative for purposes of the NEPA analysis and the 404(b)(1) analysis, or explain why it is not a distinct alternative.
- Amend the 404(b)(1) Alternatives Analysis, as needed, if there is a practicable "combined Alternatives 1 through 5" alternative.

**Air Quality**

EPA is concerned with air quality impacts from this project, particularly when considered in concert with the numerous other development and major infrastructure projects proposed or in process within the region. The proposed project is located in a nonattainment area for federal ozone (8-hour) and PM2.5 standards. In order to achieve attainment, strong measures are needed to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts.

*Cumulative Air Quality Impacts*

Thank you for including tables with criteria pollutant emission estimates from construction and operational phases of other major infrastructure projects in the region. Such information helps clarify the intensity of cumulative impacts, as well as future challenges the region would face in attaining federal air quality standards. 5

**Recommendations for the FEIS:**

- Include the following projects in Tables 4.0-4 through 4.0-7, or explain why they are excluded: Mather Specific Plan, Southport Sacramento River Early Implementation Project, Jackson Township Project, and Folsom Dam Modification Project Approach Channel.
- Discuss potential differences between the Blueprint scenario and the Base Plan scenario with respect to long-term regional cumulative air quality impacts from the operational period. The potential benefits of the Blueprint scenario do not appear to be fully described.
- Please coordinate with the air district to ensure that construction and operational emissions from this project, combined with other reasonably foreseeable projects nearby, will not exceed the relevant emission budgets in the SIPs, and document this coordination in the FEIS.

*Mitigation Measures*

Mitigation measures from the Placer Vineyards Environmental Impact Report are provided in Appendix 3.0 of the DEIS, and commitments for air quality mitigation do not appear to be made within the DEIS. 6

**Recommendation for the FEIS:**
Commit to implement all mitigation measures within Appendix 3 that are within the span of the Corps' control for direct and indirect air quality impacts that would result from the Corps' permit decision, such as all air quality control measures for material hauling and construction activities. 6

*General Conformity*
Under General Conformity regulations, both the direct and indirect emissions associated with a federal action must be evaluated. Page 3.3-31 of the DEIS states, "...the scope of the conformity analysis would be appropriately limited to the emissions associated with grading activities that would result from the filling of jurisdictional wetlands, any associated access roads and any staging areas necessary to conduct filling activities." It is unclear whether indirect impacts, such as hauling materials and equipment to the site for grading activities, were accounted for in the analysis. 7

**Recommendation for the FEIS:**
Ensure that appropriate indirect emissions are included in the conformity analysis and disclosed in the FEIS.

*Operational Period Traffic Emissions*
Mitigation measures for traffic impacts require the project proponent to contribute its fair share towards the cost of widening roadways. It is unclear whether these road widening projects are already funded, and whether they are consistent with the general plan. Further, EPA is concerned that residual air impacts from traffic are, according to the DEIS, expected to be significant even after mitigation (page 3.14-45). 8

**Recommendation for the FEIS:**
Commit to partner with the county and SACOG to develop and implement a plan for mitigating operational period transportation impacts that is consistent with regional planning goals and minimizes long-term air emissions *before* construction begins.

*Exposure to Toxic Air Contaminants*
Page 3.3-28 states, "[California Air Resources Board] has also provided planning guidance that recommends not locating sensitive receptors within 500 feet of a freeway or roadways with greater than 100,000 annual average daily traffic (AADT). No portion of the project site would be within 500 feet of a freeway or roadway with AADT of 100,000." It is unclear whether toxic air contaminant risks from future growth in AADT, due to this development project and others nearby, were considered. 9

**Recommendation for the FEIS:**
Assess and document whether sensitive receptors may, in the future, be located within 500 feet of roadways with AADT of 100,000 or more due to siting of facilities within this development project and projected growth in AADT nearby. If a risk is identified, describe measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate risks.

**Flood Risk**

Page 3.10-26 discusses project impacts on flood capacity, and page 3.10-29 discusses impacts to flood hazards related to dam or levee failure. Changes in severe weather patterns under climate change scenarios will greatly influence flood risk and related infrastructure needs. It is unclear whether climate change was considered in the analysis. 10

**Recommendation for the FEIS:**
Augment the discussions on flood capacity and risk of dike or levee failures to fully address expected changes to weather patterns due to climate change.

**Hazardous Materials**

Potential sources of hazardous materials within the project site are clearly defined. Information on nearby sources of contamination, however, does not appear to be provided.

**Recommendation for the FEIS:** 11
Ensure that appropriate buffers surrounding the project site were assessed for potential contamination that could impact the project site (i.e. through groundwater plume migration or via air currents). The assessment should include searching federal and state databases and examining aerial imagery. Please include buffer distances and methodology, document any potential nearby sources, and commit to mitigation if needed.

**Comparison between Blueprint and Base Plan**

The DEIS discusses impacts of the Blueprint scenario by stating that, "… by concentrating population closer to the core of the region, a number of environmental and lifestyle benefits would accrue, including shorter commutes, greater potential use of transit, cleaner air, and less open space lost to suburban sprawl" (page 3.7-9). The assessment does not appear disclose the full range of benefits that could result from a relatively more compact, well connected, mixed-use project. For example, areas with greater density are more likely to receive federal funds to support transit projects, which could provide residents with an important amenity and improve air quality by reducing auto-dependence. In addition, long-term municipal costs savings could accrue from more compact development, such as lower costs for sewer and road maintenance, garbage collection, and other services. Similarly, long-term resident cost savings could result from shorter commute times and more convenient access to goods and services. 12

**Recommendation for the FEIS:**
Provide detailed qualitative descriptions and quantitative measures of the degree to which benefits from "smart growth" planning might accrue under the Blueprint scenario relative to the Base Plan scenario.

**Sustainable Transportation & Building**

Creating an entirely new development provides ample opportunities to incorporate policies and designs that minimize demand for energy and water, minimize traffic impacts, and create a high-quality living environment, with easy access to jobs, services, and recreation. 13

Green building incorporates strategies to reduce energy and water needs, minimize harmful chemicals, and create a healthy indoor environment, among other goals. Green building strategies can also reduce operation and maintenance costs for owners and ease public service (i.e. water and electricity) demand requirements for the project. The U.S. Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) program offers detailed guidance, and EPA is available to assist the project proponent in identifying appropriate opportunities.

Significant operational period impacts are anticipated to result from automobile use, including high levels of greenhouse gas emissions (GHG). We strongly encourage implementation of all mitigation measures to reduce vehicle emissions, such as development of a reliable transit system with frequent service, walkable neighborhoods, and well-connected bike lanes. We recognize that the Proposed Action includes a multimodal transit terminal and a potential Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system, and includes mitigation measures to promote biking and transit.

**Recommendations for the FEIS:**

- Include a strong commitment by the County and project proponents to partner with local transit agencies and SACOG to accommodate transit access. Neighborhood design should include development of transit routes to maximize ridership, and bus stops should be identified early so that they can more easily be incorporated into streetscapes. This is particularly important for the potential BRT system along Watt Avenue since there are already plans to widen the road.
- Consider using a grid pattern for neighborhood roadways to reduce the travel distance for vehicles, bikes, and pedestrians for local trips. Grid patterns can make more trips possible to complete without use of a vehicle.
- Add GHG mitigation commitments from the Corps' Elverta DEIS, including Mitigation Measure 3.7b, which requires project proponents to develop a GHG reduction plan and receive approval from the County, in consultation with the Air District. Also require that the GHG Reduction Plan be approved *before* construction.
- Discuss the feasibility and benefits of obtaining LEED for Neighborhood Development (ND) Certification for the project area or a portion of it. LEED-ND certification provides independent, third-party verification that a neighborhood development project is located and designed to meet high levels of environmentally responsible, sustainable development, with principles that are in line with the Sacramento Region Blueprint's growth principles.
- Discuss the feasibility and benefits of obtaining LEED certification for homes, schools, and commercial buildings.
- Discuss the feasibility and benefits of exceeding CALGreen standards in priority areas by meeting "optional" standards, including: pollutant control, indoor air quality, renewable energy, energy and water conservation, and low impact development.
- Consider recycled materials that could be used to replace raw materials for particular infrastructure components. Some options include tire-derived aggregate, crushed recycled concrete, recycled asphalt pavement, and rubberized asphalt concrete.
- Consider creating a policy to use locally sourced materials to reduce air emissions from transport.

13

6

**Letter A** **U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Communities and Ecosystems Division**
**Angeles Herrera, Associate Director, dated June 10, 2013**

**Response A-1**

The U.S. EPA's general comments on the Draft EIS are noted. The U.S. EPA raises the same issues in greater detail in the detailed comments attached to its comment letter. Detailed responses to the issues raised by the U.S. EPA are presented in **Responses A-5** through **A-13**, below.

**Response A-2**

The U.S. EPA's comments related to the applicants' mitigation strategy and the status of the Placer County Conservation Plan (PCCP) are noted.

The U.S. EPA recommends that the USACE's preferred alternative avoid and minimize impacts to waters of the U.S. to the greatest extent practicable. The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) regulations at 40 CFR 1502.14(e) state that the alternatives section has to identify the "agency's preferred alternative or alternatives, if one or more exists, in the draft statement and identify such alternative in the final statement unless another law prohibits the expression of such a preference." However the USACE cannot identify a preferred alternative, because as stated in 33 CFR 325, Appendix B(9)(b)(5), the USACE is "neither an opponent nor a proponent of the applicant's proposal; therefore, the applicant's proposal is identified as the 'applicant's preferred alternative,' in the final EIS." Furthermore, in accordance with 40 CFR 1505.2(c), it is the ROD that needs to "state whether all practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm from the alternative selected have been adopted, and if not, why they were not. A monitoring and enforcement program shall be adopted and summarized where applicable for any mitigation." The ROD also must "(i)dentify all alternatives considered by the agency in reaching its decision, specifying the alternative or alternatives which were considered to be environmentally preferable." (40 CFR 1502.2(b) Therefore in this Final EIS, only the applicant's proposal is identified as the applicant's preferred alternative.

The U.S. EPA requests that the Final EIS provide more detailed information on where and how the Applicants will meet their mitigation requirements under both "stand alone conditions" and the PCCP if it is adopted for Placer County. The USACE requested more information from the Applicants regarding their Mitigation Strategy. The Applicants submitted a revised Mitigation Strategy (dated September 2013) to the USACE that focuses the mitigation for wetland impacts on preservation and creation of wetlands as compensatory mitigation but does not include the level of detail necessary for USACE to determine if the proposed strategy would sufficiently offset the impacts of the Proposed Action. The USACE's final determination regarding the Applicants' Mitigation Strategy will be included in the ROD.

The Applicants have indicated that to mitigate the impacts of the Proposed Action their intent is to provide the vast majority of mitigation within the "Reserve Acquisition Area" (RAA) in northwestern Placer County. The RAA is identified in the PCCP as a mitigation site and was specifically designed by the County to provide adequate mitigation for all projects in the development zone in western Placer County. Placer Vineyards is a small percentage of the total development area. According to Placer County, the RAA has a total area of 68,093 acres within the PCCP, of which 44,078 acres are in the valley

portion of the PCCP and 24,015 acres are in the foothill portion of the PCCP (see **Table 2.0-2**, below). Mitigation for the Proposed Action would be provided in the valley portion of the RAA. In addition, mitigation for the Proposed Action will be provided within what is termed as the "Stream System in Potential Future Growth (PFG) area. The total area within the PCCP identified for vernal pool conservation planning and mitigation is 47,697 acres (Reid 2014).

**Table 2.0-2**
**PCCP Conservation Planning and Mitigation Lands**

| Land Area (ac) | All Plan Area | Valley | Foothills |
|---|---|---|---|
| Reserve Acquisition Area (RAA) Upland and Stream System | 68,093 | 44,078 | 24,015 |
| Stream System in Potential Future Growth (PFG) | 12,993 | 3,619 | 9,374 |
| All land as primary source for Reserve System | 81,086 | 47,697 | 33,389 |

*Source: Reid 2014*

Within these 47,607 acres of land area, there are approximately 18,593 acres of vernal pool complexes, with an estimated 554 acres of existing vernal pool type wetlands. According to the County, the target net new Vernal Pool Complex (VPC) land cover (upland and wetted area) that will be created under the PCCP is approximately 3,000 acres and within this acreage, an estimated 471-508 acres of net new vernal pool type wetlands will be created (Reid 2014). Therefore, adequate land area and opportunities for creating new vernal pool type wetlands to mitigate the impacts of the Proposed Action are available within the RAA and Stream System within PFG.

The Mitigation Strategy also includes a provision that would allow the Applicants to use credits from approved conservation or mitigation banks, and therefore a limited amount of out-of-county mitigation might be implemented. According to the Mitigation Strategy, these areas for out-of-county mitigation include land along the Placer/Sutter County border, in particular, the lower portion of the Coon Creek and Auburn Ravine; portions of the floodplain along the Bear River that is within the Coon Creek watershed within Sutter County; lands contained within the levees of the Natomas East Main Drainage, Cross Canal, Pleasant Grove Creek Canal, and East Side Canal for conservation actions which improve fish passage and water quality for salmonids in Placer County; and Mitigation and Conservation Banks approved by the Wildlife Agencies and/or the USACE that contain the Plan area within the service boundary.

Prior to issuing any permits, the USACE will ensure the Applicants provide sufficient information for the USACE to determine the adequacy of any compensatory mitigation proposals. To be determined adequate by the USACE, whether developed for the entire Placer Vineyard Specific Plan (PVSP) or project-specific, compensatory mitigation proposals will need to fully satisfy the requirements of the Mitigation Rule and the South Pacific Division's (SPD) Mitigation Ratio Setting Checklist in terms of

types of mitigation and ratios and fully offset the impacts of the PVSP, or the project-specific impacts for which it was developed.

Table 4.0-2 is revised to show the suggested new column entitled "Total Mitigation excluding Preservation" and is presented in **Chapter 3.0, Errata**.

The PVSP land use diagram preserves wetlands adjacent to primary channels within the subwatersheds, maintains connectivity between these preserved waters, and includes stream setbacks as well as Low impact development (LID) strategies to avoid indirect effects on preserved wetlands. The following avoidance and minimizations goals/criteria were used by the Applicants to develop the open space/preserve system boundaries in the PVSP:

> *Preserve continuous core drainage course/wetland corridors in each drainage basin.*
>
> *a. Each primary corridor should have an average setback (buffer) of 100 feet extending laterally from the edge of preserved Waters of the US.*
>
> *b. Minimize proposed actions that would interrupt or truncate primary drainage course/wetland corridors and minimize modifications of these corridors except for those modifications that are designed to maintain or improve wetland or watershed functions over existing conditions (ECORP 2008).*

**Response A-3**

The U.S. EPA states that the discussion of Project Need in the Draft EIS needs to be supplemented with more information to justify that the proposed number of units under the PVSP are really needed.

The Proposed Action is a long-term development program that would be built out over the next 20 to 30 years. Regional housing need projections prepared by Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), on the other hand, do not extend out more than seven years at a time and regional housing need projections that go out 20 to 30 years are not available. Therefore, it is not possible to add the housing that would be built under the Proposed Action to other housing proposed in the SACOG region and compare that total to a projected need for housing 20 to 30 years in the future. However, according to the SACOG Blueprint, the SACOG region will add 1.7 million additional residents, 1 million new jobs, and 800,000 homes by 2050. The PVSP and the associated housing units and population growth are included in these estimates because development of the project site consistent with the PVSP has been taken into account in the SACOG projections.

In addition, please note that the PVSP has been approved by Placer County, which has determined that the planned housing is needed. Furthermore, according to 33 CFR 320.4(j)(2), the "primary responsibility for determining zoning and land use matters rests with state, local and tribal governments. The district engineer will normally accept decisions by such governments on those matters unless there are significant issues of overriding national importance. Such issues would include but are not necessarily limited to national security, navigation, national economic development, water quality, preservation of special aquatic areas, including wetlands, with significant interstate importance, and national energy needs. Whether a factor has overriding importance will depend on the degree of impact in an individual

case." It does not appear that there are significant issues of overriding national importance which would require the USACE to question the need for the Proposed Action established by Placer County.

**Response A-4**

The U.S. EPA comments on the Combined Alternatives 1 through 5 and requests that it be fully assessed as a separate alternative in the EIS and include it in the 404(b)(1) alternatives analysis.

Text has been added to the EIS (see **Chapter 3.0, Errata**) to clearly explain that Combined Alternatives 1 through 5, which alters the land use patterns and intensity of development on only five parcels within the PVSP site, can be combined with the development of the rest of the PVSP site per either of the two Proposed Action scenarios - the Base Plan or the Blueprint scenario.

The Combined Alternatives 1 through 5 was carried through the Draft EIS as an independent alternative. For every impact discussed in the Draft EIS, the impacts of the Combined Alternatives 1 through 5 are analyzed and described. This alternative was not described in any greater detail than Alternatives 1 through 5 because the alternative is simply a land use plan that reduces the density of development on the same 5 parcels as Alternatives 1 through 5 and keeps the proposed land use patterns on the remainder of the project site the same as they are under the Proposed Action (either scenario).

Although this alternative is not included in the Applicants' Section 404(b)(1) alternatives analysis, the USACE will conduct its own 404(b)(1) alternatives analysis of the Proposed Action and the EIS alternatives using the criteria for practicability under CWA Section 404, and will include this alternative in that analysis.

**Response A-5**

The U.S. EPA expresses concern about the Proposed Action's cumulative effects on air quality, given the fact that the area is non-attainment for ozone and fine particulate matter (PM2.5) and a substantial amount of new development is anticipated in the air basin, and recommends that strong measures are needed to avoid, minimize and mitigate air quality impacts.

As noted on page 4.0-4, the study area for cumulative air quality impacts is the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB) which encompasses nine counties in full and portions of Placer and Solano counties. A list-based approach is generally useful only when considering localized cumulative impacts on sensitive receptors from concurrent construction on two or more nearby projects. However, for evaluating cumulative air quality impacts within an air basin that covers a very large area encompassing 11 counties, a list-based approach is not reasonable because no matter how well the list is assembled, it will fail to capture all potential future sources of emissions in the air basin. It is for this reason that the local air districts do not advocate a list-based analysis of a project's cumulative air quality impacts. Instead, the air districts, including the Placer County Air Pollution Control District, recommend a mass emissions-based analysis of each project's contribution to the cumulative air quality in the air basin in their California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. However, for all projects in the vicinity of the Proposed Action for which data were available, estimated emissions were reported in the Draft EIS. Data for two of the four projects that the U.S. EPA requested be included, have been added to the relevant tables as

shown in **Chapter 3.0, Errata**. Emissions data for the other project (Jackson Township Project) were not available.

Additional information highlighting the differences between the Blueprint scenario and the Base Plan scenario and the potential benefits of the Blueprint scenario has been added to the EIS. The added text is shown in **Chapter 3.0, Errata**.

The USACE has conducted a General Conformity analysis of the Proposed Action's construction emissions and determined that the Proposed Action's construction emissions related to activities over which the USACE has jurisdiction are below de minimis levels for the pollutants for which the air basin is in nonattainment. Given this finding, the USACE is not required to coordinate with the local air district. Furthermore, as described in **Responses A-6** and **A-8**, below, numerous mitigation measures have been imposed by Placer County on the construction and operation phases of the Proposed Action (and will be imposed on the alternatives in the event that an alternative is selected by the USACE) to avoid, minimize, and mitigate air pollutant emissions, including mitigation measures that involve coordination with the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD). Please also note that the PVSP was approved by Placer County in 2007 and data regarding the estimated emissions associated with the Proposed Action have been available to the PCAPCD since that time, if not before. The PCAPCD, therefore, had the information on the project's emissions for use in the preparation of the latest air quality plan for the region, and was also actively consulted by the USACE consultant during the preparation of this EIS.

**Response A-6**

All of the key commitments for air quality mitigation in the EIR are included in the Draft EIS. PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.8-1a through 1e are identified in the Draft EIS as mitigation for the construction emissions of the Proposed Action and alternatives, and PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.8-3a through 3k are identified as mitigation for the operational emissions of the Proposed Action and alternatives. Please see Draft EIS pages 3.3-19 through 3.3-25, and Appendix 3.0.

**Response A-7**

Indirect emissions from haul and construction worker trips associated with construction activities are included in the emissions estimates reported in the Draft EIS under Impact AQ-1.

**Response A-8**

Localized air quality impacts from vehicular congestion associated with the Proposed Action and alternatives are analyzed on pages 3.3-26 and 3.3-27 of the Draft EIS under Impact AQ-3, CO Hotspots. That analysis shows that the traffic associated with the Proposed Action, combined with background traffic in 2025, will not result in CO hotspots, which are high carbon monoxide concentrations resulting from congestion at busy intersections.

Impact AQ-2 presents the operational emissions associated with the Proposed Action and alternatives. These include emissions of reactive organic gases (ROG) and nitrogen oxides (NOx) emitted by area, stationary, and mobile sources. While the emissions of these air pollutants can increase due to congestion on roadways, they are predominantly a function of the number of vehicle trips and the vehicle miles

traveled. Therefore, whether or not roadways are widened to relieve congestion, these emissions would occur in the air basin. The Draft EIS includes PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.8-3e and 4.8-3f to promote bicycle use, transit use, and ride sharing in order to reduce these emissions. It also includes PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.8-3g which states that:

> *All projects requiring issuance of residential and non-residential building permits shall participate in an off-site mitigation program coordinated through the PCAPCD to offset NOx and ROG emissions not mitigated through on-site measures. The PCAPCD, on behalf of Placer County, will determine air quality mitigation fees using calculation methodology established in practice and routinely applied to other, similar, contemporaneous land use development projects. The off-site mitigation program, coordinated through the PCAPCD, is designed to offset the project's long-term ozone precursor emissions. Monetary incentives shall be provided to sources of air pollutant emissions within the project's general vicinity that are not required by law to reduce their emissions. Therefore, the reductions are real, quantifiable and implement provisions of the 1994 State Implementation Plan. The off-site mitigation program reduces emissions within the region that would not otherwise be eliminated and thereby "offsets" the project's increase to regional emissions.*

Furthermore, in April 2012, the SACOG Board of Directors adopted the Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) 2035. The MTP/SCS 2035 meets the federal requirement for an updated MTP every four years and meets the new state requirements under SB 375 for the SACOG area. The MTP/SCS 2035 provides a plan to meet the required greenhouse gas emissions reductions, while accounting for regional housing needs, transportation demands, population growth, and financial constraints.

Given the regional planning efforts to reduce air emissions and especially the inclusion of PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.8-3g in the EIS, an additional plan to mitigate for operational air emissions of the Proposed Action (or an alternative) is not required.

**Response A-9**

As explained on page 3.3-28 in the Draft EIS, neither the Proposed Action nor any of the alternatives will place new receptors within 500 feet of a roadway that is expected to have an annual average daily traffic (AADT) of 100,000 or more under existing or future cumulative conditions. Text has been added to clarify this. See **Chapter 3.0, Errata**.

**Response A-10**

More information has been added to Impact HYDRO-6 in the Final EIS to describe the potential effect of climate change on dike safety. See **Chapter 3.0, Errata.**

**Response A-11**

Lands adjoining the PVSP site are largely undeveloped range lands, agricultural lands, and low density rural residential areas that do not contain heavy industrial or intensely developed commercial land uses that can result in groundwater plumes or air emissions that can affect nearby receptors. Although some limited light industrial, commercial, and rural residential uses are present to the north of Baseline Road and to the south of the Placer County line as well as south of Dry Creek, these uses are not a significant

source of groundwater contamination and air emissions that could affect the parcels that make up the project site. In addition, Phase 1 site assessments have been completed for a number of project site parcels to check for the potential for exposure to any on- or off-site sources of contamination. The EIR and the Draft EIS also include two mitigation measures (PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.12-15 and 4.12-17) which require that prior to submittal of a small lot tentative subdivision map for residential development or plans for industrial/commercial development, properties not previously evaluated with a current Phase I Environmental Site Assessment complete a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, as determined by the County Environmental Health Services. These measures will ensure that the new residents of the project site will not be exposed to off-site contamination.

**Response A-12**

More information has been added to Impact EJ-2 in the Final EIS to describe the benefits from smart growth planning under the Blueprint scenario. See **Chapter 3.0, Errata.**

**Response A-13**

The U.S. EPA lists a number of sustainable transportation and building measures that it recommends be imposed on the Proposed Action and alternatives to create a sustainable community.

Numerous mitigation measures are included in the PVSP EIR and EIS to reduce vehicular traffic and related emissions, as well as use of energy and water by the proposed development. All of the relevant mitigation measures already included in the Proposed Action are reproduced below for ease of reference. The mitigation measures are already included in the Proposed Action and in the event that an alternative is selected as the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA), these measures would be imposed on the alternative. Additional sustainability measures are not required.

4.7-10a A Community Service Area (CSA) shall be established to fund the cost of transit services listed in this section, and any related capital costs for buses, passenger amenities, and facilities.

4.7-10b Bus shelters shall be placed along major roadways at 0.5-mile intervals serving Medium-Density, High-Density, Commercial and Office land use designations.

4.8-3a The following guidelines shall be used by the County during review of future project-specific submittals for non-residential development within the Specific Plan area in order to reduce generation of air pollutants with intent that specified measures be required where feasible and appropriate:

- Include in all new parking lots tree plantings designed to result in 50 percent shading of parking lot surface areas within 15 years. Incorporated by reference in this measure are the City of Sacramento Parking Lot Tree Shading Design and Maintenance Guidelines dated June 17, 2003 (see EIR Appendix U). Also, see Specific Plan Policy 6.25;
- Equip HVAC units with a PremAir or similar catalyst system, if reasonably available and economically feasible at the time building permits are issued. Catalyst systems

are considered feasible if the additional cost is less than 10 percent of the base HVAC unit cost;

- Install two 110/208 volt power outlets for every two loading docks;
- Promote passive solar building design and landscaping conducive to passive solar energy use (i.e., building orientation in a south to southwest direction where feasible, encouraging planting of deciduous trees on western sides of structures, landscaping with drought-resistant species, and including groundcovers rather than pavement to reduce heat reflection). Landscaping plans shall prohibit the use of liquidambar and eucalyptus trees that produce smog-forming compounds (high emission factors for isoprenes); and
- Implement the following, or equivalent measures, as determined by the County in consultation with the APCD:
  - Establish building guidelines that encourage the use of low-absorptive coatings on all building surfaces and Energy Star roofing products on all roofs, if reasonably available and economically feasible, at the time building permits are issued;
  - Establish paving guidelines that require businesses, if feasible, to pave all privately owned parking areas with a substance with reflective attributes (albedo = 0.30 or better) similar to cement concrete. The use of a paving substance with reflective attributes similar to concrete is considered feasible under this measure if the additional cost is less than 10 percent of the cost of applying a standard asphalt product; and
  - Power all off-road equipment used at office, industrial, and commercial uses by the lowest-emission technology reasonably available at the time building permits are issued.

4.8-3b The following measures shall be used singularly or in combination to accomplish an overall reduction of 10 to 20 percent in residential energy consumption relative to the requirements of State of California Title 24:

- Use of air conditioning systems that that are more efficient than Title 24 requirements;
- Use of high-efficiency heating and other appliances, such as water heaters, cooking equipment, refrigerators, and furnaces;
- Installation of photovoltaic rooftop energy systems; and
- Establishment of tree-planting guidelines that require residents to plant trees to shade buildings primarily on the west and south sides of the buildings. Use of deciduous trees (to allow solar gain during the winter) and direct shading of air conditioning systems shall be included in the guidelines.

4.8-3c Promote a reduction in residential emissions through implementation of the following measure:

- Prohibit any wood-burning fireplaces, woodstoves, or similar wood-burning devices. Homes may be fitted with UL rated natural gas burning appliances if desired. This prohibition shall be included in any CC&Rs that are established.

4.8-3d For all projects, use the lowest-emitting architectural coatings during construction. When zero-VOC coatings are commercially available, they should be used. When only low-VOC coatings are available, they shall be used in lieu of higher-emitting formulations. Design review submittals shall include information concerning the coatings products proposed for use in the project.

4.8-3e Bicycle usage shall be promoted by requiring the following:

- All non-residential projects shall provide bicycle lockers and/or racks;
- All apartment complexes or condominiums without garages shall provide at least two Class I bicycle storage spaces per unit;
- Require residential neighborhoods to be interconnected, with easy access to commercial and recreational land uses. All neighborhoods shall have access to the Class I bicycle trails without having to travel on an arterial street. All schools and public parks (except neighborhood tot lots) shall be connected with a Class I bicycle trail through the open space and greenbelts;
- A pedestrian/bikeway (P/B) Master Plan shall be developed for the entire Specific Plan area. This master plan shall be consistent with the guidelines established in the Placer County Regional Bikeway Plan and in the Specific Plan; and
- As each residential phase is constructed, each subdivision shall install its share of the overall P/B network, and ensure that the layout of each residential phase does not interfere with completion of the overall P/B network. Residential areas adjacent to open space corridors shall provide reasonable access to the Class I P/B trails located in the corridors. These Class I corridors shall provide linkages with the comprehensive network of other trails throughout the Specific Plan area. The P/B Master Plan shall provide linkages from all residential neighborhoods to all commercial areas. Non-vehicular access shall consist of a network of convenient linkages of Class I, II and III trails.

4.8-3f Transit usage and ride sharing shall be promoted by requiring participation in the development of a regional transit system at such time as a system is established and setasides of land for park-and ride facilities. Fair share participation may consist of dedication of right-of-way, easements, capital improvements, and/or other methods of participation deemed appropriate. In addition, future project design shall ensure that an adequate number of developers in the Specific Plan area provide reservations for future installations of bus turnouts and passenger benches and shelters, to be installed at such time as transit service is established and as demand and service routes warrant. The two transit centers shall be connected with the Class I bicycle trail. The Specific Plan shall provide for set-asides of land for two separate park-and-ride facilities. Construction of the park-and-ride facilities shall be phased over the buildout period of the project, with the first 50 spaces in place prior to issuance of the 3,000$^{th}$ residential building permit.

Prior to issuance of the 6,000th residential building permit another 50 spaces shall be provided, followed by 50 more prior to the 9,000th residential building permit. Forty-three more spaces shall be provided prior to issuance of the 12,000 residential building permit for a total of 193 spaces to be constructed (equal to 0.1 percent of the anticipated daily trip generation of the project). A public transit development fee shall be required for all development projects. The amount of this fee shall be based upon the traffic generation potential of each project. A dial-a-ride transportation system shall be established to reduce individual vehicle trips and establish data for the eventual formation of a transit system within the Specific Plan area.

An Air Quality and Transportation System Management (TSM) Plan shall be prepared for the Specific Plan to implement all feasible means of reducing Specific Plan area emissions. This plan shall provide for eventual public transit and implementation of trip reduction strategies that coordinate with surrounding areas. A Transportation Management Association (TMA) shall be established that shall be funded by the developer and all businesses located within the Specific Plan area. The TSM plan shall be updated annually by TMA staff to demonstrate compliance with all air quality requirements, and to incorporate the latest state-of-the-art techniques and strategies to reduce emissions. Initially, the TMA shall provide each home and business with an information packet that will contain, at a minimum, the following information:

- Commute options: to inform Specific Plan area occupants of the alternative travel amenities provided, including ridesharing and public transit availability/schedules;
- Maps showing Specific Plan area pedestrian, bicycle, and equestrian paths to community centers, shopping areas, employment areas, schools, parks, and recreation areas;
- Instructions on how to use TMA services that will facilitate trip reduction opportunities; and
- Information regarding PCAPCD programs to reduce Countywide emissions.

4.8-3g All projects requiring issuance of residential and non-residential building permits shall participate in an off-site mitigation program coordinated through the PCAPCD to offset NOx and ROG emissions not mitigated through on-site measures.

The PCAPCD, on behalf of Placer County, will determine air quality mitigation fees using calculation methodology established in practice and routinely applied to other, similar, contemporaneous land use development projects. The off-site mitigation program, coordinated through the PCAPCD, is designed to offset the project's long-term ozone precursor emissions. Monetary incentives shall be provided to sources of air pollutant emissions within the project's general vicinity that are not required by law to reduce their emissions. Therefore, the reductions are real, quantifiable and implement provisions of the 1994 State Implementation Plan. The off-site mitigation program

reduces emissions within the region that would not otherwise be eliminated and thereby "offsets" the project's increase to regional emissions.

4.8-3h School districts shall be encouraged to incorporate the following measures into the design, construction, and operation of elementary, middle and high school buildings and facilities:

- Install bicycle lockers and racks at all appropriate locations;
- Post signage prohibiting the idling of diesel vehicles for longer than 5 minutes;
- Construct at least one bus stop at a convenient location to be used for either fixed route service within the Specific Plan area or commuter service;
- Provide a community notice board and information kiosk with information about community events, ride-sharing, and commute alternatives;
- Provide preferential parking for carpools and hybrid vehicles (vehicles with self-charging electric engines); and
- Incorporate solar water heating systems and HVAC PremAir or similar catalyst systems in building design.

4.8-3i The following measures shall be incorporated into the design, construction, and operation of public park areas:

- The pedestrian/bikeway (P/B) master plan shall provide at least one Class I linkage to all school sites;
- Additional Class I and II linkages shall be provided so as to provide convenient access to/from the park sites;
- Install bicycle lockers and racks at all appropriate locations;
- Provide a community notice board and information kiosk with information about community events, ride-sharing, and commute alternatives;

4.8-3j Prohibit open burning throughout the Specific Plan area. Include this prohibition in any project CC&Rs that are established.

4.8-3k The County may substitute different air pollution control measures for individual projects, that are equally effective or superior to those proposed herein, as new technology and/or other feasible measures become available in the course of buildout of the Specific Plan area.

4.13-1m Placer County and the project applicant shall work together to publish and distribute an Energy Resource Conservation Guide describing measures individuals can take to increase energy efficiency and conservation. The applicant shall be responsible for funding the preparation of the Guide. The Energy Resource Conservation Guide shall be updated every five years and distributed at the public permit counter.

4.13-1n The project applicants shall pay for an initial installment of Light Emitting Diode (LED) traffic lights in all Specific Plan area traffic lights.

4.13-1o The project applicants and Placer County shall jointly develop a tree planting informational packet to help project area residents understand their options for planting trees that can absorb carbon dioxide.

4.13-1p Prioritized parking within commercial and retail areas shall be given to electric vehicles, hybrid vehicles, and alternative fuel vehicles.

-----Original Message-----
From: Harry Schaedler [mailto:prudentialsacramento@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 29, 2013 1:58 PM
To: SPK-PAO SPK; Ness, William W SPK
Subject: Placer Vineyard Project enviromental review

To whom it may concern:

I have lived in the sacramento area for over 50 years and have hunted and bird watched in and on the area of this project. I have noticed that it is a loafing and rest area for migratory birds including mallard, sprig, teal, canvas back and white fronted and snow geese as well as Canadian Geese and the endangered Aleution Geese that I have seen using the area during the fall and winter migation times. I believe the area would be better served to be set aside as a wetland for these species as removing it from this use will cause the migratory birds who currently use it to move closer to and on the Sacramento airport property and flight paths which will casuse more bird strikes and put the birds and people on airplanes in danger for their lives.

1

Thank You

Harry Schaedler

Real Estate Broker

**Letter B: Harry Schaedler, Real Estate Broker, dated May 29, 2013**

**Response B-1**

The use of the project site by migratory birds is considered in the EIS analysis. Even though the majority of the project site would be developed with urban uses, as described in the Draft EIS, about 700 acres on the project site, especially along drainages, will be preserved as open space. Therefore, there would still be habitat for migratory birds on the project site within the areas designated open space and this habitat will likely improve in quality over time as it will be preserved. Additional habitat would continue to be available in the form of rice fields to the west of the project site. In addition, compensation for habitat loss will be provided in another portion of Placer County, currently planned for the northwestern portion of the County. Therefore, habitat will continue to be available in western Placer County and adjacent areas of Sacramento and Sutter counties. Furthermore, for increased use of the Sacramento airport area by birds to occur, all lands surrounding the PVSP area with similar habitat would need to be at carrying capacity for all bird species and the Natomas Basin would need to be the only area in the northern Central Valley with capacity to harbor birds displaced by the Proposed Action. As neither of these conditions are met and habitat would still continue to be available on and adjacent to the project site, the potential for increased use of the Sacramento airport area by birds due to the Proposed Action is minimal.

COX CASTLE NICHOLSON

Cox, Castle & Nicholson LLP
555 California Street, 10th Floor
San Francisco, California 94104-1513
P 415.392.4200 F 415.392.4250

R. Clark Morrison
415.262.5113
cmorrison@coxcastle.com

June 10, 2013

File No. 54619

VIA E-MAIL AND U.S. MAIL

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Sacramento District
Regulatory Division; Attn: Will Ness
1325 J Street, Room 1350
Sacramento CA, 95814-2922

DLL-CESPK-RD-EIS-Comments@usace.army.mil

Re: Comments on Placer Vineyards Specific Plan Draft EIS: SPK-1999-00737

Dear Mr. Ness:

On behalf of Placer Vineyards Development Group, LLC, we hereby submit the following comments on the draft EIS prepared for the permit actions proposed on various properties within the planning area of the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan in Placer County, California (the "Plan")

1. The Applicant's Mitigation Strategy Satisfies Corps Regulations and Adequately Mitigates Wetlands Impacts.

a. *Background on Mitigation Strategy.*

The original CEQA review conducted for the Plan proposed a more traditional mitigation approach for wetland impacts, focused exclusively on wetted acre impacts and wetted acre mitigation ratios. After publication of the Placer County EIR, and in comments on the scoping of the EIS, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") and various interest groups commented that the Plan should play an integral role in a broader long-term conservation effort for Western Placer County, and that the applicants should coordinate with the County's conservation strategy for the proposed Placer County Conservation Plan ("PCCP").

1

In response to these comments, Placer Vineyards worked closely with various groups, including the Sierra Club, Audubon Society, Placer County, and the Sacramento Area Council of Governments ("SACOG") to develop a mitigation strategy that would be compatible with the conservation strategy of the PCCP, if ultimately adopted, but that also would function *independently* of the PCCP to effect a sustainable, long-term conservation of biological resources in Western Placer County. This revised Placer Vineyards Mitigation Strategy ("Mitigation Strategy") then was

adopted by Placer County and has been fully endorsed by both the Sierra Club as well as the Audubon Society.

The goal of the Mitigation Strategy is to mitigate for the development of individual properties within the Plan Area in a manner that not only addresses Army Corps no net loss requirements, but also contributes to the improvement and sustainability of biological resources throughout Western Placer County. In order to implement this goal, the Mitigation Strategy adopts an approach that focuses on more than just wetted-acres for wetted-acres. In particular, it provides mitigation ratios for both land cover *and* wetland area.

Because most of the natural communities represented in the Plan Area require large, contiguous, and intact habitat to retain maximum biological function, the Mitigation Strategy mitigates for the irreversible conversion of the existing natural and semi-natural landscape through permanent conservation of large tracts of land with similar land cover, habitat, and agricultural value located off-site in an identified "Reserve Acquisition Area" ("RAA"). The RAA was selected in collaboration with Placer County, SACOG, Sierra Club, and the Audubon Society as the area with the greatest opportunity to support a regionally important expanse of private and public land that will support aquatic functions and meet species needs in the long term, with minimal edge effect and fragmentation from urbanization.

1

The Mitigation Strategy is specifically designed to ensure that the Plan results in no net loss of aquatic function. The selection of the RAA and the adoption of a watershed approach reflects the ecological reality that the integrity of vernal pool wetlands in particular are best sustained within a landscape of large, interconnected upland habitat. While on site avoidance of smaller vernal pools – surrounded by growth – may result in short-term avoidance of wetlands impacts or take, such an approach generally suffers over time from the deterioration of the natural system's biological and aquatic functions.[1]

b. *The Mitigation Strategy Does Not Depend upon Adoption of the PCCP.*

Although the Mitigation Strategy was designed to integrate with the PCCP if eventually adopted, its ability to provide for no net loss of aquatic functions is not dependent on the adoption of the PCCP. That is, the Mitigation Strategy does not rely upon the PCCP as a permitting vehicle, but it does recognize efforts surrounding the PCCP have generated the best available scientific and commercial evidence relating to conservation in the region. Given the large gross acreage of the Plan Area – totaling over 5,000 acres – and the broad impact assumptions that require preservation of large amounts of vernal pool grassland regardless of the wetland density of impacted sites, the Mitigation Strategy will ensure conservation of very significant portions of the RAA in a manner consistent with principles that are now generally accepted in the region.

2

[1] AECOM, Vollmar Consulting & Holland, *Summary Report: Loss of Central Valley Vernal Pools* (2009).

c. *The Mitigation Strategy Satisfies the Requirements of the Compensatory Mitigation Rule.*

The Mitigation Strategy is consistent with the approach to compensatory mitigation set forth in the Army Corps' 2008 Compensatory Mitigation Rule – a rule "specifically designed to improve [the Corps'] ability to ensure no net loss of wetlands."[2] U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, COMPENSATORY MITIGATION RULE: IMPROVING, RESTORING, AND PROTECTING THE NATION'S WETLANDS AND STREAMS: QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS, http://water.epa.gov/lawsregs/guidance/wetlands/upload/2008_03_28_wetlands_Mit_rule_QA.pdf.

i. The Compensatory Mitigation Rule Does Not Require a Wetted Acre to Wetted Acre Ratio to Ensure No Net Loss of Aquatic Functions.

The Draft EIS states that the Mitigation Strategy "would result in a net loss of wetland area and function." We fundamentally disagree. Compensatory mitigation is not properly considered exclusively on wetted acre mitigation ratios. Rather, compensatory mitigation's fundamental objective is to "to offset *environmental losses*" – and therefore quantitative ratios must be considered in light of the qualitative aspects of a proposed mitigation plan. 33 C.F.R. § 332.3(a) (emphasis added); *see also id.* § 332.3(c) ("The ultimate goal of a watershed approach is to maintain and improve the *quality and quantity* of aquatic resources within watersheds through strategic selection of compensatory mitigation sites." (emphasis added)).

3

This conclusion is supported by 33 C.F.R. Section 332.3(f), which plainly acknowledges that compensatory mitigation should be tied to overall aquatic resource functions within a particular landscape, rather than solely to compensation ratios:

> [T]he amount of required compensatory mitigation must be, to the extent practicable, sufficient to replace *lost aquatic resource functions*. In cases where appropriate functional or condition assessment methods or other suitable metrics are available, these methods should be used where practicable to determine how much compensatory mitigation is required.

(Emphasis added.) The standard under Section 332.3(f) additionally is reinforced in Section 332.5, which requires the use of "ecological performance standards" to asses whether a project is meeting the objective of replacing lost aquatic functions. And as described above, the key goal of the Mitigation Strategy is do just this – to ensure the long-term viability of all ecological resources,

[2] Army Corps regulations establish a hierarchy among various compensatory mitigation strategies in the following order: (1) mitigation bank credits; (2) in-lieu fee program credits; (3) permittee-responsible mitigation under a watershed approach; (4) permittee-responsible mitigation through on-site and in-kind mitigation; and (5) permittee-responsible mitigation through off-site and/or out-of-kind mitigation. Notably, the Mitigation Strategy does allow for use of either approved conservation or mitigation banks or an approved in-lieu fee, and where therefore to the extent such options are available they would be preferable to even a permittee-responsible watershed approach.

including all aquatic resource functions, within the Plan Area through a comprehensive, multi-faceted watershed approach to compensatory mitigation.

3

ii. The Mitigation Strategy Employs a Preference for Restoration as Favored by the Compensatory Mitigation Rule.

As between restoration, enhancement, and creation, the Mitigation Strategy states a preference for restoration of aquatic resources. Whereas restoration is available in all instances in which soils and hydrologic conditions will support long-term viability, natural topography can be reproduced, and evidence indicates the historical presence of vernal pools, both enhancement and creation only may be used in limited circumstances. All qualifying actions, for example, must be approved by Placer County on a case-by-case basis. Mitigation Strategy at 11. Similarly, the use of vernal pool creation as a strategy to mitigate for harm to aquatic resource functions will be minimized. Mitigation Strategy at 12. Such approach entirely is consistent with the Compensatory Mitigation Rule, which states that "[r]estoration should generally be the first option considered because the likelihood of success is greater and the impacts to potentially ecologically important uplands are reduced compared to establishment, and the potential gains in terms of aquatic resource functions are greater, compared to enhancement and preservation." 33 C.F.R. § 332.3(a)(2).

4

iii. Out-of-Kind Mitigation is Permissible Under the Watershed Approach.

Where appropriate and practicable, compensatory mitigation decisions must be made from an ecological perspective. Under this approach, the location, type, and amount of compensatory mitigation follows from an analytically-based watershed assessment to assure that the proposed mitigation strategy furthers the *overall* ecological performance and sustainability of aquatic resource functions within the watershed. *See* 33 C.F.R. 332..5 ("Ecological performance standards."). It does not require that a mitigation proposal to apply a fixed in-kind ratio to each type of wet acre within a development project. Traditionally, this has resulted in wetland types being severed from each other in mitigation planning so that the integrated functions of more than one wetland type are lost. Even before the Compensatory Mitigation Rule, the Corps' preference for in-kind was merely that; a preference.

5

The Mitigation Strategy's incorporation of out-of-kind mitigation furthers the Mitigation Rule's primary focus on an ecological approach.[3] As described above, the Mitigation Strategy largely employs in-kind mitigation elements in regard to vernal pool conservation. Specifically, for each 1.00 acre of vernal pool fill, 1.00 acres of vernal pool must be preserved and at least 0.75 acres of vernal pool will be restored, enhanced, or created, with an additional 0.50 acres of any wetland type. For all other wetlands, the Mitigation Strategy permits *either* in-kind or out-of-kind mitigation.

---

[3] Army Corps regulations define "in-kind" as "a resource of a similar structural and functional type to the impacted resource." By contrast, "out-of-kind means a resource of a similar structural and functional type from the impacted resource." 33 C.F.R. § 332.2.

Such a strategy not only is advantageous but also is necessary under a watershed approach – which requires greater flexibility in site selection to maximize ecological goals and overall watershed functionality. This flexibility is clearly envisioned by the Compensatory Mitigation Rule. Specifically, 33 C.F.R. Section 332.3(e)(2) states that "[i]f the district engineer determines using the watershed approach in accordance with paragraph (c) of this section that out-of-kind compensatory mitigation will serve the aquatic resource needs of the watershed, the district engineer may authorize the use of such out-of-kind compensatory mitigation."

And this flexibility is not limited to questions of in kind or out-of-kind. Under the Compensatory Mitigation Rule, a good mitigation plan should "include[] the protection and maintenance of terrestrial resources, such as non-wetland riparian areas and uplands, when those resources contribute to or improve the overall ecological functioning of aquatic resources within the watershed." 33 C.F.R. § 332.3(c)(2). Ultimately, the "goal . . . is to maintain and improve the quality and quantity of aquatic resources within watersheds through strategic selection of compensatory mitigation sites." 33 C.F.R. § 332.3(c)(2). In adopting this approach, the Mitigation Strategy reflects the ecological reality that the integrity of vernal pool wetlands is best sustained within a landscape of large, interconnected terrestrial resources, including non-vernal pool and upland habitat. And it does so in a manner that not only addresses Army Corps no net loss requirements, but also contributes to the improvement and sustainability of biological resources throughout Western Placer County.

5

iv. The Mitigation Strategy Provides Sufficient Detail for the Corps to conclude that Wetlands Impacts Will Be Adequately Mitigated.

The Mitigation Strategy is not merely a conceptual model but rather a detailed plan that imposes specific requirements on projects within the Plan Area that satisfies both the Corps Mitigation Rule and NEPA. Among its numerous requirements, the Mitigation Strategy includes the following:

- Permanent conservation of large tracts of land with similar land cover, habitat, and agricultural value will be located off-site within the RAA. Mitigation Strategy at 2.
- All land designated for conservation will be acquired from willing sellers in fee title and/or protected through establishment of conservation easements. Mitigation Strategy at 6, 13.
- For every 1.0 acres of land cover taken, 1.35 acres of land will be conserved and, to the fullest extent possible, located within the RAA. Impacts to annual grassland, vernal pool grasslands, and pasture lands shall be mitigated on existing or restorable grassland. All other land cover impacts may be mitigated on any natural or semi-natural land within the RAA, specifically including agricultural land. Mitigation Strategy at 5-6.

6

- Mitigation for wetland areas at the time of impact will be subject to a finding of baseline consistency with land cover conditions as of 2009/11 (based upon 2009 LIDR and 2011 air photos), which requires various, specific findings and which establishes a comparison of resources. Mitigation Strategy at 8-9.

- For each 1.00 acres of vernal pool take, 1.00 acres of vernal pool will be preserved. For each 1.00 acres of take of any other wetland type, the preservation requirement may be met by preserving 1.00 acres of any wetland type without regard for in-kind mitigation. The preservation requirement for open water may be met through preservation of 1.00 acres of open water or any wetland type for each 1.00 acres of take. Mitigation Strategy at 9.

- For each 1.00 acres of vernal pool take, 1.25 acres of compensatory wetlands will be restored, enhanced, or created, including a minimum of 0.75 acres of vernal pool and no more than 0.50 acres of other wetlands. For each 1.00 acres of take of any other wetland type, the compensatory restoration, enhancement, and creation requirement may be met by restoring, enhancing, and/or creating 1.25 acres of any wetland type without regard for in-kind mitigation. The compensatory requirement for open water may be met through restoration, enhancement, or creation of 1.25 acres of open water or any wetland type for each 1.00 acres of take. Mitigation Strategy at 10.

6

- Conservation efforts will include preservation and in some instances enhancement of existing high quality vernal pools, with restoration serving to protect and restore vernal pool complexes at the levels of the landscape and local watershed and to mitigate for resources lost. The use of vernal pool creation as a strategy to mitigate for lost resources will be minimized. Mitigation Strategy at 11-12.

- Wetland preservation, restoration, enhancement, and creation shall be accompanied by the associated uplands and hydrology necessary to sustain long-term viability in a natural or restored environmental setting. To minimize edge effects from adjacent urban and suburban land, vernal pools shall be no closer than 250 feet from existing or planned urban or suburban development or located such that adequate hydrology can be maintained in the event of future development. The minimum area for a vernal pool conservation site is 200 acres, provided the site is not contiguous with other reserve lands. Mitigation Strategy at 12.

- Mitigation will be accompanied by an effective monitoring and adaptive management program in order to ensure the success of mitigation efforts and no net loss of aquatic functions. Mitigation Strategy at 11.

- Credits from approved conservation or mitigation banks or in-lieu fees also may be used to meet required mitigation levels. Mitigation Strategy at 7,13.

- In some limited instances, out-of-county mitigation may be allowed that meets the biological intent of the Mitigation Strategy. Mitigation Strategy at 7-8, 13-14.

- Site-specific avoidance and minimization measures for preserving and enhancing critical, on-site aquatic functions also are incorporated. The Plan Area incorporates a 709-acre open space area that restores historic habitat linkages and habitat quality throughout the Plan Area. Specific areas that exhibit habitat degradation through historic land use have been identified and will be enhanced under the Specific Plan.

6

Thus, the Mitigation Strategy provides sufficient detail to demonstrate it meets the substantive requirements of the Mitigation Rule. The Mitigation Strategy's compliance with NEPA follows in turn. *See Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership v. Salazar*, 616 F.3d 497, 517 (D.C. Cir 2010) ("The procedural requirements of NEPA do not force agencies to make detailed, unchangeable mitigation plans for long-term developments."); see also *Id.* ("By setting forth both fixed mitigation measures and an adaptive management plan, the Record of Decision amply fulfills NEPA's mandate to discuss mitigation measures. We can require no more.").

2. The Plan is Designed to Minimize Impacts to Aquatic Features.

The EIS describes thoroughly the evaluation conducted by the Corps relative to the feasibility and practicability of off-site and on-site alternatives to avoid impacts to wetlands, all of which satisfies the requirements of NEPA and supplies the information needed for the Corps to make a LEDPA determination at the time of ROD adoption. But it bears mentioning also that that the Plan itself has been designed to minimize impacts through "Low Impact Development Strategies." In particular, the Plan reflects a tremendous effort, undertaken in years of consultation with the Corps and EPA, to minimize impacts to aquatic resources in the Plan Area through the establishment of a system of interconnected open space based upon linear features. These corridors are central to the preserve design, promote connectivity of waters and watersheds, avoid isolating wetlands and drainages, avoid natural occurring wetlands over those created artificially and/or degraded through agricultural manipulation or other human modification, and promote avoidance efficiency by maximizing wetlands avoided per total open space area.

7

The framework for developing the Plan's on-site avoidance and minimization measures was based on the principals and recommendations set forth in "A Proposed Methodology for a "Regional LEDPA" Determination: Permitting under CWA Section 404 in Western Placer County" (Vendlinski April 6, 2006). Vendlinski proposes a methodology for establishing a regional "least environmentally damaging practicable alternative" (LEDPA) for the PCCP. This methodology is based on the assumption that "... a regional conservation strategy is environmentally superior to the practice of project-level mitigation." A key premise of the proposed methodology is that "Establishing a regional LEDPA with a system of large, connected conservation reserve areas under the PCCP allows the regulated community to comply as a whole with avoidance requirements of the Federal Guidelines promulgated under CWA §404(b)(1)." A second key assumption is that "...avoidance within the development envelope is limited to stream corridor set backs, wetlands

adjacent to streams, and Low Impact Development Strategies (LIDS) incorporated into project design. These avoidance strategies are focused on mitigating negative impacts to water quality and surface water runoff that occur with watershed development."

The implication is that implementation of a scientifically-based conservation strategy with avoidance, followed by minimization measures through LIDS and the stream setbacks may provide the mechanism to assure compliance with the avoidance and minimization requirements of Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines for the entire Placer Vineyards Development Area. While the Vendlinski paper was developed for the PCCP, the general principles apply equally as well to large scale specific plans such as Placer Vineyards, as further discussed in *Placer Vineyards Specific Plan Aquatic Resources Qualitative Assessment and Avoidance and Minimization Strategy and Criteria* (AECOM, July 3 2008).

The Applicant applied the basic strategy set forth by Vendlinski for the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan to determine the significance of aquatic resources present within the plan area in terms of the overall aquatic ecosystem considering factors such as:

- The degraded nature of the existing aquatic resources;
- The difficulty of preserving the function of the aquatic resource;
- The ability to preserve the primary function of the resource in the watershed;
- The fewest permanent impacts to aquatic resources;
- The fewest temporary impacts to aquatic resources; and
- The fewest secondary permanent impacts to aquatic resources.

7

Based on these avoidance and minimization principles, the Plan emphasizes the preservation of wetlands adjacent to primary channels within the sub-watersheds of the Plan Area that are in good to excellent condition, have connectivity with adjacent wetlands/waters, and can be included in a buffered, contiguous corridor. The Applicant determined that the wetlands within these areas would be the most viable in terms of retaining wetland functions, and the most beneficial in maintaining watershed functions such as flood control, water quality, and wildlife habitat value. The aquatic resources avoided and preserved in the plan area were chosen based on their general condition, hydrologic connection, and ability to provide continued benefits to the overall watershed and will be further benefited by the Project's proposed LID strategies.

3. Comments on the Draft Regional General Permit.

a. *Comments on Terms of Authorization.*

i. Section 1. This provision should refer only to "notifications," not to "applications." It should also provide that an activity will be deemed authorized if the Corps fails to respond within the identified 45-day period. Also, please clarify that notification to the USFWS will occur within five (5) business days, or that it can be effected by the applicant. Like other regional general permits, the authorization may be issued by the Corps *subject to* USFWS completion of its appendage process.

ii. Section 2. It cannot be predicted at this time how the infrastructure will be phased, which applicant will do the construction, or whether an applicant will require a separate 404 permit. It is also possible that segments of infrastructure may be constructed by Placer County or some other public agency, which should be able to rely upon the RGP. Moreover, the individual permit applications for the Placer Vineyards properties do *not* include the impact acreages for any backbone infrastructure to be constructed on those properties. The individual permit applications will not be used to authorize backbone infrastructure.

iii. Section 3. Delete this condition. The Corps should retain maximum flexibility in responding to any oversights that may occur during the development of the 22 permits that are now under consideration. 8

iv. Section 4. Special conditions should be limited to those needed to comply with the Mitigation Strategy as it is finally approved.

v. Section 5. Please clarify that the time period for authorization is satisfied if an applicant commences or is under contract to commence the proposed work, even if the activity is not completed until the following 5-year term of the RGP. That is, please develop grandfather provisions similar to those established for NWPs. The period should commence upon completion of the 45-day review period, whether the Corps notifies or not.

vi. Section 7. Existing authorizations should be permitted to proceed to completion provided they are under construction or under contract to construct.

b. *Comments on General Conditions.*

i. Condition 1. This condition is too open-ended. The condition should be deleted, because Special Condition 5 already refers to the Programmatic Agreement that is now under development for the plan area. Compliance with the PA should be all that is required.

ii. Condition 2. These are fill activities. What maintenance activities are required, and for what period? This requirement is inappropriate for a project of this nature. This will be an active construction site for many years to come. Also note that the applicant may not be the owner of the property. In many instances fill will be conducted by developer A on property owned by developer B, all subject to a right of access.

iii. Condition 8. Please delete. This RGP is part of a broader program of development that has been fully evaluated in the EIS. This condition would create irresolvable construction-related logistical problems. It does not appear to be appropriate for a program of this nature.

iv. Condition 11. Same comment as that provided on Condition 8. This requirement is not appropriate for a project of this nature. 8

v. Condition 12. Same comment as that provided on Condition 8. This requirement is not appropriate for a project of this nature.

vi. Condition 14. Please include appropriate references to in-lieu fee program.

vii. In General. Some of the BMPs included here may not always be practicable (e.g., road crossings, restoration of temporary fills, nature of fill materials). We look forward to conducting a review by our civil engineers and meeting with you further to refine these conditions.

4. The Corps Should Revise Its Discussion of Special Status Species to Reflect Current Regulations.

a. *Special Status Definition*

The definition of "special-status" appearing at Section 3.4.2.10 (page 3.4-12) is inaccurate. Specifically, we recommend deletion of the fourth bullet item, which reads: 9

*... Species that meet the definitions of Rare, Threatened, or Endangered under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15380)*

That language typically is interpreted to extend coverage to plant species that, although not identified by either the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or the California Department of Fish and Wildlife as deserving of "special-status", are identified as such only by the California Native Plant Society.

We propose substitution of the following language:

*… Species of expressed conservation interest to either the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or the California Department of Fish and Wildlife*

Further, the EIS should recognize that the Sacramento Office of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has abandoned the use of the term "species of concern" (see Exhibit A).

b. *Special Status Plants*

Attached as Exhibit B is a proposed substitution for to Table 3.4-3 (page 3.4-14) based on our proposed revision to the EIS's definition of "special status" and updating the status reported for each species.

c. *Special Status Animals*

Attached as Exhibit C is a proposed substitution for Table 3.4-4 (page 3.4-15) based on removing formerly-designated federal "species of concern", adding "Birds of Conservation Concern" (because they are the subject of "expressed conservation interest" to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service see (Exhibit D )), and updating the status reported for each species

d. *The Special Status Significance Threshold Should be Revised to Reflect Current Regulations*

9

The Biological Significance Thresholds found in Section 3.4.4.1 (page 3.4-30) should be revised to reflect regulatory terminology. Specifically, the first bullet item currently states that the Proposed Action or its alternatives would result in significant effects on biological resources if they would:

*… have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, Threatened, Endangered, otherwise protected, or special-status species, by the CDFW or the USFWS.*

We recommend that the undefined term "sensitive" be deleted, and that "… special-status species, by the CDFW or the USFWS" be replaced by "of expressed conservation interest to either the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or the California Department of Fish and Wildlife", in order to mirror the definition of "special-status."

e. *Effects on Federally Listed Plant Species*

We request that Mitigation Measure BIO-3 (page 3.4-53) be revised to clarify that protocol surveys for federally listed plant species are required to be conducted only where suitable habitat is present for such species to avoid unnecessary future surveys as follows:

*Prior to any ground disturbance on lands* that contain suitable habitat for federally listed plant species and *that have not been surveyed for federally-listed plant species, a protocol survey will be completed by a qualified biologist during the blooming season to determine whether the species are present within the area of ground disturbance. If the species are not discovered, no further action is required.*

9

5. The EIS Should be Revised to Correctly Reflect the Wetland Impacts of the Alternatives

Our review of the EIS indicates that it overstates the wetlands avoidance that would be achieved by alternatives. As shown below, the EIS appears to contain two categories of errors. First, the acreage of additional wetlands that would be avoided under four of the five alternatives (i.e., #1, #2, #3, and #5) has been significantly overstated. In addition, because all of those wetlands also represent potential habitat for listed aquatic invertebrates, we would expect those acreages to agree with those discussed under "Impact BIO-2". However, those acreages have also been significantly overstated for three of the five alternatives (i.e., #2, #3, and #5), although by different amounts. In addition, the incremental increases in uplands that would be avoided under two of the alternatives (i.e., #3 and #5) have also been significantly overstated. The appropriate values for open space and wetland impacts are reported in the revised tables 3.4-8 and 3.4-11, below. The revised tables were constructed by querying directly ECORP's internal GIS database in order to confirm/verify the statements made and/or the acreages reported in the DEIS.

10

Internal EIS Inconsistencies

| | | | Impact/Mitigation BIO-1 (Wetlands) | | | Impact/Mitigation BIO-2b (Aquatic Invertebrate Habitat) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | DEIS | ECORP | | DEIS | ECORP |
| Property #1b | Hodel | | | | | | |
| | | Uplands Newly Avoided: | 17 | 15.5 | | 17 | 15.5 |
| | | Wetlands Newly Avoided: | 4.1 | 2.468 | | 2.5 | 2.468 |
| Property #3 | Petrovich | | | | | | |
| | | Uplands Newly Avoided: | 5 | 4.2 | | 5 | 4.2 |
| | | Wetlands Newly Avoided: | 2.8 | 1.473 | | 2 | 1.473 |
| Property #16 | Miller | | | | | | |
| | | Uplands Newly Avoided: | 48 | 39 | | 48 | 39 |
| | | Wetlands Newly Avoided: | 4.9 | 3.18 | | 4.1 | 3.18 |
| Property #17 | Gulley | | | | | | |
| | | Uplands Newly Avoided: | 2 | 1.2 | | 2 | 1.2 |
| | | Wetlands Newly Avoided: | 0.1 | 0.14 | | 0.1 | 0.14 |
| Property #23 | Fong | | | | | | |
| | | Uplands Newly Avoided: | 19 | 0.138 | | 19 | 0.138 |
| | | Wetlands Newly Avoided: | 2 | 0.151 | | 4.1 | 0.151 |

Next, the several of the acreages used in the EIS that are intended to reflect the incremental benefit of an alternative appear to be overstated. The acreages highlighted in yellow below reflect acreages used in the EIS that are inconsistent with ECORP's review of the underlying GIS database.

10

EIS Inconsistencies with ECORP Database

| | | | Impact/Mitigation BIO-1 (Wetlands) | | | Impact/Mitigation BIO-2b (Aquatic Invertebrate Habitat) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | DEIS | ECORP | | DEIS | ECORP |
| Property #1b | Hodel | | | | | | |
| | | Uplands Newly Avoided: | 17 | 15.5 | | 17 | 15.5 |
| | | Wetlands Newly Avoided: | 4.1 | 2.468 | | 2.5 | 2.468 |
| Property #3 | Petrovich | | | | | | |
| | | Uplands Newly Avoided: | 5 | 4.2 | | 5 | 4.2 |
| | | Wetlands Newly Avoided: | 2.8 | 1.473 | | 2 | 1.473 |
| Property #16 | Miller | | | | | | |
| | | Uplands Newly Avoided: | 48 | 39 | | 48 | 39 |
| | | Wetlands Newly Avoided: | 4.9 | 3.18 | | 4.1 | 3.18 |
| Property #17 | Gulley | | | | | | |
| | | Uplands Newly Avoided: | 2 | 1.2 | | 2 | 1.2 |
| | | Wetlands Newly Avoided: | 0.1 | 0.14 | | 0.1 | 0.14 |
| Property #23 | Fong | | | | | | |
| | | Uplands Newly Avoided: | 19 | 0.138 | | 19 | 0.138 |
| | | Wetlands Newly Avoided: | 2 | 0.151 | | 4.1 | 0.151 |

10

ECORP's review indicates that Tables 3.4-1, 3.4-2, 3.4-8, and 3.4-11 should also be revised. The tables below were constructed by querying directly ECORP's internal GIS database in order to confirm the acreages reported in the DEIS. These errors should be corrected to permit a more accurate comparison of the alternatives.

11

Table 3.4-1 Project Site Habitat Types (acres)

| Habitat Type | Properties with Active Permit Applications | Properties without Active DA Permit Applications (Including SPA) | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Seasonal Wetlands | 81.5 | ~~0.6~~6.9 | ~~82.1~~88.4 |
| Vernal Pools | 32.5 | ~~8.6~~5.8 | ~~41.1~~38.3 |
| Stream/Pond | 49.3 | ~~1.5~~7.0 | ~~50.8~~56.3 |
| Marsh/Riparian | 39.1 | ~~3.5~~6.5 | ~~42.6~~45.6 |
| Oak Woodland/Oak Savannah | 65.5 | ~~1.8~~5.1 | ~~67.3~~70.6 |
| Annual Grassland | 2123.7 | ~~1349.2~~1002.7 | ~~3472.9~~3126.4 |
| Agricultural Land | 1330.3 | ~~117.4~~419.9 | ~~1447.7~~1750.2 |
| Roads/Other Surfaces | 22.0 | ~~5.3~~26.8 | ~~27.3~~48.8 |
| Total | 3743.9 | ~~1486.4~~1480.8 | ~~5231.8~~5224.7 |

11

Table 3.4-2 Project Site Waters of the U.S.

| Waters of the U.S. | Properties with Active Permit Applications | Properties without Active DA Permit Applications (Including SPA) | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Depressional Wetlands | | - | - |
| Vernal Pools | 32.5 | ~~0.1~~5.8 | ~~32.6~~38.3 |
| Seasonal Wetland | 41.4 | 1.4 | 42.8 |
| Seasonal Wetland Swale | 12.7 | 3.4 | 16.1 |
| Seasonal Marsh | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Pond | 18.5 | 5.4 | 23.9 |
| Drainage Swale | 2.1 | 0.0 | 2.1 |
| Riverine Wetlands | | - | |
| Canal/Ditch | 1.5 | 0.6 | 2.1 |
| Creek | 6.0 | 1.0 | 7.0 |
| Ephemeral Stream | 4.1 | 0.0 | 4.1 |
| Intermittent Stream | 17.8 | 0.0 | 17.8 |
| Channel | 1.5 | 0.0 | 1.5 |
| Riverine Seasonal Wetlands | 25.3 | ~~0.0~~2.1 | ~~25.3~~27.4 |
| Riverine Seasonal Marsh | 0.6 | ~~0.0~~4.7 | ~~0.6~~5.3 |
| Riverine Perennial Marsh | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
| Total | 164.7 | ~~12.0~~24.4 | ~~176.7~~189.1 |

11

Table 3.4-8 Proposed Action and Alternatives- Impacts to Waters of the United States (acres)

| Alternative | Development Footprint | Open Space | On-Site Impacts | Off-Site Impacts | Total Direct Impacts |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Proposed Action | 4521 | 709 | 115.1 | 4.2 | 119.3 |
| No Action Alternative | 3297 | 1933 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Alternative 1 | ~~4506~~4504 | ~~725~~726 | ~~113.6~~110.9 | 4.2 | ~~116.8~~115.1 |
| Alternative 2 | ~~4517~~4516 | ~~715~~714 | ~~113.6~~112.2 | 4.2 | ~~117.8~~116.4 |
| Alternative 3 | ~~4482~~4475 | ~~748~~757 | ~~111.9~~110.1 | 4.2 | ~~116.1~~114.3 |
| Alternative 4 | ~~4520~~4519 | ~~710~~711 | ~~115~~114.9 | 4.2 | ~~119.2~~119.1 |
| Alternative 5 Combined | ~~4521~~4502 | ~~709~~728 | ~~114.9~~113.0 | 4.2 | ~~119.1~~117.2 |
| Alternatives 1 through 5 | ~~4461~~4431 | ~~769~~799 | ~~107.7~~102.2 | 4.2 | ~~111.9~~106.4 |

11

Table 3.4-11 Vernal Pool Invertebrate Aquatic Habitat Direct Impacts (acres)

| Alternative | Development Footprint | Open Space | On-Site Impacts | Off-Site Impacts | Total Direct Impacts |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Proposed Action | 4521 | 709 | 97.2 | 2.6 | 99.8 |
| No Action Alternative | 3297 | 1933 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Alternative 1 | ~~4506~~4504 | ~~725~~726 | 94.7 | 2.6 | 97.3 |
| Alternative 2 | ~~4517~~4516 | ~~715~~714 | ~~95.7~~95.2 | 2.6 | ~~98.3~~97.8 |
| Alternative 3 | ~~4482~~4475 | ~~748~~757 | ~~94.0~~93.1 | 2.6 | ~~96.6~~95.2 |
| Alternative 4 | ~~4520~~4519 | ~~710~~711 | 97.1 | 2.6 | 99.7 |
| Alternative 5 Combined | ~~4521~~4502 | ~~709~~728 | ~~97.0~~93.1 | 2.6 | ~~99.6~~95.7 |
| Alternatives 1 through 5 | ~~4461~~4431 | ~~769~~799 | ~~89.8~~85.4 | 2.6 | ~~92.4~~87.0 |

6. Other Comments.

We have attached to this letter as Exhibit E other specific comments in table format on the Draft EIS.

Sincerely,

R. Clark Morrison

RCM/CHC

05461\4242868v7

# EXHIBIT A

# EXHIBIT A

# Species of Concern

Species of Concern is an informal term. It is not defined in the federal Endangered Species Act. The term commonly refers to species that are declining or appear to be in need of conservation.

Many agencies and organizations maintain lists of at-risk species. (See side bar) These lists provide essential information for land management planning and conservation efforts.

The Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office does not maintain a Species of Concern list.

## Avoiding Listing

The best way to help at-risk species is to help them recover before they decline to the point where they need formal protection.

We take an active role with our partners, stakeholders and other knowledgeable people to identify and conserve sensitive species, identify research needs and set priorities for recovery.

Our Partnerships Program (../../cp/Home/cp_conserv-partner-prog.htm) provides grants and other assistance to individuals and groups engaged in local, private, voluntary conservation efforts. This can include conservation of at-risk species.

Section 6 grants (http://www.fws.gov/midwest/endangered/grants/S6_grants.html) to states and territories can be used for unlisted species under habitat conservation plans (../../es/Habitat-Conservation-Plans/es_hcp.htm).

## Recovery Plans

Our recovery plans typically include sensitive unlisted species. We recommend that you consult the following plans when working in applicable ecosystems:

- Chaparral and Scrub Community Species East of San Francisco Bay (http://ecos.fws.gov/docs/recovery_plan/030407.pdf) (PDF 3MB)
- Coastal Plants of the Northern San Francisco Peninsula (http://ecos.fws.gov/docs/recovery_plan/031006.pdf) (PDF 5.8MB)
- Gabbro Soil Plants of the Central Sierra Nevada Foothills (http://ecos.fws.gov/docs/recovery_plan/020830b.pdf) (PDF 5.4MB)
- Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Native Fishes (http://ecos.fws.gov/docs/recovery_plan/961126.pdf) (PDF 17MB)
- Serpentine Soil Species of the San Francisco Bay Area (http://ecos.fws.gov/docs/recovery_plan/980930c.pdf) (PDF 25MB)
- Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley (http://ecos.fws.gov/docs/recovery_plan/980930a.pdf) (PDF 34MB)
- Vernal Pool Ecosystems (../../es/Recovery-Planning/Vernal-Pool/es_recovery_vernal-pool-recovery.htm) web page.

*Last updated: May 17, 2013*

FOLLOW US ONLINE

(http://www.facebook.com/usfws)

(http://twitter.com/#!/usfwshq)

(http://www.flickr.com/photos/usfws_pacific

(http://www.youtube.com/usfws)

DIRECTIONS (Footer-Navigation/Directions/nav_directions.htm)

EMAIL (mailto:rustico_bigalbal@fws.gov)

*Phone: (916) 414-6600*

*Fax: (916) 414-6712/6713*

# EXHIBIT B

# EXHIBIT B

## Proposed Table 3.4-3

| Name | FESA Status | CESA Status | Other Status | Habitat | Likelihood of Occurrence on Project Site |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bogg Lake hedgehyssop *Gratiola heterosepala* | - | E | CRPR 1B | Vernal Pools | Marginal habitat is present. |
| Sacramento Orcutt grass *Orcuttia viscida* | E | E | CRPR 1B | Vernal Pools | Marginal habitat is present. |
| Slender Orcutt grass *Orcuttia tenuis* | T | E | CRPR 1B | Vernal Pools | Marginal habitat is present. |
| Hartweg's golden sunburst *Pseudobahia bahiifolia* | E | E | CRPR 1B | Foothills, woodlands, clay grasslands | No suitable habitat is present. |

FESA: Federal Endangered Species Act
E: Endangered
T: Threatened

CESA: California Endangered Species Act
E: Endangered
T: Threatened

CRPR: California Rare Plant Rank
1B: Plants Rare, Threatened, or Endangered in California and Elsewhere

- 1 -



Letter C

# EXHIBIT C

# EXHIBIT C

## Proposed Table 3.4-4

| Name | FESA Status | CESA Status | Other Status | Habitat | Likelihood of Occurrence on Project Site |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Invertebrates** | | | | | |
| Conservancy fairy shrimp *Branchinecta conservation* | E | - | - | Vernal Pools, swales, seasonal wetlands | Marginal habitat present. Not observed on site. Know to occur in the project region. |
| Vernal pool tadpole shrimp *Lepidurus packardi* | E | - | - | Vernal Pools, some seasonal wetlands | Present on project site. |
| Vernal pool fairy shrimp *Branchinecta lynchi* | T | - | - | Vernal Pools, some seasonal wetlands | Present on project site. |
| Valley elderberry longhorn beetle* *Desmocerus californicus dimorphus* | T | - | - | Elderberry shrubs | Suitable habitat present. Not observed in portion of the project site surveyed. |
| **Amphibians and Reptiles** | | | | | |
| Western spadefoot *Spea hammondii* | - | - | SSC | Grasslands with seasonal breeding pools | Suitable habitat present. |
| California tiger salamander *Ambystoma californiense* | T | T | SSC | Valley-foothill grasslands with suitable breeding pools | Marginal habitat present. |
| Western pond turtle *Actinemys marmorata* | - | - | SSC | Permanent water bodies with basking sites such as logs and rocks | Suitable habitat present. |
| California red-legged frog *Rana aurora draytonii* | T | - | SSC | Deeper pools and streams with emergent or overhanging vegetation | Marginal habitat present. |
| Giant garter snake *Thamnophis gigas* | T | T | - | Perennial water bodies with sufficient cover vegetation | Marginal habitat present. |
| **Birds** | | | | | |
| Grasshopper sparrow *Ammodramus savannarum* | - | - | SSC | Short to middle-height, moderately open grasslands with scattered shrubs. Upland meadows, pastures, hayfields | Suitable habitat present in off-site utility corridor. |
| Northern harrier *Circus cyaneus* | - | - | SSC | Grasslands, seasonal wetlands, agricultural lands | Suitable habitat present. Observed foraging. |
| White-tailed kite *Elanus leucurus* | - | - | FP | Open grassland, and farmlands. Nests in tall trees near foraging areas | Suitable habitat present. |
| Western burrowing owl *Athene cunicularia* | - | - | SSC | Grasslands with friable soils for burrowing | Suitable habitat present. |
| Swainson's hawk *Buteo swainsoni* | - | T | BCC | Large trees, riparian woodlands and open grasslands/agricultural fields for foraging | Suitable nesting and foraging habitat present. |

- 1 -





Letter C

| Name | FESA Status | CESA Status | Other Status | Habitat | Likelihood of Occurrence on Project Site |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greater sandhill crane *Grus canadensis tabida* | - | T | FP | Seasonal wetlands, irrigated pastures, alfalfa and corn fields | Marginal foraging habitat present. No nesting habitat. |
| Loggerhead shrike *Lanius ludovicianus* | - | - | BCC SSC | Grasslands, pastures, agricultural lands | Suitable foraging habitat present. Observed foraging. Marginal nesting habitat. |
| California black rail *Laterallus jamaicensis* | - | T | BCC FP | Shallow, perennial freshwater marshes | Marginal habitat present. |
| Tricolored blackbird *Agelaius tricolor* | - | - | BCC SSC | Open water areas with tall emergent vegetation or in willow and blackberry thickets | Suitable habitat present. |
| Western yellow-billed cuckoo *Coccyzus americanus* | C | E | BCC | Large blocks of riparian habitats, particularly woodlands with cottonwoods and willows | No suitable habitat present. |
| Golden eagle *Aquila chrysaetos* | - | - | BCC FP | Grasslands | Suitable nesting and wintering habitat present. |
| Prairie falcon *Falco mexicanus* | - | - | BCC | Grasslands | Suitable nesting habitat present. |
| Long-billed curlew *Numenius americanus* | - | - | BCC | Grasslands, pasture | Suitable nesting habitat present. |
| Short-eared owl *Asio flammeus* | - | - | SSC | Marsh, grassland | Suitable nesting habitat present. |
| **Bats** | | | | | |
| Pallid bat *Antrozous pallidus* | - | - | SSC | Shrublands, grasslands, woodlands, forests; rocky areas, caves, hollow trees | Suitable foraging habitat present. Marginal roosting habitat present. |
| Townsend's big-eared bat *Corynorhinus townsendii townsendii* | - | - | SSC | Most low to mid elevation habitats; caves, mines, and buildings for roosting | Suitable foraging habitat present. Marginal roosting habitat present. |
| **Fish** | | | | | |
| Delta smelt *Hypomesus transpacificus* | T | E | - | Sacramento Delta | Not present in Dry Creek watershed |

| Name | FESA Status | CESA Status | Other Status | Habitat | Likelihood of Occurrence on Project Site |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Central Valley steelhead *Oncorhynchus mykiss irideus* | T | - | - | Sacramento River and its perennial tributaries | Occurs on-site within Dry Creek. |
| Central Valley Chinook Salmon (spring-run) *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha* | T | T | - | Sacramento River and its perennial tributaries | Not present in Dry Creek watershed. |
| Sacramento River Chinook salmon (winter-run) *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha* | E | E | - | Sacramento River and its perennial tributaries below Shasta Dam | Not present in Dry Creek watershed. |
| Sacramento River Chinook salmon (fall/late fall-run) *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha* | - | - | SSC | Sacramento River and its perennial tributaries below Keswick Dam | Occurs on-site within Dry Creek. |

*Note: The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has determined that delisting is warranted for this species.

FESA: Federal Endangered Species Act
E: Endangered
T: Threatened
C: Candidate

CESA: California Endangered Species Act
E: Endangered
T: Threatened

Others Status:
SSC: California Species of Special Concern
FP: Fully Protected (CDFG Special Animal List 2011)
BCC: U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service Bird of Conservation Concern (USFWS 2002).

# EXHIBIT D

# EXHIBIT D

Division of Migratory Bird Managment -

# Migratory Bird Program

**Conserving the Nature of America**

The Migratory Bird Program - Conserving America's Birds

Avocets Credit: Donna A. Dewhurst




**What are Birds of Conservation Concern?**

- The 1988 amendment to the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act mandates the U.S. Fish and (USFWS) to "identify species, subspecies, and populations of all migratory nongame birds th additional conservation actions, are likely to become candidates for listing under the Endang (ESA) of 1973." **Birds of Conservation Concern 2008** is the most recent effort to carry out species considered for the BCC include
  - nongame birds
  - gamebirds without hunting seasons
  - subsistence-hunted nongame birds in Alaska
  - ESA candidate, proposed, and recently delisted species
- The overall goal of the **Birds of Conservation Concern** is to accurately identify the migrato migratory bird species (beyond those already designated as Federally threatened or endang our highest conservation priorities. Bird species considered for inclusion on lists in this repo birds, gamebirds without hunting seasons, subsistence-hunted nongame birds in Alaska; anc Species Act candidate, proposed endangered or threatened, and recently delisted species.
- **Birds of Conservation Concern** *2008* encompasses three distinct geographic scales includ level (United States in its entirety, including island "territories" in the Pacific and Caribbean), American Bird Conservation Initiative (NABCI) Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs), anc Wildlife Service Regions level. This is primarily derived from assessment scores from three conservation plans: the Partners in Flight North American Landbird Conservation Plan, the Shorebird Conservation Plan , and the North American Waterbird Conservation Plan.
- The **Birds of Conservation Concern** includes some non-MBTA-protected species because status and efforts are of concern to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- To maximize the usefulness of this report to multiple partners, the **Birds of Conservation C** are presented in 46 separate tables, comprising 37 BCR lists (Tables 2 to 38), 8 USFWS Re 39 to 47) and 1 National list (Table 48). Summaries of the status of each species at each of geographic scales are provided in Appendix B, and a list of scientific names of all species m Appendix C. The BCR lists range from 10 to 53 species, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Regi 27 to 78 species, and the National list consists of 147 species. The number of priority specie roughly 10 to 15 percent of all bird species of any given geographic unit. View table.

http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/currentbirdissues/management/bcc.html 5/22/2013

# EXHIBIT E

# EXHIBIT E

| DEIS Page | Language at Issue | Comment |
|---|---|---|
| 2.0-11 | 3rd paragaph. | It should be noted that Alternatives F and G were replaced by the study area alternatives when it became clear that these two alternatives were not practicable means of avoiding impacts within the plan area. By examining specific study areas throughout the plan area, instead of relying upon the "blunt instrument" approach reflected in F and G, the agencies were able to respond to the results of the CRAM analysis and developer more finely tuned alternatives for higher priority areas. |
| 2.0-25 | Discussion of Water Supply and Distribution Facilities | On the top of page 2.0-25, please make the following change: "In the event that the long-term supply facilities are not in place when the initial ARPS supply from the two points of delivery has been fully used, a second initial surface water supply project ~~would~~ could be constructed."<br><br>This edit would make the text consistent with the text found on page 3.11-3. |
| 3.4-45 | Mitigation Measure BIO-1 | MM BIO 1 should be revised to contemplate the use the use of in-lieu fee and/or permittee-responsible creation and/or in-lieu fee consistent with the ACOE's mitigation rule. |
| 3.4-66 | MM BIO-10 | Applying BIO-10 to all transmission line corridors within the Plan Area is not practicable and is inconsistent with Specific Plan approved by the County because not all transmission corridors are intended to be open space. This mitigation measure should be revised to clarify that it is only intended to be applicable areas designated Open Space within a transmission line corridor. We request the following revision<br><br>"To protect habitat of the stream channels and the transmission line corridors designated by the Specific Plan as Open Space . . ." |
| 3.6-3, ¶3. | "For purposes of analysis | In order to resolve conflicting language about the depth of the vertical APE, as |

12
13
14
15
16

Letter C

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| sentence 7 | in this EIS, it is assumed that in most cases the depth of excavation on the project area (the vertical APE) would be less than 6 feet below ground surface." | described on pages 3.6-3 and 3.6-4, we recommend that sentence 7 of ¶3 on page 3.6-3 be rephrased as follows: "In most cases the depth of excavation on the project area would be less than 6 feet (1.8 meters) below ground surface." |
| 3.6-3, ¶3, sentence 6 and 3.6-4, ¶1, sentence 2 | | In order to resolve conflicting language about the depth of the vertical APE, as described on pages 3.6-3 and 3.6-4, we recommend that comment 1 of 2 be addressed, as well as the following change to sentence 2 of ¶1 on page 3.6-4: "The vertical APE extends from approximately 35 feet (11 meters) above the surface (for the construction of structures) and 25 feet (7 meters) below the surface, to allow for the deep installation of buried utilities and infrastructure." |
| Table 3.6-4 footer | "Measures recommended if resource will be adversely affected by the PVSP." | The nature and extent of mitigations necessary for resolving adverse effect to historic properties will be determined through the implementation of the PA and HPMP, and resulting HPTP. We recommend that the footer be changed to read: "Possible measures if resource will be adversely affected by the PVSP, or as stipulated through the HPTP." |
| MM CR-1, page 3.6-36 | Programmatic Historic Properties Treatment Plan | Since the time of the preparation of the public draft EIS, the ongoing consultation between the USACE and SHPO has resulted in a change to the name of this document. It is now referred to in the Draft Programmatic Agreement as a Historic Property Management Plan (HPMP)." We recommend that the title of MM CR-1 be changed to read: "Prepare, Execute, and Implement a Programmatic Agreement with Historic Property Management Plan and Project-Specific Historic Property Treatment Plans." |
| MM CR-1, page 3.6-36 | "…USACE shall satisfy the requirements of Section 106 of the NHPA through the development…" | The execution and implementation of a Programmatic Agreement will allow the USACE to satisfy both Section 106 of the NHPA and NEPA. We recommend that the statement be revised to read, "For all action alternatives that require federal permitting and authorization, USACE shall satisfy the requirements of NEPA and Section 106 of the NHPA through the development and execution of a PA." |
| Sentence 3 of MM | "Preparation of the phase-specific APE and | Depending on the outcome of the inventory and evaluation of eligibility, and in cases where historic properties are identified within an APE and will be impacted, a |

16
17
18
19
20
21

Letter C

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CR-1, page 3.6-36 | inventory and evaluation of properties within the APE shall be performed prior to any ground-disturbing work in the APE for any federal permitting or authorization of individual development phases." | Determination of Effect and HPTP will also be required prior to ground-disturbing activities within the APE. We recommend that the sentence be revised to read, "Determination of the project- or phase-specific APE, and the related inventory, evaluation of eligibility, determination of effect, and mitigation measures to resolve adverse effect to historic properties, shall be performed as appropriate prior to permit issuance and any subsequent ground-disturbing work in the APE for any federal permitting or authorization of individual development phases." |
| Impact CR-2, Alts 1 through 5, page 3.6-38 | "All of the on-site alternatives, like the No Action Alternative, would reduce the potential to encounter unanticipated buried cultural deposits because the total area of ground disturbance on the site would be reduced and the amount of ground disturbance along Dry Creek (the most sensitive area for potential buried prehistoric deposits) would also be reduced." | To clarify and distinguish between potential for unanticipated discovery due to archaeological/ geoarchaeological sensitivity and estimating the frequency of encountering subsurface deposits during construction, we recommend that the statement be revised as follows:<br><br>"All of the on-site alternatives, like the No Action Alternative, have a similar potential to encounter unanticipated buried cultural deposits. However, because the total area of ground disturbance in the project area would be reduced and the amount of ground disturbance along Dry Creek (the most sensitive area for potential buried prehistoric deposits) would also be reduced, the frequency and amount of unanticipated discovery would be commensurate with the smaller area of impact." |
| Impact CR-3, page 3.6-38 and -39 | Alternatives 1 through 5 and water pipelines would have no impact on Native American archaeological resources. Mitigation is not needed. | We recommend that Impact CR-3 be replaced by the following text: "The construction and operation of off-site water pipeline infrastructure by the Placer County Water Agency (PCWA), which would be used by the No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5, has unknown effects on historic properties. Following the application by PCWA to USACE for a Section 404 permit for the pipeline infrastructure project, the USACE will inventory, evaluate eligibility, determine effect, and develop measures to resolve the adverse |

21

22

23

Letter C

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | effect to historic properties in accordance with the PA and HPMP, as specified in MM CR-1 and CR-2. If PCWA will not seek a Section 404 permit or is not otherwise subject to the PVSP, then the comparable procedures in CEQA or Section 106 of the NHPA will apply, as appropriate." |
| 3.9-20 | Text indicates residential uses are minimum of 100' for powerline "corridor" | The text should be clarified to reflect that residential uses will be at least 100 feet from existing powerlines. The distance from powerline easements varies throughout the Project Site. See Draft EIR pp. 4.12-35-36. The EIS's use of the word "corridor" in vague as to whether it refers to the physical powerlines or the easements they are found within. |
| 3.11-5 | Reference in section 3.11.2.3 to "Curry Creek Community Plan Area" | Although Placer County talked about adopting a Curry Creek Community Plan area in 2004, the County has taken any implementing actions. To our knowledge Placer County has not implemented the preparation of the Curry Creek Community Plan. We recommend the following edits in text on :<br>"Lands to the north of the project site are located in Roseville and unincorporated Placer County, and include the ~~Curry Creek Community Plan area and~~ Sierra Vista Specific Plan area and land identified for the eventual Curry Creek Community Plan." |
| 3.11-15 | Significance thresholds "conflict with the applicable plans, policies, or regulations." | To the extent that the significance thresholds throughout the EIS parallel those found in typical CEQA documents (including Placer County's multi-volume EIR for the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan at p. 4.1-45), we recommend the following modification to the third significance threshold found at the bottom of page 3.11-12:<br>• conflict with applicable plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, |
| 3.14-43 | Impact TRA-11 Riego Road RR X-ing. | We believe that because the contribution of all alternatives to cumulative traffic conditions that could require a widened railroad crossing are less than sigificant, that the EIR should be revised to delete the following language ~~"The No Action Alternative would pay its fair share toward the road widening, including a grade separation if needed."~~ |
| 3.15-24t | Impact Util-2 | To be consistent with the conclusion that the No Action Alternative would likely |

23
24
25
26
27
28

Letter C

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | have a lower recycled water demand than the Proposed Action, we request the following revision follows "deficit of less than 0.7 mgd" and delete "~~a demand of 3.5 mgd.~~" |
| 3.15-29 | Dry Creek WWTP | Flows for 2.9 to 4.2 mgd would not conflict with current planning efforts on the Wastewater Master Plan for Dry Creek. WWTP plans an expansion for 18 mgd to 21 mgd. The City of Roseville as the lead agency of the Regional Wastewater Authority prepared an analysis entitled Roseville Regional Wastewater Treatment Service Area Master Plan (May 1996) and an accompanying environmental document with the assistance of Montgomery Watson and ESA. This study led to the decision by the Authority Board to ultimately expand the capacity of the Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant to 21 MGD which provides service to surrounding areas . The flow projections in the Master Plan included those generated by the buildout of Placer Vineyards. Thus the development of Placer Vineyards is consistent with current planning efforts and would not conflict. |

28

29

Letter C

**Letter C: Cox, Castle & Nicholson LLP, R. Clark Morrison on behalf of Placer Vineyards Development Group LLC, dated June 10, 2013**

**Response C-1**

The Applicants' comments regarding the approach to mitigation contained in the Applicants' revised draft Mitigation Strategy are noted. The USACE will consider this information in its evaluation of the Applicants' revised draft Mitigation Strategy for its ability to mitigate the impacts of the Proposed Action on jurisdictional waters.

**Response C-2**

The Applicants' comment regarding the Applicants' revised draft Mitigation Strategy and its relationship to the PCCP is noted.

**Response C-3**

The Applicants' comment regarding the revised draft Mitigation Strategy's consistency with the approach to compensatory mitigation under the 2008 Compensatory Mitigation Rule is noted and will be considered by the USACE in its evaluation of the Applicants' revised draft Mitigation Strategy.

**Response C-4**

The Applicants' comment regarding the restoration emphasis of the revised draft Mitigation Strategy is noted. The revised draft Mitigation Strategy, submitted by the Applicants to the USACE in September 2013, emphasizes compensatory mitigation for wetland impacts that includes creation and preservation.

**Response C-5**

The Applicants' comments regarding out-of-kind mitigation allowed under the watershed approach and the ecological benefits from a landscape approach to mitigation are noted.

**Response C-6**

The Applicants' comments regarding the detailed elements of the revised draft Mitigation Strategy are noted. The USACE will consider this information in its evaluation of the Applicants' revised draft Mitigation Strategy.

**Response C-7**

The Applicants state that the avoidance and minimization requirements of Section 404(b)(1) are satisfied by the PVSP because the plan preserves wetlands adjacent to primary channels within the sub-watersheds, maintains connectivity between these preserved waters, and includes adequate stream setbacks as well as Low Impact Development (LID) strategies to avoid indirect effects on preserved wetlands. The avoidance and minimization features of the Proposed Action are described in the Draft EIS, consistent with the information presented by the Applicants. As this information is presented by the Applicants in support of their assertion that the Proposed Action is the LEDPA, the USACE will consider this information in its Section 404(b)(1) alternatives evaluation. The USACE's final determination regarding LEDPA will be included in the ROD.

**Response C-8**

The Applicants provide a number of comments on the Draft Regional General Permit, which was included in the Draft EIS appendices. These comments do not relate to the EIS. The USACE will consider these comments in its preparation of the Final Regional General Permit.

**Response C-9**

The Applicants provide a number of comments related to the definition of special-status species used in the Draft EIS.

The USACE has reviewed the comments and agrees that because plants listed by the California Native Plant Society are not protected under the state or federal Endangered Species Acts, it is appropriate to revise the definition of special-status species on page 3.4-12 of the Draft EIS to delete reference to the California Environmental Quality Act section. The Draft EIS text and tables have been revised consistent with this comment. The suggested language has been added to Mitigation Measure BIO-3. See **Chapter 3.0, Errata.**

**Response C-10**

All of the original data files were checked and it was confirmed by the USACE that some of the data reported for Alternatives 1 through 5 in the Draft EIS are not consistent with the latest information available based on refined mapping of Alternatives 1 through 5. The numbers have been corrected and checked for internal consistency. The corrections are shown in **Chapter 3.0, Errata**.

**Table 2.0-3**, below presents the acreage of impacts that were reported as avoided under each alternative in the Draft EIS Impacts BIO-1 and BIO-2, and the corresponding corrected numbers in this Final EIS. The corrected numbers show that a somewhat lower acreage of the waters of the U.S. and invertebrate habitat will be avoided under the Combined Alternatives 1 through 5 than indicated in the Draft EIS.

**Table 2.0-3**
**Additional Acreages of Waters of the U.S. and Invertebrate Habitat Avoided under the Alternatives**

| Alternative | Property | Draft EIS Impact BIO-1 (Avoided Waters of the US) | Final EIS Impact BIO-1 (Avoided Waters of the US) | Draft EIS Impact BIO-2 (Avoided Invertebrate Habitat) | Final EIS Impact BIO-2 (Avoided Invertebrate Habitat) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alternative 1 | 1b (Hodel) | 4.2 | 2.4 | 2.5 | 2.4 |
| Alternative 2 | 3 (Petrovich) | 2.9 | 1.3 | 2.0 | 1.3 |
| Alternative 3 | 16 (Miller) | 5.0 | 3.4 | 4.1 | 3.4 |
| Alternative 4 | 17 (Gulley) | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Alternative 5 | 23 (Fong) | 2.1 | 1.2 | 4.1 | 1.2 |
| Combined Alternatives 1 through 5 | 1, 3, 16, 17 & 23 | 12.9* | 8.5 | 12.8 | 8.5 |

*ECORP 2012a, 2012b, and 2013*
*Note: Columns may not add due to rounding.*
** This number should have been 14.4 based on the sum of Alternatives 1 through 5 values. However the Draft EIR reported 12.9 in error.*

**Response C-11**

The acreages reported in the Draft EIS Tables 3.4-1 and 3.4-2 were obtained from the PVSP EIR. Since the publication of the PVSP EIR, the aerial photographs for properties without active DA permit applications were reexamined by ECORP Consulting on behalf of the Applicants. As a result of that reexamination, some of the acreage numbers have changed. The USACE has reviewed and agrees with the changes. The corrected numbers are presented in **Chapter 3.0, Errata** in revised Tables 3.4-1 and 3.4-2.

As noted in **Response C-10**, above, it was confirmed by the USACE that some of the data reported for Alternatives 1 through 5 in the Draft EIS have changed based on refined mapping. All numbers have been checked for internal consistency and corrected in the Final EIS. Therefore, Draft EIS Tables 3.4-8 and 3.4-11 have been corrected.

As shown in **Table 2.0-3** in **Response C-10**, above, the benefits from Alternatives 1 through 5 singly or combined, in terms of a reduction in impacts on the waters of the U.S. and invertebrate habitat, are somewhat lower than previously presented in the Draft EIS.

**Response C-12**

The information noted in this comment is already reflected in the third paragraph on page 2.0-9 of the Draft EIS, therefore no change is necessary.

**Response C-13**

Text changes were made to the first sentence at the top of page 2.0-25 as shown in **Chapter 3, Errata**.

**Response C-14**

Mitigation Measure BIO-1 on page 3.4-45 is revised as shown in **Chapter 3, Errata**.

**Response C-15**

Mitigation Measure BIO-10 on page 3.4-66 is revised as shown in **Chapter 3, Errata**.

**Response C-16**

Revisions to the description of the depth of excavation are shown in **Chapter 3, Errata**.

**Response C-17**

Revisions to the description of the vertical APE are shown in **Chapter 3, Errata**.

**Response C-18**

Revisions to the Table 3.6-4 footer are shown in **Chapter 3, Errata**.

**Response C-19**

The revisions to the title of Mitigation Measure CR-1 are shown in **Chapter 3, Errata**.

**Response C-20**

The suggested edit was determined by the USACE to be unnecessary and has not been included in the edits to the mitigation measure.

**Response C-21**

The revisions to the text of Mitigation Measure CR-1 are shown in **Chapter 3, Errata**.

**Response C-22**

Revisions to the Impact CR-2 analysis for Alternatives 1 through 5 are shown in **Chapter 3, Errata**.

**Response C-23**

Revisions to the Impact CR-3 analysis are shown in **Chapter 3, Errata**.

**Response C-24**

The revision to the Impact HAZ-5 analysis is shown in **Chapter 3, Errata**.

**Response C-25**

The first sentence under 3.11.2.3 Existing and Planned Land Uses in the Vicinity of Project Site is revised as shown in **Chapter 3, Errata**.

**Response C-26**

The USACE has determined that the suggested change to the significance threshold is not required as the thresholds in the EIS do not need to follow CEQA.

**Response C-27**

The No Action Alternative analysis under Impact TRA-11 is revised as shown in Chapter 3, Errata. As analyzed in the Draft EIS, the No Action Alternative would not trigger the need for additional widening over the rail line. Therefore, the No Action Alternative would not need to pay its fair share towards road widening.

**Response C-28**

The No Action Alternative analysis under Impact UTIL-2 is revised as shown in **Chapter 3, Errata**.

**Response C-29**

The Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) capacity analysis for the Proposed Action (Base Plan and Blueprint Scenarios) under Impact UTIL-3 on page 3.15-29 is revised as shown in **Chapter 3, Errata**.

**Letter D**

KASSOUNI LAW

June 10, 2013

Will Ness, Project Manager
US Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District
1325 J Street, Room 1350, Sacramento, California 95814-2922

Dear Mr. Ness:

This comment letter is submitted on behalf of Hodel Family Enterprises, L.P (Hodel Family) in response to a call for public comments regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) recently published for the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan. The Hodel Family owns a parcel of land within the proposed Placer Vineyard's development which the DEIS labels 1B/Hodel (hereafter referred to as the Hodel Parcel). The property has been owned for almost 70 years through four generations. In 1985, Gordon Hodel (deceased), a Right-of-Way agent for Nevada Irrigation District, helped organize the farmers, now known as Placer Vineyards Development Group, to prevent their properties from being rezoned and therefore devalued by large, well-funded developers. Almost 30 years later, the Hodel Family, again, has serious concerns about the effects that the adoption of Proposed Land Use Alternative 1[1] (Alternative 1) would have on the value and use of their property. For the reasons explained below, the Hodel Family submits that Alternative 1 is unfeasible and should be altered significantly to address these concerns.

## I. The Corps Lacks Jurisdiction Over The Hodel Parcel

Pursuant to 33 U. S. C. § 1344, the Corps has jurisdiction to regulate developments involving "waters of the United States." However, this jurisdiction does not extend to every puddle or raindrop that happens to fall to the ground. Instead, the Supreme Court has interpreted "waters of the United States" to include, primarily, interstate waters that are navigable in fact—i.e. lakes, rivers, and streams – along with other "relatively permanent" bodies of water that connect with those waters. *Rapanos v. US*, 547 U.S. 715, 732-33, 742 (2006). Additionally, because of the "inherent difficulties of defining precise bounds" of these waters, wetlands adjoining traditional waters may also "be defined as waters [of the United States] under the Act." *United States v. Riverside Bayview Homes, Inc.*, 474 U. S. 121 (1985).

1

"Isolated ponds" and other wetlands which are not connected to traditional waters do not present these boundary drawing problems. *Rapanos* , 547 U.S. at 742; *Solid Waste Agency of Northern Cook Cty. v. Army Corps of Engineers,* 531 U.S. 159, 167, 171 (2001). Accordingly, they are not considered "waters of the United States" and are not subject to Corps jurisdiction. *Id.* For example, in *Solid Waste Agency*, 531 U.S. 159, the Court found that the Corps lacked jurisdiction over a group of isolated seasonal ponds which had developed in abandoned gravel-mining pits. In doing so, the Court expressly refuted the notion that "isolated," "seasonal" ponds with no

[1] As found on 2.6.2 of the DEIS and in Table 2.0-8 of the same.

555 CAPITOL MALL, SUITE 900
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814
TELEPHONE 916.930.0030
FACSIMILE 916.930.0033

surface connection to traditional navigable waters could be considered "waters of the United States." *Id.* at 171-2.

More recently, in *Rapanos*, 547 U.S. 715 the Court rejected the Corps' claim of jurisdiction over several parcels of land containing wetlands that were only tenuously connected to navigable waters. There the Corps argued that the wetlands at issue were waters of the United States because they were "near ditches or man-made drains that eventually empty into traditional navigable waters." *Id.* at 729. The Court disagreed. Four justices found that the wetlands were not waters of the United States because the wetlands lacked a "continuous surface connection" to bodies that were "waters of the United States" in their own right. *Id.* at 742. The fifth justice, Justice Kennedy, found that the wetlands were not waters of the United States because the wetlands tenuous connections to navigable waters via nearby streams were not sufficient to create a "sufficient nexus" between the wetlands and navigable waters. That is, there was no nexus by which the wetlands would "significantly affect the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of other covered waters more readily understood as 'navigable.'" *Id.* at 780. Under either standard, however, the Court agreed that wetlands which are not connected, or only tenuously connected, to navigable waters cannot be "waters of the United States" for the purpose establishing Corps jurisdiction.

1

Here, the Corps has claimed jurisdiction over the Hodel Parcel because it contains three seasonal vernal pools which the Corps claims are jurisdictional wetlands. Yet as in *Rapanos*, these vernal pools are, at best, not even tenuously connected to *any* other body of water, much less a navigable waterway. Indeed the CRAM Report found that the only vernal pool tested on the property, VP 46, was wet as little as two weeks a year, and even then, had no connection to the floodplain of any river or stream. Accordingly, the vernal pools are not waters of the United States and the Corps lacks jurisdiction over the property.

## II. The Dedication of 21 Acres of the Hodel Parcel Under Alternative 1 Is Excessive and Raises Serious Constitutional Concerns

Under Alternative 1, twenty-one acres of the Hodel Parcel is to be dedicated as open space in order to reduce the impact of development on approximately two-acres of seasonal vernal pools. The Corps claims that these 21 acres contain jurisdictional wetlands and has therefore exercised eminent domain without just compensation—a regulatory taking. Additionally, these twenty-one acres cannot be developed or sold for mitigation purposes. Instead, the land must be deeded to an environmental organization, and a trust fund must be established in order to maintain the property as open space into perpetuity.[2] In the future, a building permit for residential housing on the remaining acres will only be issued if the developer complies with these conditions.

2

[2] This information is taken from conversations that the Hodel Family had with various developers as well as Mr. Bob Shattuck of PV/ Lennar.

KASSOUNI LAW



These restrictions on the use of the Hodel Parcel are grossly excessive and run contrary to the Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution. When the government places conditions on the development of property, the Constitution requires that those conditions meet two criteria: 1) there must be an "essential nexus" between the permit conditions and a legitimate state interest, and 2) the degree of the exactions required by the permit condition must bear a close relationship to the projected impact of the proposed development. *Dolan v Tigard*, 512 U.S. 374, 386 (1994). In other words, there must be some congruence, or "rough proportionality" between the restriction imposed and the impact of the development requested. *Id.* at 391; *see, also, Penn Central Transp. Co. v. New York City*, 438 U. S. 104, 127 (1978) ("[A] use restriction may constitute a "taking" if not reasonably *necessary* to the effectuation of a substantial government purpose") (emphasis added).

For example, in *Dolan v Tigard,* 512 U.S. 374, Ms. Dolan sought a permit to expand her pre-existing store and pave the store's parking lot. As a condition of permit approval, the City Planning Commission ordered that she dedicate ten- percent of her property to the City for the construction of a bicycle path and buffer to offset any increased traffic or flooding-risks created by the expansion of her store. *Id.* at 380. The Court conceded that these conditions bore a sufficient nexus to the City's legitimate interest in offsetting the effects of the development on flooding and traffic congestion. *Id.* at 387. However, the Court found that the dedication of ten-percent of Ms. Dolan's property to the public was excessive when compared to the impact her development would have on the City's interest. As the Court explained, the right to exclude others is "one of the most essential sticks in the bundle of rights that are commonly characterized as property." *Id.* at 393. The proposed dedication would have "eviscerated" that right for ten percent of Ms. Dolan's property. *Id.* Thus, because the City failed to show in quantifiable measures how the project's impact on flooding and traffic would justify such a large taking, the dedication requirement was found unconstitutional. *Id.* at 394-5.

Here, Alternative 1 would require the dedication of over one-third (38%) of the Hodel Parcel as open space in order to minimize hypothetical impacts to alleged low-priority seasonal wetlands[3] occupying less than four-percent of the property. Yet, as in *Dolan*, the Corps does not explain in quantifiable terms how such an evisceration of property rights, or the creation of 21 acres of dry grassy land, is justified by any impacts the proposed development might have on the two acres of alleged wetlands. Indeed, the creation of such a large open space in that area violates the Corps' own land use compatibility standards. *See* DEIS at 3.11-6. Accordingly, Alternative 1's proposed dedication of open space on the Hodel Parcel fails to meet the standard set forth in *Dolan* and should be changed.

2

[3] The Hodel Family does not concede that these pools are wetlands.

KASSOUNI LAW



**III. Alternative 1 Singles Out the Hodel Parcel for Burdens Not Placed on Similar Properties**

The Equal Protection Clause requires that the government treat similarly situated individuals alike. *Plyler v. Doe*, 457 U. S. 202, 216 (1982). When the government crafts laws which treat individuals differently who appear to be similarly situated, it must provide a reason for the disparate treatment that is rationally related to the protection of the public, and consistent with the general purpose of the law. *Reed v. Reed,* 404 U. S. 71, 75-76 (1971). In the case of development projects or zoning restrictions, that means that any designation or classification which causes one developer or development to bear a greater regulatory burden than another, must further a legitimate purpose of the law. *Cleburne v. Cleburne Living Center, Inc.*, 473 US 432, 446-447.

Here, the Hodel Family property has been singled-out under Alternative 1 for open-space burdens not carried by other similarly situated properties. In particular the Hodel property must set aside 21 acres of open space because of three alleged vernal pools located on the property. Since these pools are being taken as a group, large areas of land between the pools which have no bio diversity or wetlands have been unjustifiably included in Alternative 1. As seen on the No Action Alternative map (FIGURE 2.0-9), the Corps sets aside wetlands on other parcels in Placer Vineyards, as well as all three of the alleged vernal pools on the Hodel Parcel. On this map, however, the Corps does not take from Hodel the extra amounts of acreage that it does in Alternative 1. On the map that contains Alternative 1, the other parcels are allowed to fill many of their wetlands, yet deny that right to the Hodel Parcel. In addition, the Hodel Parcel is required to give up extra acres, 21 acres for 2 acres of jurisdictional wetland, which causes them to bear the burden for the whole. This disparate treatment is arbitrary and raises serious Equal Protection concerns. Accordingly, Alternative1 should be rejected in favor of a plan that gives back open space for residential use on the Hodel Parcel by allowing 2 or all three of the alleged vernal pools to be filled and the minor drainage areas caused by rolling typography to be covered so that the Hodels as individual owners do not carry such a heavy burden for the Placer Vineyards Development plan as a whole.

3

**IV. The Wetlands Designation in Alternative 1 is flawed and the 21 Acre Dedication for those Wetlands is Unjustified.**

Two acres of jurisdictional wetlands on the Hodel Parcel were initially designated for preservation with aerial photography. This aerial photograph was then photo shopped, painting pools and swales bright blue causing them all to appear hydrologically equal. They are not. This false impression occurred because the photo shopped pools were evenly painted blue to the

4

KASSOUNI LAW



extreme edges with no gradation in color to denote variation or difference. In addition, the swales on Alternative 1 were also painted blue so that the minor, normal drainage of a rolling typography appears as significant as deep water trenches on other properties. These photo shopped aerials not only created the impression that the areas are hydrologically equivalent, but also creates the impression that they were all perfectly and similarly adapted for diverse fish, wildlife, and fauna. They are not. Anyone who looked at the untouched aerial photographs could see, or anyone who lived on the property as long as the Hodels know that this is absolutely not true.

Another look at the Hodel Parcel aerial photograph raises questions about how the 21 acres of open space for 2 acres of jurisdictional wetlands was accomplished. The EIS states that "[t]he alternate site plan designates the area around the three pools, including a 100-foot (30-meter) buffer, as open space."[ EIS 2.6.2] Using the scale on google maps it can be determined that more than a 100-foot buffer was set aside in some instances: 1) over 400 feet are set aside for open space between the two vernal pools on the west, and 2) about 300 feet is set aside between the vernal pool and the property line on the east. The measurement between the western vernal pools was confirmed on June 8, 2013 by Hodel Family members who found the actual distance to be around 482 feet. The EIS in Alternative 1 states that the Corps will take a 100 foot buffer around each vernal pool, but nowhere does it explain or justify the taking of 300 feet between the buffers.

4

Of the three vernal pools that Alternative 1 designates as open space only one was scored by the CRAM in Aug/Sept 2009. This was followed by an informal walk through in May 2010 (CRAM 2.3, p4) when five other pools in Placer Vineyard were retested. CRAM 2.2 that states *"not every wetland or wetland system on the property was tested. Wetlands and wetland systems that were not assessed were those that were considered to be similar to other nearby wetlands (via aerial photograph interpretation), and therefore [do]not provide any unique information. However, in instances during field surveys when these wetland systems were found to be different, additional AAs were established to incorporate these additional wetlands."* Only one vernal pool (center) was assessed on 1B and as was mentioned earlier, aerial photography was enhanced to make the other "two vernal pools" (northwest and northeast vp) appear to be similar. The one assessed vernal pool, the largest of the three in the center, only received a CRAM rating of C+ (78.531%). The other two pools do not share similar features yet they were not assessed. When Hodel Family accompanied the "group" during both the Aug/Sept assessment and May informal walk through they were assured that the larger vernal pool was not significant, and that the other two were even less so. This was confirmed today, June 8, 2013 during another informal walk through by the Hodel Family.

Finally, it should be noted that the CRAM did not assess the Hodel Parcel vernal pools as a wetlands system because they are not. In order to create a system, however, extra acreage is taken from the Hodel Parcel is taken in order to artificially create a system of vernal pools . This

deprives the Hodel Family of 21 developable acres out of their small 56 acre parcel based on flawed planning.

4

## V. Alternative 1 Is Impractical and Creates Health And Safety Risks As Well As Conflicts In Residential Use

Alternative 1 creates an incompatible land use on the Hodel Parcel – i.e. 21 acres of open space with high density peninsula in the middle. The proposed 21 acres of Open Space on the property has no trees and has yearly weed cover that can grow to 3 feet high. This creates an annual fire danger which requires the Hodels to disk a fire break around their house every year. Fire danger is increased with major roads and increased population (especially high density) within, and surrounding the 21 acres. Additionally, cattle are allowed to graze part of the property to reduce the weeds and fire danger. Cattle droppings draw flies which are a nuisance to residential housing. The combination of fire hazards along with health and safety concerns created by the cattle render the current layout of Alternative 1 impractical.

5

Further, the location of high density development in the middle of open space violates the Corps' own goals and policies where they state that high density should be "along major transportation corridors and transit routes".4 The purpose for this policy is obvious and previous land use proposals for the Hodel Parcel planned accordingly. However, for the sake of preserving three vernal pools which are, in fact, not similar, not significant, and not a system, the EIS is willing to sacrifice its own policy. Beyond this, the EIS report acknowledges that conflicts are created in Alternative 1 by the proposed proximity of high density residential and low density residential. They further suggest that those conflicts might be severe. The Hodels are concerned that if the "severity of potential conflicts" cannot be avoided then land uses, developable units, and property value would suffer. The only solution for this problem would for the Corps to reconsider the taking of some, if not all, vernal pools on the Hodel Parcel so that residential land use could be planned to best meet the needs of the people who live there. This would also be the most equitable for the Hodels, a small, single parcel which has been excessively and unfairly burdened by the Corps' taking of 21 acres for 2 acres of jurisdictional wetlands.5

4 *See, e.g.*, Goal 1B: "To provide adequate land in a range of residential densities to accommodate the housing needs of all income groups expected to reside in Placer County"; Policy 1.B.1: "The County shall promote the concentration of new residential development in higher-density residential areas located along major transportation corridors and transit routes."

5 "The high-density residential land use could conflict with low-density residential uses to the west on Parcel 5A. However, as described above, development of these uses would be guided by the goals, policies and guidelines contained in the Specific Plan and existing County regulations which would reduce the severity of potential conflicts." 3.11-14

KASSOUNI LAW



For the foregoing reasons, Alternative 1 is highly infeasible, extremely unfair, and detrimental for the value and use of the Hodel Parcel. Alternative 1 open space, 21 acres, along with Placer Vineyards Road and Parks easements, 5 acres, reduces the developable property from 56 acres to 30 acres, a reduction in potential value by 46%. The Hodel family is a small land owner by comparison to the larger Placer Vineyards Developers. The two acres of alleged "jurisdictional wetlands" do not justify the taking of 21 acres of open space, therefore Alternate 1 should be altered significantly to address the foregoing concerns.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

Timothy V. Kassouni

**Letter D: Kassouni Law, Timothy V. Kassouni on behalf of Hodel Family Enterprises, L.P., dated June 10, 2013**

**Response D-1**

Based on the wetlands delineation that was submitted to the USACE by the Applicant for the Hodel parcel and a field verification conducted by USACE, the USACE determined that the water features on the parcel are waters of the U.S. pursuant to the Clean Water Act. If the Applicant would like a re-evaluation of the USACE's determination, the Applicant will need to submit a revised wetlands delineation and provide evidence in support of the claim that the project site wetlands are not jurisdictional. The USACE will evaluate the information and inform the Applicant of its determination.

**Response D-2**

Both NEPA and Section 404(b)(1) process require an evaluation of alternatives to the Proposed Action. As the Proposed Action would result in the filling of wetlands on the Hodel parcel, the USACE must evaluate alternatives that avoid or minimize that impact. The alternative put forth in the Draft EIS is a reasonable alternative and was therefore evaluated in the document. Once the Final EIS is completed, the USACE will conduct further evaluation of the alternatives pursuant to Section 404(b)(1) of the Clean Water Act to identify the LEDPA. The USACE's final determination will be included in the ROD, and a decision whether to issue or deny the permits will be made once the ROD is prepared. Please note that the USACE will consider all of the Hodel Family comments in its evaluation of alternatives under Section 404(b)(1), including the concern that the restrictions imposed by Alternative 1 on the use of the Hodel parcel may constitute a regulatory taking.

**Response D-3**

As discussed in the Draft EIS (pages 2.0-10 and 11), the USACE conducted a California Rapid Assessment Method (CRAM) analysis of the wetland resources on the PVSP project site to identify areas where avoidance of wetlands would be most beneficial. Based on the results of the CRAM analysis, the USACE in consultation with U.S. EPA identified five areas on the project site where the potential for further avoidance of wetlands should be further evaluated. From these areas, five focused avoidance alternatives were defined which included the development of the rest of the project site per the PVSP and additional avoidance of wetland resources in each of the five avoidance areas. Alternative 1 is one of the five additional avoidance alternatives developed for the NEPA document in this manner. These alternatives focus preservation on locations with higher densities of aquatic resources, and on aquatic resources of greater quality relative to the aquatic resources on the PVSP site as whole, as measured by the CRAM.

The land use diagram for the Hodel parcel under Alternative 1 differs from the land use diagram for the same property under the No Action Alternative because the requirement to obtain a Section 404 permit from the USACE under the No Action alternative is avoided by simply not filling the  However, the avoidance of wetlands under the No Action Alternative does not avoid indirect impacts to listed species present in the vernal pools or prevent habitat fragmentation. Therefore, Alternative 1 was developed to encompass all three vernal pools within one open space area to avoid habitat fragmentation and indirect impacts on listed species. Furthermore, to avoid fragmentation, the roadway that previously bisected the

parcel was relocated to the south. As a result of these changes, the total area of open space under this alternative increased to 21 acres. In summary, to avoid direct and indirect impacts to the waters of the U.S. and invertebrate habitat on this parcel, under this alternative, about 21 acres would be preserved as open space and residential development would be clustered in the areas indicated on the graphic for this alternative.

As stated in the Draft EIS, the CRAM analysis tested some of the wetlands on the site and applied the results of the tested wetlands to other nearby wetlands. The average CRAM score of the evaluated features on the entire PVSP site was 69.1 and the scores ranged from a low of 50.8 to a high of 80.7. Based on the CRAM rating of 78.53 for the center vernal pool on the Hodel parcel and the presence of the other two large vernal pools near the center vernal pool, the parcel was determined to be one of five properties on the PVSP site where additional avoidance of wetlands would be most beneficial.

As noted above, once the Final EIS is completed, the USACE will conduct further evaluation of the alternatives pursuant to Section 404(b)(1) of the Clean Water Act to identify the LEDPA. The USACE's final determination will be included in the ROD. Please note the USACE will consider all of the Hodel Family comments in its evaluation of alternatives under Section 404(b)(1) of the Clean Water Act.

**Response D-4**

The graphics presented in the Draft EIS are not photo-shopped as stated in the comment. On most of the graphics, different colors were used to depict the proposed land uses such as low density, medium and high-density residential, commercial, institutional uses, roads, open space, roads, and water features. Blue is used in the graphics to show water features that would otherwise not be discernible given the scale of the aerial photos.

Please refer to **Response D-3**, above which explains why additional land around the three vernal pools was designated open space under Alternative 1.

**Response D-5**

Fire management tactics are discussed in depth in Section, 3.13 Public Services under Impact PUB-2. Concerns regarding compatibility of cattle grazing and residential uses are analyzed in Section 3.2, Agricultural Resources under Impact AG-2. As noted above, once the Final EIS is completed, the USACE will conduct further evaluation of the alternatives pursuant to Section 404(b)(1) of the Clean Water Act to identify the LEDPA. The USACE's final determination will be included in the ROD. The USACE will consider the Hodel Family comments regarding the practicability and additional impacts on the human environment that would result from the implementation of Alternative 1 in its evaluation of alternatives under Section 404(b)(1) of the Clean Water Act.

**Letter E**

SIERRA CLUB
FOUNDED 1892
Mother Lode Chapter

SIERRA FOOTHILLS AUDUBON SOCIETY

June 10, 2013

Will Ness, Project Manager
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District
1325 J Street, Room 1350
Sacramento, CA 95814-2922

Sent via email: william.w.ness@usace.army.mil

**Subject: Comments on SPK-1999-00737-DEIS for the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan**

Dear Mr. Ness,

This comment letter supersedes our 2007 comments in response to the PN/NOI in which we expressed concerns that the project's approach to avoidance, minimization and mitigation of vernal pools was inadequate. Since we submitted our comments in 2007, we have worked with the project proponents, Placer County, and SACOG on an environmentally preferred approach that best supports regional planning and conservation goals for Western Placer County while meeting the requirements of State and Federal law. Based on the additional detail and explanation provided through that process, we are now supportive of the proposed project and believe that it represents the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA) for the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan.

1

In line with the fundamental principles of conservation biology, the proposed plan reflects the ecological reality that the integrity of vernal pool wetlands is best sustained within a landscape of large interconnected upland habitat. In contrast, onsite avoidance of smaller vernal pool preserves surrounded by urban growth suffers over time from the deterioration of the natural system's biological function. Accordingly, the proposed project focuses on offsite conservation and restoration of naturally functioning vernal pool landscapes, while preserving and enhancing other important aquatic resources and adjacent features on site.

We also support the currently proposed mitigation strategy, consistent with the revised CEQA mitigation measures adopted by Placer County September 11, 2012. We developed this Mitigation Strategy jointly with the project proponents in consultation with Placer County,

SACOG and others, specifically for application to Placer Vineyards. It reflects the best available science on vernal pool biology, including local information associated with the proposed Placer County Conservation Plan (PCCP). While it is obviously impractical to identify the exact location of mitigation sites at this point for such a large plan with so many independent projects that will develop over a long period of time, the proposed Mitigation Strategy provides sufficient detail regarding the targeted mitigation area and other qualitative requirements as to ensure appropriate mitigation in a manner that will provide a smooth transition for the PCCP if and when adopted.

Based upon the best available science and in order to assure compatibility with the PCCP, if adopted, the proposed mitigation strategy addresses no net loss in the context of vernal pool complexes and associated grasslands, rather than addressing wet acre impacts and mitigation ratios in isolation. As a result, compensatory mitigation achieves no net loss in the context of functioning ecosystems, which increases functions and values. Other qualitative components of the PCCP incorporated into the proposed mitigation strategy include targeted locational criteria coordinated with Placer County and SACOG to reduce impacts from future urbanization and enhance the potential for connectivity, minimum acreage requirements for preserves to reduce edge effects, and a strong preference for restoration over creation that emphasizes quality over quantity but limits opportunities for compensatory mitigation. For consistency with the PCCP and based on the best available science, there is no attempt to draw firm distinctions between impacts to vernal pools and other associated wetlands within vernal pool grasslands since such distinctions are often artificial and ignore the way these features function together in a natural landscape. Since these distinctions are blurred when assessing impacts, some flexibility is appropriately provided for out of kind compensatory mitigation.

1

We believe this approach is sound whether or not the PCCP is ultimately adopted or utilized by projects in the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan. On its own, because of the scale of the project, applying the proposed avoidance, minimization and mitigation strategy to the development of the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan will make a significant contribution toward regional conservation of vernal pool and grassland habitat. As a bonus, the avoidance, minimization and mitigation will be compatible with the proposed PCCP if and when adopted. Offsite habitat conservation provided by the project will be within the Reserve Acquisition Area of the PCCP, where threats from future urban development should not occur. Vernal pool conservation reserves will generally be a minimum of 200 acres, unless the site is contiguous with other reserve lands. The proposed mitigation strategy is the approach most likely to contribute to the establishment of a system of large, connected reserve areas that will provide the most long-term environmental benefit.

We believe the proposed project represents the LEDP A for the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan. We encourage your approval of the proposed project along with the regional approach to conservation as embodied in the proposed avoidance, minimization and mitigation strategy. The

proposed project and mitigation strategy meets the avoidance, minimization and compensatory requirements of the CWA §404(b)(I) Guidelines, while at the same time ensuring the long-term biological function of vernal pools and vernal pool grassland habitat. 1

Please feel free to contact us regarding these comments.

Sincerely,

Terry Davis
Director
Mother Lode Chapter Sierra Club
909 12th Street, Suite 202
Sacramento, CA 95814
916 557-1100 ext. 108
terry.davis@sierraclub.org

Ed Pandolfino
Conservation Co-Chair
Sierra Foothills Audubon Society
ERPfromCA@aol.com

**Letter E: Sierra Club/Sierra Foothills Audubon Society, Terry Davis and Ed Pandolfino, dated June 10, 2013**

**Response E-1**

The comments from Sierra Club and Sierra Foothills Audubon Society in support of the Proposed Action as LEDPA and the Applicants' draft Mitigation Strategy are noted.

**Letter No. F**

MIWOK MAIDU United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria

Gene Whitehouse, Chairman | John L. Williams, Vice Chairman | Danny Rey, Secretary | Brenda Adams, Treasurer | Calvin Moman, Council Member

June 17, 2013

William Ness
California North Branch Office
Regulatory Division, Sacramento District
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
1325 J Street, Room 1350
Sacramento, California 95814-2922

Subject: SPK-1999-00737, DEIS for the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan, Placer County

Dear Mr. Ness,

Thank you for requesting information regarding the above referenced project. The United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC) of the Auburn Rancheria is comprised of Miwok and Southern Maidu (Nisenan) people whose tribal lands are within Placer County and ancestral territory spans into El Dorado, Nevada, Sacramento, Sutter, and Yuba counties. The UAIC is concerned about development within its aboriginal territory that has potential to impact the lifeways, cultural sites, and landscapes that may be of sacred or ceremonial significance. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this and other projects in your jurisdiction.

UAIC's Environmental Services Department has reviewed the following document, *SPK-1999-00737, Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIR) for the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan, Placer County*, and has the following recommendations:

P. 3.6-2, Section 3.6.1 INTRODUCTION
The UAIC understands that the measures to complete the identification, evaluation of significance, and resolution of adverse effect (mitigation of significant impacts) to significant cultural resources will be stipulated through the development and execution of a Programmatic Agreement (PA) with a programmatic Historic Property Management Plan (HPMP). It is important to note right away that NOT all archaeological work described herein was conducted by or under the direct supervision of archaeologists who meet the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for prehistoric and historical archaeology. 1

P. .3.6-2, 3.6.2 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT, 3.6.2.1 Study Area and Project Area of Potential Effects (APE)
The Placer Vineyards Specific Plan (PVSP) proposes extensive residential and commercial development, parks and other open space, and associated infrastructure, over a period of about 30 to 40 years; this Proposed Action will drastically modify the landscape from its current native state. 2

Tribal Office 10720 Indian Hill Road Auburn, CA 95603 (530) 883-2390 FAX (530) 883-2380

P. 3.6-4, 3.6.2.2 Regional Prehistory, Ethnography and History
Update Maidu and Miwok prehistory and history references in the archaeological reports. Update Prehistory section to include Martis/Kings Beach complex and such Nisenan sources as Sheri Tatsch, Terry L. Jones and Kathryn Klar, and Moratto. Additional ethnographic sources include Littlejohn, Riddell, and Merriam. The DEIR includes some but not all of these references. Additional discussion on the Native American settlers and ethnographic informants that inhabited the project area is needed. 3

P. 3.6-15, 3.6.4.2 Analysis Methods, Archaeological Surveys
None of Ric Windmiller's reports meet the DOI SOI Standards and Qualifications and are not adequate for compliance with NEPA and Section 106. 4

UAIC requests a resurvey of Dry Creek using tribal monitors. We would like any additional features found recorded on DPR forms and site records updated.

P. 3.6-18, Efforts to Identify Potential Buried Archaeological Deposits
Efforts to identify potential buried archaeological deposits should include review of existing burial data from previous excavations and collections being held in curation facilities. The corridors along Dry Creek (which runs along the southeastern boundary of the PVSP site and within the APEs of some off-site improvements) and its major tributaries (primarily in the eastern part of the project area) should be considered to be highly sensitive for the potential presence of buried prehistoric cultural deposits. 5

P. 3.6-18, Results of Previous Cultural Resources Identification and Evaluation
As noted by both ECORP Consulting and the UAIC, the Ric Windmiller survey reports incorrectly plot or make reference to unlocated resources. The UAIC recommends all sites are relocated and adequately evaluated in accordance to the DOI SOI Standards and Qualifications and are not adequate for compliance with NEPA and Section 106. Many of Windmiller's evaluations are premature and were done for CEQA compliance, not Section 106. Therefore formal evaluation will be required that will need to comply with Section 106.

The evaluation should include acknowledgement that the prehistoric significance of the area as an archaeological district and the resources on the project as contributing elements to the Dry Creek archaeological district. Reevaluate resources and reconsider Criteria A, B, and C. The UAIC contends that all of the prehistoric resources on-site are contributing elements to the Nisenan district and its territories. 6

In the absence of physical evidence or inability to relocate resources, a formal significance assessment and test program should be carried out in compliance with federal regulations. If possible UAIC would like copes of GIS data and shapefiles for all the cultural resources in the project area.

In consultation with the appropriate Native American tribes, USACE will identify Historic Properties of traditional religious and cultural importance including landscapes, ecological knowledge, lifeways, and traditional cultural properties.

P. 3.6-18, 3.6.5 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND MITIGATION MEASURES
All parties should prepare, Execute, and Implement a Memorandum of Agreement to supplement the Programmatic Agreement with Programmatic Historic Properties Treatment Plan and Project-Specific Treatment Plans. The UAIC would like to participate in the review of the 7

Tribal Office 10720 Indian Hill Road Auburn, CA 95603 (530) 883-2390 FAX (530) 883-2380

MOA/PA and sign both documents as a Concurring Party. The MOA should be prepared in the development of the Proposed Action and adverse effects to the existing landscape, lifeways, and ecological features and knowledge. This should be considered at the Programmatic Level since all of this will permanently alter the landscape as previously stated in the DEIR, by piece-mealing it out at the project level will not consider the overall adverse and cumulative effects that the Dry Creek Archaeological District will endure.

The UAIC would like to provide input on the identification, evaluation, and proposed treatment of historic properties. In addition, the FEIR should be updated to reflect the May 23, 2013, field visit between UAIC, USACE, and ECORP Consulting and describe the field conditions, sites visited and submit site record update forms.

7

UAIC's Environmental Services Department has reviewed the following documents, *SPK-1999-00737, Programmatic Agreement between the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the California Office of Historic Preservation and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (TBD) regarding the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan, Placer County*, and has the following recommendations:

The UAIC accepts the invitation to Review the Programmatic Agreement (PA) and Requests Concurring Party Status. The UAIC would like to know when the Historic Property Treatment Plan will be developed and would like to participate in the review and approval process. It is understood that no Section 404 permits will be issued by the Corps under the PVSP until all cultural resources issues have been adequately addresses and mitigated. The Regional General Permit for the PVSP Proposed Action should include a MOA to deal with adverse effects to the landscape, lifeways, and ecological knowledge of the local indigenous populations.

Stipulation 3, Permit APE's for Specific Projects: Historic Property Identification and Evaluation.
Project level permit issuances should not be allowed to piecemeal contributing elements to the district or components of archaeological sites.
G. Draft copies of the survey, evaluation, or any other type of cultural resources report should be reviewed concurrently with the SHPO.

8

Stipulation 4, Project-Specific Determinations of Effect.
A. The UAIC would like to be consulted on Determinations of Effect and have the opportunity to review and provide comments.

9

Stipulation 5, Historic Property Treatment Plans
A. UAIC would like to be included here;
B. see above Stipulation 5, A.

C. see above Stipulation 5, A.
The UAIC requests to be involved throughout the consultation process for Stipulations A, B, and C, and recommends a separate Treatment and Disposition agreement be developed to deal with potential discoveries.

10

Stipulation 6, Review of Historic Property Treatment Plan.
We request to remain included in the review process for the HPTP and would like to receive 3 final hard and digital copies of the HPTP.

11

Tribal Office 10720 Indian Hill Road Auburn, CA 95603 (530) 883-2390 FAX (530) 883-2380

Stipulation 9, Public Involvement and Native American Involvement.
The UAIC is a sovereign nation and a formal government. It is believed that additional time will be needed to address the TCP, landscape, archaeological district, and ethnohistorical concern of the area. This will include interviewing tribal elders. 12

E. UAIC would like to review and comment on draft copies of the survey and evaluation reports, and receive final hard and digital copies as stated in Stipulation 6.

Stipulation 10, Modifications and Additions to Off-site Infrastructure
We would like to be invited to consult on and review any proposed project areas on- or off-site. 13

Stipulation 11, Discovery of Unanticipated Human Remains
If any human remains are located the UAIC would like to be contacted immediately. 14

Stipulation 12, Curation
The UAIC recommends that no artifacts be taken and that all archaeological material be reburied immediately after excavation and in-field analysis. If the Corps determines it necessary to take cultural material and curate it then this should be done in consultation with the UAIC. We would like all associated NAGPRA collections repatriated and archaeological collections removed during excavation returned and reburied on site. 15

Stipulation 13, Treatment of Human Remains and Associated Objects
There needs to be a Native American Treatment and Disposition agreement and MOA developed in order to ensure that remains, grave goods, items of cultural patrimony, and sacred objects encountered during the undertaking are treated with respect, dignity and in accordance with Section 5097 of the Public Resources Code. 16

Stipulation 14, Professional Qualifications and Standards
It is understood that many of the survey and evaluation reports were prepared under CEQA permitting conditions and do not meet the requirements set forth in the Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualification Standards (36 CFR Part 61). All reports, existing reports and any newly prepared reports will have to comply with Section 106 requirements, standards, and guidelines. It is also important that the Corps ensure the individual/s conducting the ethnographic and ethnohistorical work conducted pursuant to the PA, HPMP, HPTP, and MOA be carried out by the requirements set forth in the Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualification Standards (36 CFR Part 61), Bulletin 38, and Preservation Brief 36. 17

UAIC's Environmental Services Department has reviewed the following documents, *SPK-1999-00737, Historic Properties Management Plan, Placer Vineyards Specific Plan, Placer County, ECORP Project No. 2001-196.1,* and has the following recommendations:

P. 13, CONTEXT, 3.2 Cultural Context
The Ethnographic Context should:

- continue to the current date, rather than ending with the Great Depression;
- reference that the project area is within the service area and ancestral territory of the United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria; 18
- reference contemporary cultural events and connections to Roseville (the Roseville Maidu Museum can provide you with descriptions of dances, celebrations, art, food and other information describing contemporary cultural context);

Tribal Office 10720 Indian Hill Road Auburn, CA 95603 (530) 883-2390 FAX (530) 883-2380

- describe the ethnographic village of *Pitchiku* (Littlejohn 1928, Tatsch 2006, Wilson & Towne 1978);
- characterize the unique resources and landscape of the Placer Vineyard area within the Nisenan community (with an emphasis on the Dry Creek corridor);
- We recommend the following references to supplement your Ethnographic Context and Prehistoric Archaeology sections:
    - H.R. 4228, 103rd Cong. (1994). The Auburn Indian Restoration Act.
    - Bibby, Brian
      2005 Deeper than Gold: Indian life in the Sierra foothills. Berkeley: Heyday Books.
    - Davis, Leonard M.
      1981 Rocklin, past, present, future : an illustrated history of Rocklin, Placer County, California, from 1864 to 1981. Roseville, Calif.: Rocklin Friends of the Library.
    - Hogeland, Kim and L. Frank
      2007 First Families: A Photographic History of California Indians. Berkeley, CA: Heyday Books.
    - Johnson, Jerald J., and Melissa Farncomb
      2005 Archaeological Field Manual, California State University, Sacramento. 7 (Institute of Archaeology and Cultural Studies). Institute of Archaeology and Cultural Studies, Department of Anthropology, California State University, Sacramento.
    - Littlejohn, Hugh
      1928 Nisenan geography: field notes and manuscript. Ethnological Documents of the Department and Museum of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley, 1875-1958 . Bancroft Library, Berkeley, CA.
    - Rosenthal, Jeffrey S., Gregory G. White, and Mark Q. Sutton
      2007 The Central Valley: A View from the Catbird's Seat. *In* California Prehistory: Colonization, Culture and Complexity. T.L. Jones and K.A. Klar, eds. Pp. 147-164. Lanham, MD: Altamira Press.
    - Tatsch, Sheri Jean
      2006 The Nisenan: Dialects & Districts of A Speech Community, Native American Studies, University of California, Davis.

18

Your extensive use of the Wallace (1978) Northern Valley Yokuts reference as a source for the Prehistoric Archaeology of PVSP is not appropriate to the Roseville area, which is in Nisenan territory; Moratto (1985), Elsasser (1978); Johnson (2005) and Rosenthal et al (2007) are more regionally and culturally appropriate sources for the discussion of prehistoric archaeology. We recommend that you update Maidu and Miwok prehistory and history references in the archaeological reports. Update Prehistory section to include Martis/Kings Beach complex and such Nisenan sources as Sheri Tastch, Terry L. Jones and Kathryn Klar, and Moratto. Additional ethnographic sources include Littlejohn, Riddell, and Merriam.

P. 23, 4.3, Curation

The UAIC recommends that no artifacts be taken and that all archaeological material be reburied immediately after excavation and in-field analysis. If the Corps determines it necessary to take cultural material and curate it this should be done in consultation and under a formal memorandum of agreement with the Tribe. We would like all associated NAGPRA collections repatriated and archaeological collections removed during excavation returned and reburied on site.

19

Tribal Office 10720 Indian Hill Road Auburn, CA 95603 (530) 883-2390 FAX (530) 883-2380

P. 23, IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES
Your baseline research should include consultation with cultural resources staff and a request from the UAIC's Tribal Historic Resources Information System. 20

P. 26, Subsurface Testing of Prehistoric and Historic Archaeological Sites
The UAIC Tribal Historic Preservation Officer would like to be contacted prior to initiation of subsurface excavation.

Danny Rey, THPO
United Auburn Indian Community
10720 Indian Hill,
Auburn, California 95603
530-883-2350
dannyr@auburnrancheria.com 21

Prior to formal excavations a tribal treatment plan needs to be developed. Tribal monitors are recommended during all ground disturbing actives or discoveries associated with Native American human remains or artifacts.

P. 34, 6.2 Native American Organizations and Concurring Parties
The UAIC requests to be a Concurring Party on any agreements developed for the Proposed Action and specific projects. 22

P. 35, 7.0 Assessment of Effects
The UAIC would like to review and comment on any Finding or Determinations of Effect submitted to the Corps or SHPO for review and assessment. 23

P. 36, 8.0 Resolution of Adverse Effects
Resolution of Adverse Effects should be accomplished in consultation with the affected Tribe/s, including UAIC. 24

P. 36, Treatment
UAIC appreciates the opportunity to draft and review a Historic Properties Treatment Plan (HPTP) and any other associated documents; and, requires a separate Treatment and Disposition Plan be developed for the appropriate protocols that conform to the Native American beliefs. If necessary a curation agreement should also be developed at this time. 25

The UAIC would also like to make a few general points for consideration in developing the scope and content of the Placer Vineyards SP Draft Environmental Impact Reports (DEIR):

- The UAIC recommends that projects within the Placer Vineyards SP DEIR jurisdiction be designed to incorporate known cultural sites into open space or other protected areas;
- The UAIC is interested in holding conservation easements for culturally significant prehistoric sites; 26
- We would like all associated NAGPRA collections repatriated and archaeological collections removed during excavation returned and reburied on site;
- The UAIC recommends that no collection or curation of Native American artifacts or human remain take place. If the Corps determines it necessary to take cultural material and curate it then this should be done in consultation with the UAIC;

Tribal Office 10720 Indian Hill Road Auburn, CA 95603 (530) 883-2390 FAX (530) 883-2380

- The UAIC would like the opportunity to provide Tribal representatives to monitor projects if excavation and data recovery are required for prehistoric cultural sites, or in cases where ground disturbance is proposed at or near sensitive cultural resources; 26
- The UAIC requests no removal of artifacts from archaeological sites, and it is interested in receiving cultural materials from prehistoric sites where excavation and data recovery has been performed;
- The UAIC would like to receive copies of environmental notices and documents for projects within the jurisdiction of the DIER. 27

The UAIC is interested in preserving and protecting all prehistoric resources within our Service Area; therefore we welcome efforts that afford the greatest protection of cultural sites and landscapes. Evaluation of cultural resources offers this opportunity. We look forward to continuing this dialogue with the US Army Corps. Please contact Marcos Guerrero, Cultural Resources Manager, at (530) 883-2364 or email at mguerrero@auburnrancheria.com if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Gene Whitehouse,
Chairman

CC: Marcos Guerrero, CRM

Tribal Office 10720 Indian Hill Road Auburn, CA 95603 (530) 883-2390 FAX (530) 883-2380

**Letter F: Miwok Maidu United Auburn Indian Community, Gene Whitehouse, dated June 17, 2013**

**General Response**

The comment letter raises various issues regarding the cultural resources surveys and evaluations of the Specific Plan Area performed to date and mitigation that will be implemented to minimize the impacts of Specific Plan development on historic properties. Portions of the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan (PVSP) area has been subjected to baseline cultural resources surveys and evaluations by a professional archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for archaeology. Based on these studies, the USACE was able to develop a baseline cultural context statement for the plan area that provides sufficient information about potential effects to historic properties for the purposes of a programmatic-level analysis. Based on this information, the USACE concluded that historic properties are likely to be affected as developments are sought under the Specific Plan over the duration of the project. However, not all areas in the PVSP have been surveyed at this time and specific effects to historic properties cannot be assessed until project-specific development permit applications are considered under the PVSP, consultation for that permit will be carried out pursuant to a Programmatic Agreement (PA) under section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). The project-specific consultation for each property will be directed by the PA and Historic Property Management Plan (HPMP), which has been drafted and submitted to the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and other consulting parties for their review and comment. The PA will be signed prior to the issuance of the PVSP Regional General Permit by the USACE, SHPO, and other appropriate parties. The PA and HPMP specify the Section 106 process that will be followed by the USACE and individual applicants who will need to demonstrate compliance with applicable standards and guidelines in survey, inventory, evaluation of eligibility, and finding of effect for individual resources and potential districts. Through this process, previously unrecorded cultural resources – such as buildings that become historic in age, unrecorded archaeological sites, or historic or prehistoric districts – may be identified and would be subject to evaluation and, if eligible and subject to adverse effects, mitigated pursuant to the PA and HPMP.

**Response F-1**

Comment noted. Please see the **General Response**, above.

**Response F-2**

The landscape of the Specific Plan Area has been modified over many years, as a result of active grazing, agricultural activities, homesteading, and adjacent residential and commercial development. As noted in the Draft EIS page 3.6-3 through -4, the viewshed of the Specific Plan area includes mixed-use rural residential development, scattered rural residences, and new residential subdivisions. The Specific Plan Area itself is also disturbed, as it contains some rural residences and has been historically used for dry farming, cattle grazing, and rice cultivation. Although the current landscape no longer represents its native (pre-European contact) state, the USACE acknowledges that full buildout will alter the Specific Plan area from its current state and this may cause adverse effects to historic or prehistoric cultural resources.

**Response F-3**

The archaeological reports submitted for this project have already been accepted as final. However, references will be noted for future reports. Technical reports prepared under the Programmatic Agreement will be required to include an appropriate cultural context statement, which may include, but would not be limited to, the references suggested here.

**Response F-4**

Comment noted. Please see the **General Response**, above. All future studies will be carried out under the methods and standards stipulated in the HPMP, which ensures compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards, and other relevant standards and guidelines.

Please see the **General Response**, above. Because Dry Creek crosses multiple property lines that may or may not be included in the PVSP, a resurvey of this area at this time is not possible due to multiple permissions required to access the Dry Creek corridor which are not currently granted, and would not change the findings of the EIS. However, each applicant for a Section 404 permit within the Specific Plan Area will be required to provide technical reports that comply with the PA and HPMP. This will include a survey of each permit area carried out by or under the direct supervision of qualified professional consultants. In some instances, the USACE may determine a resurvey of previously surveyed areas will be warranted, if survey standards specified in the HPMP are not met by previous surveys. All technical studies will be required to record newly identified sites on Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) -series site records, and to update existing site records with new information. The request for tribal monitors to be included on consultant survey teams has been noted for future reference and will be handled on a case-by-case basis.

**Response F-5**

Comment noted. Please see the **General Response**, above. Consultants carrying out technical studies under the PA will be required to make a good faith effort to seek out all available information that may inform their studies and the USACE before a permit decision is made.

**Response F-6**

Please see the **General Response**, above. The USACE will take into account all sources of information related to sites previously recorded in the Specific Plan Area. Efforts will be made to relocate and properly identify previously recorded sites as prescribed by the PA and HPMP. All future technical reports prepared under the PA are required to meet specific mapping accuracy thresholds and will be required to provide sufficient information as prescribed in the PA in order for the USACE to make eligibility determinations under the Criteria for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places.

The USACE has concluded there is not sufficient information currently available to determine whether or not a National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-eligible archaeological district exists. However, as noted in the **General Response**, should previously unrecorded historic properties, including any archaeological district, be identified in the future, impacts to such resources would be addressed implementation of the PA and HPMP. All technical studies carried out under the PA will include an

evaluation of eligibility to the NRHP under all criteria, using all available data and in consideration of individual resources and the relationship between individual resources in a district, if present. More specific information about the presence of a prehistoric archaeological district is welcomed as part of ongoing government-to-government consultation and will be taken into consideration as part of individual permit decisions, but does not change the findings of the EIS.

In accordance with the PA and HPMP, evaluations of eligibility and significance will include subsurface testing, if archaeological deposits are known or suspected. The USACE will continue to consult with the Tribes (including the United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria [UAIC]) as individual permits are processed, and the UAIC may request site information through that forum. In general however, GIS data and shape files of confidential cultural resources are excluded from the public record under Exemption 3 of the federal Freedom of Information Act (5 USC § 552). This type of information is also protected under Section 304 of the NHPA.

Consultation between the Native American community and the USACE is ongoing.

**Response F-7**

Please see the **General Response** and **Response F-6**, above. Should a determination be made that a NRHP-eligible archaeological district exists, then the impacts to the district would be addressed and resolved through the Section 106 process set forth in the PA and HPMP. This would ensure that the impacts of future USACE permitting actions affecting any such district would be evaluated and mitigated accordingly. The USACE acknowledges receipt of the UAIC's request to be a concurring party to the PA.

The USACE welcomes input on the identification, evaluation, and proposed treatment of historic properties. The Final EIS has been updated to reflect a field visit between the USACE, UAIC, and cultural resources consultant, ECORP, in May 2013. Site record updates and forms have been prepared but cannot be appended to the Final EIS because confidential cultural resources information is protected under Section 304 of the NHPA.

**Response F-8**

Comment taken under advisement. The PA provides for the consideration and appropriate treatment of historic districts as a whole, preventing the approval of project-specific Historic Property Treatment Plans (HPTPs) for development projects which contain a portion of said historic district, in order to prevent inconsistencies in implementation of project-specific HPTPs.

**Response F-9**

Comment taken under advisement. Tribal consultation will continue in accordance with the PA and HPMP, as well as Section 106 of the NHPA and its implementing regulations.

**Response F-10**

Comment taken under advisement. The USACE will consider including concurring parties, including the UAIC, in the review and comment process set forth in the PA for draft technical reports.

**Response F-11**

Comment taken under advisement. The USACE will consider including the UAIC and other parties in the review and comment process set forth in the PA for project-specific HPTPs.

**Response F-12**

Comment taken under advisement. The USACE will consider including concurring parties, including the UAIC, in the review and comment process set forth in the PA for draft technical reports and will provide concurring parties with copies of all final reports.

**Response F-13**

Comment noted.

**Response F-14**

Comment taken under advisement. The USACE will ensure that Native American human remains, grave goods, items of cultural patrimony, and sacred objects encountered within permit areas subject to the PVSP and governed by the PA are treated in accordance with the requirements of Section 7050.5 of the California State Health and Safety Code and Section 5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code The USACE will consider adding a requirement to notify the UAIC of any such discovery to the PA and project-specific HPTPs.

**Response F-15**

Artifact collections that have been or may be generated through this project are not the property of the federal government, and therefore, the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act does not apply to this project. However, your request to have archaeological collections reburied on-site has been noted and will be taken into consideration during project-specific consultation.

**Response F-16**

Please see **Response F-14**, above. The USACE will consider including appropriate language to the PA and/or any project-specific HPTPs regarding the appropriate handling and treatment of Native American human remains, grave goods, items of cultural patrimony, and sacred objects encountered within permit areas subject to the PVSP.

**Response F-17**

Comment noted. Please see the **General Response,** above.

**Response F-18**

The UAIC suggests that the discussion of the Cultural Context in the EIS be further clarified and expanded using a series of recommended references.

The USACE appreciates the information provided by the UAIC, and has added text to the Cultural Context section acknowledging some of the references provided by the UAIC. The revisions to the Draft EIS text are shown in **Chapter 3.0, Errata**. Please also note that the technical reports prepared under the Programmatic Agreement will be required to include an appropriate cultural context statement, which

may include, but is not limited to, the references suggested by the UAIC. Some of the other suggested edits to the Draft EIS text have not been made because while they are useful information, they do not alter the findings of the EIS.

**Response F-19**

Please see **Response F-14 and Response F-15**, above. Your request for consultation regarding the curation of artifact collections which may be generated through this project has been noted and will be taken into consideration during project-specific consultation.

**Response F-20**

Comment noted. Please see the **General Response**, above.

**Response F-21**

Comment noted. Tribal consultation will continue in accordance with the PA and HPMP, as well as Section 106 of the NHPA and its implementing regulations.

**Response F-22**

Comment noted. Tribal consultation will continue in accordance with the PA and HPMP, Section 106 of the NHPA and its implementing regulations, and in accordance with the USACE's Tribal Consultation Policy, Tribal Policy Principles, the Department of Defense's American Indian and Alaska Native Policy, Executive Order 13175, and other applicable policies regarding Government-2-Government consultation.

**Response F-23**

Comment noted. Tribal consultation will continue in accordance with the PA and HPMP, as well as Section 106 NHPA and its implementing regulations.

**Response F-24**

Comment noted. Tribal consultation will continue in accordance with the PA and HPMP, as well as Section 106 NHPA and its implementing regulations. The USACE will involve the Tribes in collaborative processes designed to ensure information exchange, consideration of perspectives, comments, and recommendations, before and during decision making in order to address any adverse effects.

**Response F-25**

Comment noted. Tribal consultation will continue in accordance with the PA and HPMP, as well as Section 106 of the NHPA and its implementing regulations.

**Response F-26**

Comment noted. Please see the **General Response,** above. Tribal consultation will continue in accordance with the PA and HPMP, as well as Section 106 NHPA and its implementing regulations.

**Response F-27**

Comment noted.

# 3.0 ERRATA

## 3.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter shows revisions to the Draft EIS, subsequent to the document's publication and public review. The revisions are presented in the order in which they appear in the Draft EIS and are identified by page number in respective chapters. These revisions are shown as excerpts from the Draft EIS. Strikethrough (~~strikethrough~~) text indicates deletions and underlined (<u>underlined</u>) text indicates additions.

## 3.2 REVISIONS TO THE DRAFT EIS

### Abstract

The second paragraph of the Abstract is revised as follows:

The Proposed Action<u>, which is the Applicant's Preferred Alternative,</u> encompasses two possible scenarios that represent the potential low-end and high-end of the range of development densities that could be developed on the project site: the "Base Plan scenario" and "Blueprint scenario." The development footprint under both scenarios would be the same, though the land use designations and acreages under the various land uses would differ. The "Base Plan" scenario includes: 3,361 acres (1,360 hectares) of residential uses totaling 14,132 single- and multi-family residential units at buildout, 309 acres (125 hectares) of commercial and office uses, 309 acres (125 hectares) of public/quasi-public uses such as schools, 211 acres (85 hectares) of parks, 709 acres (287 hectares) of open space, and ~~331~~<u>332</u> acres (134 hectares) of roadways. The "Blueprint" scenario includes: 3,220 acres (1,303 hectares) of residential uses totaling 21,631 single- and multi-family residential units at buildout, 342 acres (138 hectares) of commercial and office uses, 366 acres (148 hectares) of public/quasi-public uses such as schools, 273 acres (110 hectares) of parks, 709 acres (287 hectares) of open space, and 321 acres (130 hectares) of roadways.

### ES Executive Summary

Table ES-1 on Draft EIS page ES-3 is revised as follows:

**Table ES-1**
**Proposed Action and Alternatives – Acreages by Land Use**

| Alternative | Development Footprint (in acres) | Residential Development (in acres) | Residential Units at Buildout | Other Development (in acres) | Open Space (in acres) | Potential Direct Impacts on Aquatic Resources* <u>(in acres)</u> |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Proposed Action /<u>Applicant's Preferred Alternative</u> – Base Plan | 4,522 | 3,361 | 14,132 | Commercial – 309 | 709 | 119.3 |
| | | | | Public Uses – 309 | | |
| | | | | Parks – 211 | | |
| | | | | Roads – 332 | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Proposed Action/Applicant's Preferred Alternative - Blueprint | 4,522 | 3,220 | ~~21,634~~21,631 | Commercial – 342 | 709 | 119.3 |
| | | | | Public Uses – 366 | | |
| | | | | Parks – 273 | | |
| | | | | Roads – 321 | | |
| No Action Alternative | 3,297 | 2,410 | 8,441 | Commercial – 221 | 1,933 | 0 |
| | | | | Public Uses – 211 | | |
| | | | | Parks – 124 | | |
| | | | | Roads – 332 | | |
| Combined Alternatives 1 through 5 | ~~4,431~~4,429 | 3,267 | 14,132*** | Commercial – 340 | ~~799~~801 | ~~106.4~~110.8 |
| | | | | Public Uses – 293 | | |
| | | | | Parks – 200 | | |
| | | | | Roads – 330 | | |
| Alternative 1 | 4,504 | 3,357 | 14,132*** | Commercial – 310 | 726 | ~~115.1~~116.9 |
| | | | | Public Uses – 301 | | |
| | | | | Parks – 210 | | |
| | | | | Roads – 329 | | |
| Alternative 2 | 4,516 | 3,328 | 14,132*** | Commercial – 340 | 714 | ~~116.4~~118.1 |
| | | | | Public Uses – 307 | | |
| | | | | Parks – 207 | | |
| | | | | Roads – 335 | | |
| Alternative 3 | ~~4,473~~4,472 | 3,322 | 14,132*** | Commercial – 309 | ~~757~~758 | ~~114.3~~115.9 |
| | | | | Public Uses – 304 | | |
| | | | | Parks – 208 | | |
| | | | | Roads – 332 | | |
| Alternative 4** | 4,520 | 3,361 | 14,132*** | Commercial – 309 | ~~711~~710 | ~~119.1~~119.2 |
| | | | | Public Uses – 309 | | |
| | | | | Parks – 211 | | |
| | | | | Roads – 332 | | |
| Alternative 5 | 4,502 | 3,345 | 14,132*** | Commercial – 309 | 728 | ~~117.2~~118.8 |
| | | | | Public Uses – 309 | | |
| | | | | Parks – 208 | | |
| | | | | Roads – 331 | | |

*Note: Due to rounding, the development footprint and open space acreages may not add up to the total project site acreage, with a possibility of 1 to 2 acres difference.*

* *Direct impacts from all development on properties with active DA permit applications and within the Special Planning Area. An estimated 4.2 acres of direct impact expected to result from off-site infrastructure development is included in the reported values.*

** *Implementation of Alternative 4 would be contingent upon implementation of Alternative 3. Therefore, impact value reported for Alternative 4 is inclusive of impact value reported for Alternative 3, above.*

****The number of units that would be built under Alternatives 1 through 5 would be the same as the Proposed Action. This is because to the extent that the number of units to be built on a property is reduced due to the revised footprint, the same number of units would be built on another property by increasing the density, so that the total number of units for the PVSP as a whole would still remain 14,132 (or ~~21,634~~ 21,631 units if Alternatives 1 through 5 are combined with the Blueprint scenario).*

## 2.0 Project Description

The first sentence at the top of Draft EIS page 2.0-25 is revised as follows:

In the event that the long-term water supply facilities are not in place when the initial ARPS supply from the two points of delivery has been fully used, a second initial surface water supply project ~~would~~could be constructed.

Table 2.0-8 on Draft EIS page 2.0-40 is revised as follows:

**Table 2.0-8**
**Alternative 1 – Property 1B Site Land Use Summary (in acres)**

| Land Use | Proposed Action-Base Plan | Proposed Action - Blueprint | Alternative 1 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Low Density Residential | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| Medium Density Residential | 18 | 14 | 22 |
| High Density Residential | 6 | 11 | 8 |
| *Residential Subtotal* | *34* | *25* | *30* |
| Commercial | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Religious Facilities | 9 | 17 | 1 |
| *Public Uses Subtotal* | *9* | *17* | *1* |
| Open Space | 4 | ~~4~~3.5 | 21 |
| Park | 2 | 4 | 1 |
| Roads | 7 | ~~7~~6.5 | 4 |
| *Park, Roads and Open Space Subtotal* | 13 | 14 | 26 |
| **Total** | **56** | **56** | **56** |

Table 2.0-9 on Draft EIS page 2.0-40 is revised as follows:

**Table 2.0-9**
**Alternative 2 – Property 3 Site Land Use Summary (in acres)**

| Land Use | Proposed Action - Base Plan | Proposed Action - Blueprint | Alternative 2 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Medium Density Residential | ~~27~~26.5 | 0 | 0 |
| High Density Residential | 7 | 17 | 0 |
| *Residential Subtotal* | *~~34~~33.5* | *17* | *0* |
| Commercial Mixed Use | 0 | 18 | 0 |
| Commercial | 25 | 25 | ~~56~~63.5 |
| *Commercial Subtotal* | *25* | *43* | *~~56~~63.5* |
| Religious Facilities | 4 | 0 | 2 |
| *Public Uses Subtotal* | *4* | *0* | *2* |
| Open Space | 26 | ~~27~~26.5 | ~~31~~31.4 |
| Park | 4 | 6 | 0 |
| Roads | 8 | 8 | ~~11~~3.6 |
| *Park, Roads and Open Space Subtotal* | *38* | *~~41~~40.5* | *~~42~~35* |
| **Total** | **~~101~~100.5** | **~~101~~100.5** | **~~101~~100.5** |

Section 2.6.4 Alternative 3 and Table 2.0-19 on Draft EIS page 2.0-43 is revised as follows:

## 2.6.4 Alternative 3

Alternative 3 involves an alternative land use plan that would avoid a ~~large~~ cluster of wetlands (totaling approximately 3.4 acres [~~2~~ 1.4 hectares] of jurisdictional wetlands) on Property 16, a 94-acre (38-hectare) property located in the southwestern portion of the project site. The alternate land use plan for this property would increase the acres of open space to about ~~63~~65 acres (~~25~~26 hectares) and would provide a 100-foot (30-meter) buffer between the development area and the wetlands to be avoided. The residential acreage under the alternative would be reduced by about 40 acres (16 hectares) and acreage for religious facilities would be eliminated. Even though the acreage for residential uses would be substantially reduced under Alternative 3, this EIS assumes that the total number of residential units would be the same as the Proposed Action Base Plan scenario. This would be achieved by building the residential units at a higher density in other portions of the project site. The proposed land uses for Property 16 under Alternative 3 are shown in **Figure 2.0-12** and **Table 2.0-10**, below.

**Table 2.0-10**
**Alternative 3 – Property 16 Site Land Use Summary (in acres)**

| Land Use | Proposed Action - Base Plan | Proposed Action - Blueprint | Alternative 3 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Low Density Residential | 43 | 26.5 | 0 |
| Medium Density Residential | 20 | 32.5 | 23.6 |
| High Density Residential | 0 | 4.5 | 0 |
| *Residential Subtotal* | *63* | *63.5* | *23.6* |
| *Commercial Subtotal* | *0* | *0* | *0* |
| Religious Facilities | 5.5 | 5.5 | 0 |
| *Public Uses Subtotal* | *5.5* | *5.5* | *0* |
| Open Space | 16 | 16 | ~~63.4~~65.3 |
| Park | 4 | 4.5 | 1.5 |
| Roads | 5.5 | 4.5 | ~~5.5~~3.6 |
| *Park, Roads and Open Space Subtotal* | *25.5* | *25* | *70.4* |
| | | | |
| **Total** | **94** | **94** | **94** |

Draft EIS text on page 2.0-47 is revised as follows:

### 2.6.7 Combined Alternatives 1 through 5

Combined Alternatives 1 through 5 would involve a land use plan that would be the same as the Proposed Action (either scenario) for all properties that make up the site except for Properties 1B, 3, 16, 17, and 23 where the land use plans presented under Alternatives 1 through 5 would be implemented. As a result filling of an additional ~~9.2~~8.5 acres (~~3.7~~3.4 hectares) of wetlands on Properties 1B, 3, 16, 17, and 23 would be avoided.

This alternative, which alters the development footprint and the amount of development on only five of the PVSP properties, can be combined with either of the two Proposed Action scenarios. While Properties 1B, 3, 16, 17, and 23 would be developed per this combined alternative, the remainder of the PVSP site could be developed at Base Plan densities per the Proposed Action Base Plan or it could be developed at Blueprint densities per the Proposed Action Blueprint scenario. As with Alternatives 1 through 5, the total number of dwelling units that are developed within the PVSP site would remain the same under this alternative (14,132 dwelling units under the Base Plan and 21,631 dwelling units under the Blueprint scenario) because the reduction in the number of units developed on Properties 1B, 3, 16, 17, and 23 (about 84 units) would be offset by developing other portions of the project site at slightly higher densities.

Table 2.0-13 on Draft EIS page 2.0-48 is revised as follows:

**Table 2.0-13**
**Proposed Action and Alternatives – Acreages by Land Use**

| Alternative | Development Footprint (in acres) | Residential Development (in acres) | Residential Units at Buildout | Other Development (in acres) | Open Space (in acres) | Potential Direct Impacts on Aquatic Resources* (in acres) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Proposed Action – Base Plan | 4,522 | 3,361 | 14,132 | Commercial – 309 | 709 | 119.3 |
| | | | | Public Uses – 309 | | |
| | | | | Parks – 211 | | |
| | | | | Roads – 332 | | |
| Proposed Action - Blueprint | 4,522 | 3,220 | ~~21,634~~21,631 | Commercial – 342 | 709 | 119.3 |
| | | | | Public Uses – 366 | | |
| | | | | Parks – 273 | | |
| | | | | Roads – 321 | | |
| No Action Alternative | 3,297 | 2,410 | 8,441 | Commercial – 221 | 1,933 | 0 |
| | | | | Public Uses – 211 | | |
| | | | | Parks – 124 | | |
| | | | | Roads – 332 | | |
| Combined Alternatives 1 through 5 | ~~4,431~~4,429 | 3,267 | 14,132*** | Commercial – 340 | ~~799~~801 | ~~106.4~~110.8 |
| | | | | Public Uses – 293 | | |
| | | | | Parks – 200 | | |
| | | | | Roads – 330 | | |
| Alternative 1 | 4,504 | 3,357 | 14,132*** | Commercial – 310 | 726 | ~~115.1~~116.9 |
| | | | | Public Uses – 301 | | |
| | | | | Parks – 210 | | |
| | | | | Roads – 329 | | |
| Alternative 2 | 4,516 | 3,328 | 14,132*** | Commercial – 340 | 714 | ~~116.4~~118.1 |
| | | | | Public Uses – 307 | | |
| | | | | Parks – 207 | | |
| | | | | Roads – 335 | | |
| Alternative 3 | ~~4,473~~4,472 | 3,322 | 14,132*** | Commercial – 309 | ~~757~~758 | ~~114.3~~115.9 |
| | | | | Public Uses – 304 | | |
| | | | | Parks – 208 | | |
| | | | | Roads – 332 | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alternative 4** | 4,520 | 3,361 | 14,132*** | Commercial – 309 | ~~711~~710 | ~~119.1~~119.2 |
| | | | | Public Uses – 309 | | |
| | | | | Parks – 211 | | |
| | | | | Roads – 332 | | |
| Alternative 5 | 4,502 | 3,345 | 14,132*** | Commercial – 309 | 728 | ~~117.2~~118.1 |
| | | | | Public Uses – 309 | | |
| | | | | Parks – 208 | | |
| | | | | Roads – 331 | | |

*Note: Due to rounding, the development footprint and open space acreages may not add up to the total project site acreage, with a possibility of 1 to 2 acres difference.*

* *Direct impacts from all development on properties with active DA permit applications and within the Special Planning Area. An estimated 4.2 acres of direct impact expected to result from off-site infrastructure development is included in the reported values.*

** *Implementation of Alternative 4 would be contingent upon implementation of Alternative 3. Therefore, impact value reported for Alternative 4 is inclusive of impact value reported for Alternative 3, above.*

****The number of units that would be built under Alternatives 1 through 5 would be the same as the Proposed Action. This is because to the extent that the number of units to be built on a property is reduced due to the revised footprint, the same number of units would be built on another property by increasing the density, so that the total number of units for the PVSP as a whole would still remain 14,132 (or ~~21,634~~ 21,631 units if Alternatives 1 through 5 are combined with the Blueprint scenario).*

## 3.3 Air Quality

The last paragraph under the No Action Alternative Impact AQ-4 analysis on Draft EIS page 3.3-28 is revised as follows:

Receptors associated with the No Action Alternative would not be located near any existing significant sources of TACs. The existing land uses surrounding the site are primarily residential and rangeland, with no industrial sites or other significant sources of TACs. CARB has also provided planning guidance that recommends not locating sensitive receptors within 500 feet of a freeway or roadways with greater than 100,000 annual average daily traffic (AADT). Under existing or cumulative future conditions ~~N~~no portion of the project site would be within 500 feet of a freeway or roadway with AADT of 100,000. Baseline Road has the highest existing and projected AADT of the roads adjacent to the site, with a~~n~~ projected AADT of 40,700 when the traffic under the No Action Alternative is added to the cumulative (2025) background conditions. This number is well below the AADT of 100,000. Therefore, the No Action Alternative is expected to result in a **less than significant** effect related to TACs. No mitigation is required.

The Proposed Action Impact AQ-4 analysis on Draft EIS page 3.3-28 is revised as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| **Proposed Action (Base Plan and Blueprint Scenarios) and Alts. 1 through 5** | Although the Proposed Action and Alternatives 1 through 5 would construct a larger project, the effect related to exposure to TACs would be substantially the same as discussed above for the No Action Alternative. As with the No Action Alternative, neither the Proposed Action nor Alternatives 1 through 5 would locate sensitive receptors near roadways that would have an AADT of 100,000 or more under existing and projected cumulative conditions. The effect would be **less than significant**. No mitigation is required. |

## 3.4 Biological Resources

Table 3.4-1 on Draft EIS page 3.4-4 is revised as follows:

**Table 3.4-1**
**Project Site Habitat Types (acres)**

| Habitat Type | Properties with Active DA Permit Applications | Properties without Active DA Permit Applications (including SPA) | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Seasonal Wetlands | 81.5 | ~~0.6~~6.9 | ~~82.1~~88.4 |
| Vernal Pools | 32.5 | ~~8.6~~5.8 | ~~41.1~~38.3 |
| Stream/Pond | 49.3 | ~~1.5~~7.0 | ~~50.8~~56.3 |
| Marsh/Riparian | 39.1 | ~~3.5~~6.5 | ~~42.6~~45.6 |
| Oak Woodland/Oak Savannah | 65.5 | ~~1.8~~5.1 | ~~67.3~~70.6 |
| Annual Grassland | 2,123.7 | ~~1,349.2~~1,002.7 | ~~3,472.9~~3,126.4 |
| Agricultural Land | 1,330.3 | ~~117.4~~419.9 | ~~1,447.7~~1,750.2 |
| Roads/Other Surfaces | 22.0 | ~~5.3~~26.8 | ~~27.3~~48.8 |
| **Total** | **3,743.9**[1] | **~~1,486.4~~1,480.8** | **~~5,231.8~~5,224.7**[2] |

*Source: ECORP, 2012b; Placer County, 2006.*

[1] *This number represents the acreage for the 3,746-acre development area. Surveyed boundary data overlap results in minor acreage discrepancy.*

[2] *This number is slightly greater (1.8 acres) than the total area of the project site due to survey boundary data overlap error.*

Table 3.4-2 on Draft EIS page 3.4-9 is revised as follows:

**Table 3.4-2**
**Project Site Waters of the U.S.**

| Waters of the U.S. | Properties with Active DA Permit Applications | Properties without Active DA Permit Applications (including SPA) | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Depressional Wetlands** | | | |
| Vernal Pool | 32.5 | ~~0.1~~5.8 | ~~32.6~~38.3 |
| Seasonal Wetland | 41.4 | 1.4 | 42.8 |
| Seasonal Wetland Swale | 12.7 | 3.4 | 16.1 |
| Seasonal Marsh | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Pond | 18.5 | 5.4 | 23.9 |
| Drainage Swale | 2.1 | 0.0 | 2.1 |
| **Riverine Wetlands** | | | |
| Canal/Ditch | 1.5 | 0.6 | 2.1 |
| Creek | 6.0 | 1.0 | 7.0 |
| Ephemeral Stream | 4.1 | 0.0 | 4.1 |
| Intermittent Stream | 17.8 | 0.0 | 17.8 |
| Channel | 1.5 | 0.0 | 1.5 |
| Riverine Seasonal Wetlands | 25.3 | ~~0.0~~2.1 | ~~25.3~~27.4 |
| Riverine Seasonal Marsh | 0.6 | ~~0.0~~4.7 | ~~0.6~~5.3 |
| Riverine Perennial Marsh | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
| **Total** | **164.7** | **~~12.0~~24.4** | **~~176.7~~189.1** |

*Source: ECORP, 2012b.*

The fourth bullet item under Section 3.4.2.10 on Draft EIS page 3.4-12 is revised as follows:

- ~~Species that meet the definitions of Rare, Threatened, or Endangered under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (*State CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15380)~~

Table 3.4-3 on Draft EIS page 3.4-14 is revised as follows:

**Table 3.4-3**
**Special-Status Plants with Potential to occur on the Project Site or in the Off-Site Infrastructure Areas**

| Name | ~~Federal~~ FESA Status | ~~State~~ CESA Status | Other Status | Habitat | Likelihood of Occurrence on Project Site |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bogg's Lake hedge-hyssop *Gratiola heterosepala* | - | E | CRPR 1B | Vernal Pools | Marginal habitat is present. |
| Sacramento Valley Orcutt grass *Orcuttia viscida* | E | E | CRPR 1B | Vernal Pools | No suitable habitat present. |
| Slender Orcutt grass *Orcuttia tenuis* | T | E | CRPR 1B | Vernal Pools | No suitable habitat present. |
| ~~Henderson's bentgrass *Agrostis hendersonii*~~ | ~~SC~~ | ~~—~~ | | ~~Vernal pools~~ | ~~Marginal habitat present.~~ |
| ~~Ahart's dwarf rush *Juncus leiospermus* var. *ahartii*~~ | ~~SC~~ | ~~—~~ | | ~~Vernal pools~~ | ~~Marginal habitat present.~~ |
| Hartweg's golden sunburst *Pseudobahia bahiaefolia* | E | E | CRPR 1B | Foothills, woodlands, clay grasslands | No suitable habitat present. |

*Status explanations:*
***~~Federal~~FESA: Federal Endangered Species Act***
~~— = No status~~
*E = Listed as "endangered" under the federal Endangered Species Act*
*T = Listed as "threatened" under the federal Endangered Species Act*
~~*SC = species of concern*~~
***~~State~~CESA: California Endangered Species Act***
~~— = No status~~
*E = Listed as "endangered" under the California Endangered Species Act*
*R = Listed as "rare" under the California Endangered Species Act*
***CRPR: California Rare Plant Rank***
***1B** = Plants Rare, Threatened, or Endangered in California and Elsewhere*

Table 3.4-4 on Draft EIS page 3.4-15 is revised as follows:

**Table 3.4-4**
**Special-Status Wildlife Species with Potential to Occur on the Project Site or in the Off-Site Infrastructure Areas**

| Name | ~~Federal~~ FESA Status | ~~State~~ CESA Status | Other Status | Habitat | Likelihood of Occurrence on Project Site |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Invertebrates** | | | | | |
| Conservancy fairy shrimp *Branchinecta conservatio* | E | - | - | Vernal pools, swales, seasonal wetlands | Marginal habitat present. Not observed on-site. Known to occur in the project region. |
| Vernal pool tadpole shrimp *Lepidurus packardi* | E | - | - | Vernal pools, some seasonal wetlands | Present on project site. |
| Vernal pool fairy shrimp *Branchinecta lynchi* | T | - | - | Vernal pools, some seasonal wetlands | Present on project site. |
| ~~California linderiella *Linderiella occidentalis*~~ | ~~SC~~ | ~~-~~ | ~~-~~ | ~~Vernal pools, some seasonal wetlands~~ | ~~Suitable habitat present.~~ |
| Valley elderberry longhorn beetle *Desmocerus californicus dimorphus* | T | - | - | Elderberry shrubs | Suitable habitat present. Not observed in portion of the project site surveyed. |
| **Amphibians and Reptiles** | | | | | |
| Western spadefoot *Spea hammondii* | - | ~~SSC~~ - | SSC | Grasslands with seasonal breeding pools | Suitable habitat present. |
| California tiger salamander *Ambystoma californiense* | T | ~~SSC~~ | SSC | Valley-foothill grasslands with suitable breeding pools | Marginal habitat present. |
| Western pond turtle *Actinemys marmorata* | - | ~~SSC~~ | SSC | Permanent water bodies with basking sites such as logs and rocks | Suitable habitat present. |
| California red-legged frog *Rana aurora draytonii* | T | ~~SSC~~ | SSC | Deeper pools and streams with emergent or overhanging vegetation | Marginal habitat present. |
| Giant garter snake *Thamnophis couchi gigas* | T | T | - | Perennial water bodies with sufficient cover vegetation | Marginal habitat present. |
| **Birds** | | | | | |
| Grasshopper sparrow *Ammodramus savannarum* | - | ~~SSC~~ - | SSC | Short to middle-height, moderately open grasslands with scattered shrubs. Upland meadows, pastures, hayfields. | Suitable habitat present in off-site utility corridor. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Northern harrier<br>*Circus cyaneus* | - | ~~SSC~~ - | SSC | Grasslands, seasonal wetlands, agricultural lands | Suitable habitat present. Observed foraging. |
| White-tailed kite<br>*Elanus leucurus* | - | ~~FP~~ - | FP | Open grassland, and farmlands. Nests in tall trees near foraging areas | Suitable habitat present. |
| Western burrowing owl<br>*Athene cunicularia* | - | ~~SSC~~ - | SSC | Grasslands with friable soils for burrowing | Suitable habitat present. |
| Swainson's hawk<br>*Buteo swainsoni* | - | T | BCC | Large trees, riparian woodlands and open grasslands/agricultural fields for foraging | Suitable nesting and foraging habitat present. |
| Greater sandhill crane<br>*Grus candadensis tabida* | - | T | FP | Seasonal wetlands, irrigated pastures, alfalfa and corn fields | Marginal foraging habitat present. No nesting habitat. |
| Loggerhead shrike<br>*Lanius ludovicianus* | - | ~~SSC~~ - | BCC<br>SSC | Grasslands, pastures, agricultural lands | Suitable foraging habitat present. Observed foraging. Marginal nesting habitat. |
| California black rail<br>*Laterallus jamaicesis* | - | T | BCC<br>FP | Shallow, perennial freshwater marshes | Marginal habitat present. |
| Tricolored blackbird<br>*Agelaius tricolor* | - | ~~SSC~~ - | BCC<br>SSC | Open water areas with tall emergent vegetation or in willow and blackberry thickets | Suitable habitat present. |
| Western yellow-billed cuckoo<br>*Coccyzus americanus* | ~~SC~~C | E | BCC | Large blocks of riparian habitats, particularly woodlands with cottonwoods and willows | No suitable habitat present. |
| **Bats** | | | | | |
| Pallid bat<br>*Antrozous pallidus* | - | ~~SSC~~ - | SSC | Shrublands, grasslands, woodlands,<br>forests; rocky areas, caves, hollow trees | Suitable foraging habitat present. Marginal roosting habitat present. |
| Townsend's big-eared bat<br>*Corynorhinus townsendii townsendii* | - | ~~SSC~~ - | SSC | Most low to mid elevation habitats; caves, mines, and buildings for roosting | Suitable foraging habitat present. Marginal roosting habitat present. |
| Yuma myotis<br>*Myotis yumanensis* | - | ~~SSC~~ - | SSC | Forests and woodlands; caves, mines, and buildings for roosting | Suitable foraging habitat present. Marginal roosting habitat present. |
| **Fish** | | | | | |
| Delta smelt | T | ~~T~~E | - | Sacramento Delta | Not present in Dry Creek watershed |
| Central Valley steelhead | T | - | - | Sacramento River and its perennial tributaries | Occurs on-site within Dry Creek |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Central Valley Chinook Salmon (spring-run) | T | T | - | Sacramento River and its perennial tributaries | Not present in Dry Creek watershed |
| Sacramento River Chinook salmon (winter-run) | E | E | - | Sacramento River and its perennial tributaries below Shasta Dam | Not present in Dry Creek watershed |
| Sacramento River Chinook salmon (fall/late fall-run) | ~~SC~~ - | - | SSC | Sacramento River and its perennial tributaries below Keswick Dam | Occurs on-site within Dry Creek |

*Status explanations:*
***~~Federal~~FESA: Federal Endangered Species Act***
*E = Listed as "endangered" under the federal Endangered Species Act*
*T = Listed as "threatened" under the federal Endangered Species Act*
*C = Candidate*
*~~SC = species of concern; species for which the USFWS has on file sufficient information on biological vulnerability and threat(s) to support issuance of a proposed rule to list, but issuance of the proposed rule is precluded~~*
*~~= no listing~~*
***~~State~~CESA: California Endangered Species Act***
*E = Listed as "endangered" under the California Endangered Species Act*
*R = Listed as "rare" under the California Endangered Species Act*
*~~FP = fully protected under the California Fish and Game Code~~*
*~~SSC = species of special concern in California~~*
*~~= no listing~~*
***Other Status:***
*SSC = California Species of Special Concern*
*FP = Fully Protected (CDFG Special Animal List 2011)*
*BCC = US Fish and Wildlife Service Bird of Conservation Concern (USFWS 2002)*

The first bullet under Section 3.4.3.1 on Draft EIS page 3.4-30 is revised as follows:

- have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, on any species identified as a candidate, ~~sensitive,~~ Threatened, Endangered, otherwise protected, or ~~special-status species,~~ otherwise protected by the CDFW or the USFWS

The alternatives analyses under Impact BIO-1 and Table 3.4-8 starting on Draft EIS page 3.4-39 is revised as follows:

**Alt. 1** Alternative 1 presents a modified land use plan for Property 1B located in the eastern portion of the project site with land uses on the remainder of the project site unchanged from the Proposed Action. Under this alternative ~~land use plan~~, an additional ~~17~~16.9 acres (~~7~~6.8 hectares) located within Property 1B would be designated open space for a total of 21 acres (8 hectares), as shown in **Figure 3.4-7, Alternative 1 (Property 1b) – Impact and Avoidance Areas**, and the filling of three large wetlands (~~approximately~~ an additional 2.4 acres (1.0 hectare) for a total of ~~4.1~~2.5 acres [~~1.7~~ 1.0 hectare~~s~~]) present in this open space area would be avoided. As land development on the rest of the PVSP project site would remain the same as under the Proposed Action, wetland impacts on the rest of the project

site would be the same as under the Proposed Action (either scenario). As a result, this alternative would involve filling of ~~110.9~~112.7 acres (~~44.9~~45.6 hectares) of wetlands on the project site and 4.2 acres (1.7 hectares) of wetlands off-site for a total of ~~115.1~~116.9 acres (~~46.6~~47.3 hectares), as shown in **Table 3.4-8**. As with the Proposed Action and based on the significance criteria, the loss of these wetlands would be a **significant** effect of this alternative. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure BIO-1** would reduce effects to wetlands under Alternative A so that there would be no net loss of wetland area and functions. However without a detailed mitigation plan the USACE cannot fully evaluate this effect and has therefore assumed that it would remain potentially **significant**.

**Alt. 2** Alternative 2 presents a modified land use plan for Property 3 located in the northeastern portion of the project site adjacent to Baseline Road with land uses on the remainder of the PVSP project site unchanged from the Proposed Action (either scenario). Under this alternative ~~land use plan~~, an additional ~~5~~5.4 acres (~~2~~2.2 hectares) located within Property 3 would be designated open space for a total of 31.4 acres (12.7 hectares), as shown in **Figure 3.4-8, Alternative 2 (Property 3) – Impact and Avoidance Areas**, and the filling of wetlands (~~about~~an additional 1.3 acres (0.5 hectare) for a total of ~~2.8~~2.1 acres [~~1.1~~0.8 hectare~~s~~]) present in this expanded open space area would be avoided. As land development on the rest of the project site would remain the same as under the Proposed Action, wetland impacts on the rest of the project site would be the same as under the Proposed Action (either scenario). As a result, this alternative would involve filling ~~112.2~~113.9 acres (~~45.4~~46.1 hectares) of wetlands on the project site and 4.2 acres (1.7 hectares) of wetlands off-site for a total of ~~116.4~~118.1 acres (~~47.1~~47.8 hectares), as shown in **Table 3.4-8**. As with the Proposed Action and based on the significance criteria, the loss of these wetlands would be a **significant** effect of this alternative. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure BIO-1** would reduce effects to wetlands under Alternative 2 so that there would be no net loss of wetland area and functions. However without a detailed mitigation plan the USACE cannot fully evaluate this effect and has therefore assumed that it would remain potentially **significant**.

**Alt. 3** Alternative 3 presents a modified land use plan for Property 16 located in the southwestern portion of the project site adjacent to Watt Avenue with land uses on the remainder of the PVSP project site unchanged from the Proposed Action (either scenario). Under the alternative ~~land use plan~~, an additional ~~48~~49.3 acres (~~19.4~~20.0 hectares) located within Property 16 would be designated open space for a total of 65.3 acres (26.4 hectares), as shown in **Figure 3.4-9, Alternatives 3 and 4 (Properties 16 & 17) – Impact and Avoidance Areas**, and the filling of wetlands (~~approximately~~an additional 3.4 acres (1.4 hectares) for a total of ~~4.9~~3.7 acres [~~2.0~~1.5 hectares]) present in this additional open space area would be avoided. Wetland impacts on the rest of the project site would be the same as under the Proposed Action (either scenario). As a result, this alternative would involve filling ~~110.1~~111.7 acres (~~44.6~~45.2 hectares) of wetlands on the project site and 4.2 acres (1.7 hectares) of wetlands off-site for a total of ~~114.3~~115.9 acres (~~46.3~~46.9 hectares), as shown in **Table 3.4-**

**8**. As with the Proposed Action and based on the significance criteria, the loss of these wetlands would be a **significant** effect of this alternative. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure BIO-1** would reduce effects to wetlands under Alternative 3 such that there would be no net loss of wetland area and functions. However without a detailed mitigation plan the USACE cannot fully evaluate this effect and has therefore assumed that it would remain potentially **significant**.

**Alt. 4** Alternative 4 presents a modified land use plan for Property 17 located in the southwestern portion of the project site adjacent to Property 17 with land uses on the remainder of the PVSP project site unchanged from the Proposed Action (either scenario). Under this alternative ~~land use plan~~, ~~an additional~~ about ~~2~~1.3 acres (~~0.8~~0.5 hectare) located within Property 17 would be designated as open space as opposed to no open space under the Proposed Action, as shown in **Figure 3.4-9, Alternatives 3 and 4 (Properties 16 & 17) – Impact and Avoidance Areas**, and the filling of wetlands (about 0.1 acre [0.04 hectare]) present in this additional open space area would be avoided. Wetland impacts on the rest of the project site would be the same as under the Proposed Action (either scenario). As a result, this alternative would involve filling ~~114.9~~115.0 acres (~~46.5~~46.5 hectares) of wetlands on the project site and 4.2 acres (1.7 hectares) of wetlands off-site for a total of ~~119.1~~119.2 acres (48.2 hectares), as shown in **Table 3.4-8**. As with the Proposed Action and based on the significance criteria, the loss of these wetlands would be a significant effect of this alternative. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure BIO-1** would reduce effects to wetlands under Alternative 4 such that there would be no net loss of wetland area and functions. However without a detailed mitigation plan the USACE cannot fully evaluate this effect and has therefore assumed that it would remain potentially **significant**.

**Alt. 5** Alternative 5 presents a modified land use plan for Property 23 located in the western portion of the project site adjacent to Locust Road with land uses on the remainder of the PVSP project site unchanged from the Proposed Action (either scenario). Under ~~the modified land use plan~~ this alternative, an additional ~~19~~19.4 acres (~~8~~7.9 hectares) located within Property 23 would be designated as open space for a total of 41.9 acres (17.0 hectares), as shown in **Figure 3.4-10, Alternative E (Property 23) – Impact and Avoidance Areas**, and the filling of wetlands (~~about~~an additional 1.2 acres (0.6 hectare) for a total of ~~2.0~~4.4 acres [~~0.8~~1.8 hectares]) present in this preserved area would be avoided. Wetland impacts on the rest of the project site would be the same as under the Proposed Action (either scenario). As a result, this alternative would involve filling ~~113.0~~113.9 acres (~~45.7~~46.1 hectares) of wetlands on the project site and 4.2 acres (1.7 hectares) of wetlands off-site for a total of ~~117.2~~118.1 acres (~~47.4~~47.8 hectares), as shown in **Table 3.4-8**. As with the Proposed Action and based on the significance criteria, the loss of these wetlands would be a significant effect of this alternative. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure BIO-1** would reduce effects to wetlands under Alternative 5 such that there would be no net loss of wetland area and functions. However without a detailed mitigation plan, the USACE

cannot fully evaluate this effect and has therefore assumed that it would remain potentially **significant**.

**Combined Alts. 1 through 5**

Should all five alternatives (Alternatives 1 through 5) be implemented (Alternatives 1 through 5 combined), in addition to the areas designated as open space under the Proposed Action, an additional ~~90~~92.3 acres (~~36~~37.4 hectares) of land on the project site would be preserved as open space for a total of 160.8 acres (64.0 hectares). As a result of the reduced development footprint and focused avoidance of wetlands on the five properties, filling of an additional 8.5 acres (3.7 hectares) of waters for a total of 12.8 acres (5.5 hectares) would be avoided on these five properties. Therefore, this alternative would involve filling ~~102.2~~106.6 acres (~~41.4~~43.1 hectares) of wetlands on the PVSP project site and 4.2 acres (1.7 hectares) of wetlands off-site for a total of ~~106.4~~110.8 acres (~~43.1~~44.8 hectares), as shown in **Table 3.4-8**. As with the Proposed Action and based on the significance criteria, the loss of these wetlands would be a significant effect of this alternative. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure BIO-1** would reduce effects to wetlands under Alternatives 1 through 5 combined so that there would be no net loss of wetland area and functions. However without a detailed mitigation plan, the USACE cannot fully evaluate this effect and has therefore assumed that it would remain potentially **significant**.

**Table 3.4-8**
**Proposed Action and Alternatives - Impacts to Waters of the United States (acres)**

| Alternative | Development Footprint | Open Space | On-Site Impacts | Off-Site Impacts | Total Direct Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Proposed Action | 4,522 | 709 | 115.1 | 4.2 | 119.3 |
| No Action Alternative | 3,297 | 1,933 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Alternative 1 | 4,504 | 726 | ~~110.9~~112.7 | 4.2 | ~~115.1~~116.9 |
| Alternative 2 | 4,516 | 714 | ~~112.2~~113.9 | 4.2 | ~~116.4~~118.1 |
| Alternative 3 | ~~4,473~~4,472 | ~~757~~758 | ~~110.1~~111.7 | 4.2 | ~~114.3~~115.9 |
| Alternative 4 | ~~4,519~~4,520 | ~~711~~710 | ~~114.9~~115.0 | 4.2 | ~~119.1~~119.2 |
| Alternative 5 | 4,502 | 728 | ~~113.0~~113.9 | 4.2 | ~~117.2~~118.1 |
| Combined Alternatives 1 through 5 | ~~4,431~~4,429 | ~~799~~801 | ~~102.2~~106.6 | 4.2 | ~~106.4~~110.8 |

*Source: ECORP, 2012b ~~and~~ 2013*

Mitigation Measure BIO-1 on Draft EIS page 3.4-45 is revised as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| **Mitigation Measure BIO-1:** | **Wetland Compensatory Mitigation (*Applicability – Proposed Action ~~and~~, Alternatives 1 through 5, and Combined Alternatives 1 through 5*)** |
| *The Applicants shall prepare and present to the USACE a detailed mitigation plan that incorporates permittee-responsible preservation and/or restoration at an off-site location or purchase of constructed wetland creation/restoration credits and preservation credits by the Applicants. The USACE will evaluate the specifics of this plan to determine the actual mitigation requirements based on a number of factors, including but not limited to functions, location (watershed), change in surface area, uncertainty, or risk of failure, and temporal loss of function. The final mitigation requirements will be incorporated into the permit conditions. The purchase of credits from an approved in-lieu fee provider may also be a permissible mitigation option.* | |

The alternatives analyses under Impact BIO-2 and Table 3.4-11 starting on Draft EIS page 3.4-49 is revised as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| **Alt. 1** | Under Alternative 1**,** an additional 17 acres (7 hectares) of open space would be designated on the project site, avoiding impacts to an additional ~~2.5~~2.4 acres (1.0 hectare) of vernal pool invertebrate habitat on the project site as compared to the Proposed Action. As shown in **Table 3.4-11, Vernal Pool Invertebrate Aquatic Habitat Direct Impacts**, Alternative 1 would directly impact ~~94.7~~94.8 acres (~~38.3~~38.4 hectares) of vernal pool invertebrate aquatic habitat on the project site and 2.6 acres (1.1 hectares) off-site for a total of ~~97.3~~97.4 acres (39.4 hectares). The loss of vernal pool invertebrates and their habitat as a result of grading, filling, or indirect degradation would be a **significant** effect of the alternative.<br><br>**Mitigation Measures BIO-1** and **BIO-2b** would reduce impacts on vernal pool invertebrate habitat by providing replacement aquatic habitat and preserving wetlands, and by implementing other mitigation as required by the USFWS. The impact would be reduced to **less than significant** with mitigation. |
| **Alt. 2** | Under Alternative 2**,** an additional 5 acres (2 hectares) of open space would be preserved, avoiding impacts to an additional ~~2.0~~1.3 acres (0.~~8~~5 hectare) of vernal pool invertebrate habitat on the project site as compared to the Proposed Action. As shown in **Table 3.4-11, Vernal Pool Invertebrate Aquatic Habitat Direct Impacts**, Alternative 2 would directly impact ~~95.2~~96.0 acres (~~38.5~~38.8 hectares) of vernal pool invertebrate habitat on the project site and 2.6 acres (1.1 hectares) off-site for a total of ~~97.8~~98.6 acres (~~39.6~~39.9 hectares). The loss of vernal pool invertebrates and their habitat as a result of grading, filling, or indirect degradation would be a **significant** effect of the alternative.<br><br>**Mitigation Measures BIO-1** and **BIO-2b** would reduce impacts on vernal pool invertebrate habitat by providing replacement aquatic habitat and preserving wetlands, and by implementing other mitigation as required by the USFWS. The impact would be reduced to |

**less than significant** with mitigation.

**Alt. 3** Under Alternative 3**,** an additional ~~48~~49.3 acres (~~19~~20.0 hectares) of open space would be preserved, avoiding impacts to an additional ~~4.1~~3.4 acres (~~1.7~~1.4 hectares) of vernal pool invertebrate habitat on the project site as compared to the Proposed Action. As shown in **Table 3.4-11, Vernal Pool Invertebrate Aquatic Habitat Direct Impacts**, Alternative 3 would directly impact ~~93.1~~93.8 acres (~~37.7~~38.0 hectares) of vernal pool invertebrate habitat on the project site and 2.6 acres (1.1 hectares) off-site for a total of ~~95.7~~96.4 acres (~~38.7~~39.0 hectares). The loss of vernal pool invertebrates and their habitat as a result of grading, filling, or indirect degradation would be a **significant** effect of the alternative.

**Mitigation Measures BIO-1** and **BIO-2b** would reduce impacts on vernal pool invertebrate habitat by providing replacement aquatic habitat and preserving wetlands, and by implementing other mitigation as required by the USFWS. The impact would be reduced to **less than significant** with mitigation.

**Alt. 4** Under Alternative 4**,** an additional ~~2~~1.3 acres (~~0.8~~0.5 hectare) of open space would be preserved, avoiding impacts to an additional 0.1 acre (0.04 hectare) of vernal pool invertebrate habitat on the project site as compared to the Proposed Action. As shown in **Table 3.4-11, Vernal Pool Invertebrate Aquatic Habitat Direct Impacts**, Alternative 4 would directly impact 97.1 acres (39.3 hectares) of vernal pool invertebrate habitat on the project site and 2.6 acres (1.1 hectares) off-site for a total of 99.7 acres (40.3 hectares). The loss of vernal pool invertebrates and their habitat as a result of grading, filling, or indirect degradation would be a **significant** effect of the alternative.

**Mitigation Measures BIO-1** and **BIO-2b** would reduce impacts on vernal pool invertebrate habitat by providing replacement aquatic habitat and preserving wetlands, and by implementing other mitigation as required by the USFWS. The impact would be reduced to **less than significant** with mitigation.

**Alt. 5** Under Alternative 5**,** an additional ~~19~~19.4 acres (~~8~~7.9 hectares) of open space would be preserved, avoiding impacts to an additional ~~4.1~~ 1.2 acres (~~1.7~~0.5 hectare) of vernal pool invertebrate habitat on the project site as compared to the Proposed Action. As shown in **Table 3.4-11, Vernal Pool Invertebrate Aquatic Habitat Direct Impacts**, Alternative 5 would directly impact ~~93.1~~96.0 acres (~~37.7~~38.8 hectares) of vernal pool invertebrate habitat on the project site and 2.6 acres (1.1 hectares) off site for a total of ~~95.7~~98.6 acres (~~38.7~~39.9 hectares). The loss of vernal pool invertebrates and their habitat as a result of grading, filling, or indirect degradation would be a **significant** effect of the alternative.

**Mitigation Measures BIO-1** and **BIO-2b** would reduce impacts on vernal pool invertebrate habitat by providing replacement aquatic habitat and preserving wetlands, and by implementing other mitigation as required by the USFWS. The impact would be reduced to **less than significant** with mitigation.

**Combined Alts. 1 through 5**

With implementation of Alternatives 1 through 5 combined**,** an additional ~~90~~92.3 acres (~~36~~37.4 hectares) of open space would be created on the project site, avoiding impacts to an additional ~~12.8~~8.5 acres (~~5.2~~3.4 hectares) of vernal pool invertebrate habitat on the project site as compared to the Proposed Action. As shown in **Table 3.4-11, Vernal Pool Invertebrate Aquatic Habitat Direct Impacts**, Alternatives 1 through 5 combined would directly impact ~~84.4~~88.7 acres (~~34.1~~35.9 hectares) of vernal pool invertebrate aquatic habitat on the project site and 2.6 (1.1 hectares) acres off-site for a total of ~~87.0~~91.3 acres (~~35.2~~36.9 hectares). The loss of vernal pool invertebrates or their habitat as a result of grading, filling, or indirect degradation would be a **significant** effect of these alternatives combined.

**Mitigation Measures BIO-1** and **BIO-2b** would reduce impacts on vernal pool invertebrate habitat by providing replacement aquatic habitat and preserving wetlands, and by implementing other mitigation as required by the USFWS. The impact would be reduced to **less than significant** with mitigation.

**Table 3.4-11**
**Vernal Pool Invertebrate Aquatic Habitat Direct Impacts[1] (acres)**

| Alternative | Development Footprint | Open Space | On-Site Direct Impacts | Off-Site Direct Impacts | Total Direct Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Proposed Action | 4,521 | 709 | 97.2 | 2.6 | 99.8 |
| No Action Alternative | 3,297 | 1,933 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Alternative 1 | 4,504 | 726 | ~~94.7~~94.8 | 2.6 | ~~97.3~~97.4 |
| Alternative 2 | 4,516 | 714 | ~~95.2~~96.0 | 2.6 | ~~97.8~~98.6 |
| Alternative 3 | ~~4,473~~4,472 | ~~757~~758 | ~~93.1~~93.8 | 2.6 | ~~95.7~~96.4 |
| Alternative 4 | ~~4,519~~4,520 | ~~711~~710 | 97.1 | 2.6 | 99.7 |
| Alternative 5 | 4,502 | 728 | ~~93.1~~96.0 | 2.6 | ~~95.7~~98.6 |
| Combined Alternatives 1 through 5 | ~~4,431~~4,429 | ~~799~~801 | ~~84.4~~88.7 | 2.6 | ~~87.0~~91.3 |

*Source: ECORP, 2012a~~; ECORP~~, 2012b, and 2013*

[1] *Habitat includes vernal pools, seasonal wetlands, seasonal wetland swales, drainage swales, and riverine seasonal wetlands.*

The first bullet under Mitigation Measure BIO-3 on Draft EIS page 3.4-53 is revised as follows:

- *Prior to any ground disturbance on lands that contain suitable habitat for federally listed plant species and that have not been surveyed for federally listed plant species, a protocol survey will be completed by a qualified biologist during the blooming season to determine whether the species are present within the area of ground disturbance. If the species are not discovered, no further action is required.*

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.4-4 on Draft EIS page 3.4-59 is revised as follows:

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.4-4: Western Pond Turtle**
**(*Applicability – Proposed Action, Alternatives 1 through 5, and Combined Alternatives 1 through 5*)**

*Construction shall be designed to avoid impacts to potential habitat for western pond turtle, if feasible. If construction is required in areas of potential habitat, then a focused survey for this species shall be conducted prior to approval of engineering plans. The survey is required to determine the presence or absence of this species on the properties surveyed. If pond turtles are found on the properties surveyed, locations of these occurrences shall be mapped.*

*A detailed mitigation/conservation plan that provides for "no net loss" of individuals of the species or its habitat shall be developed upon confirming the presence of this species on the properties surveyed. If this species is not found on the properties surveyed, no further studies are necessary.*

*The replacement of western pond turtle habitat required by this measure ~~could~~ shall be ~~partially or~~ entirely addressed by ~~included within~~ **Mitigation Measure 4.4-1**, to the extent that the mitigation area includes areas appropriate for western pond turtle. As an alternative to these measures, once the PCCP is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.*

Impact BIO-8 on Draft EIS page 3.4-59 is revised as follows to reflect the change in numbering of Mitigation Measure 4.4-1b to be 4.4-6:

## Impact BIO-8 Effects on Protected Raptor Species and Other Nesting Birds

**No Action**

Ground disturbing activities and tree removal under the No Action Alternative would affect potential nesting habitat of protected bird species. Construction disturbance as part of the project site development could result in active nest abandonment, removal of an active nest, or otherwise injure a raptor or nesting birds. This would be a **significant** effect. However, with mitigation the effect would be **less than significant**.

Grassland and trees within the project site provide suitable foraging habitat and nesting sites for several protected raptor species. Disturbance resulting in active nest abandonment or removal of an active nest or otherwise injuring, pursuing, or killing a protected raptor is prohibited under the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act, the California Endangered Species Act, and/or the California Fish and Game Code. The potential effects on nesting birds are presented below.

*Burrowing Owl*

Burrowing owl has not been recorded within the properties surveyed, but potential foraging and nesting habitat for burrowing owls is present on the project site. Burrowing owl nests could be established in the future. Burrowing owls nest in burrows, so site preparation activities could destroy or damage a nest, or disturb nesting owls. The disruption of nesting burrowing owls would be a **significant** effect.

**Mitigation Measure 4.4-5** in the PVSP EIR was adopted by Placer County at the time of

the approval of the PVSP to address the Proposed Action Base Plan's effect on burrowing owls. The USACE assumes that Placer County would impose the same mitigation measure on the No Action Alternative to address this effect. The mitigation measure requires a pre-construction survey for burrowing owl nests, and if active nests are found, no construction activities shall take place within 500 feet of the nest until the young have fledged. The mitigation measure also provides for passive relocation of burrowing owls and compensatory mitigation for loss of habitat. Placer County concluded that with this mitigation, the effect will be reduced to a less than significant level. The USACE agrees with the conclusion in the PVSP EIR and finds that this effect would be reduced to **less than significant**.

*Swainson's Hawk*

Although no Swainson's hawk nests have been observed within the project site, they have been recorded within 1 mile (2 kilometers) of the project site. Swainson's hawks are known to nest within 10 miles (16 kilometers) of foraging habitat. Since the majority of the project site would be considered potential foraging habitat, development of the No Action Alternative would eliminate grassland foraging habitat for this species. Removal of potential foraging habitat and nesting trees for Swainson's hawk would be a **significant** effect. CDFW recommends that projects that result in the loss of potential habitat for Swainson's hawk (which includes grasslands) within 10 miles (16 kilometers) of an active nest site provide mitigation for that loss. **Mitigation Measure ~~4.4-1b~~4.4-6** in the PVSP EIR was adopted by Placer County at the time of the approval of the PVSP to address the Proposed Action Base Plan's effect on Swainson's hawk habitat. This mitigation measure has been incorporated by the Applicants in their proposed mitigation strategy. The USACE assumes that Placer County would impose the same mitigation measure on the No Action Alternative to address this effect. The mitigation measure requires preservation of off-site foraging habitat at ratios recommended by the CDFW: 1:1 for each acre lost within 1 mile (2 kilometers) of a nest, 0.75:1 for each acre lost within 1 to 5 miles (2 to 8 kilometers) of a nest, and 0.5:1 for each acre lost within 5 to 10 miles (8 to 16 kilometers) of a nest. It also requires that any Swainson's hawk nesting trees that are removed be replaced at a 15:1 ratio in areas suitable for Swainson's hawk foraging and nesting. This measure would ensure that there is "no net loss" of nesting trees over time. Placer County concluded that with this mitigation, the effect will be reduced to a less than significant level. The USACE agrees with the conclusion in the PVSP EIR and finds that the effect of the No Action Alternative on Swainson's hawk would be reduced to a **less than significant** level with mitigation.

*Other Raptors and Nesting Birds*

Raptors, including red-tailed hawk, white-tailed kite, and great horned owl, are likely to nest within the project site. Special-status species surveys within the project site

| | |
|---|---|
| | documented the presence of one potentially active raptor nest in a small tree along the seasonal marsh area in the south-central portion of the project site. Other nests could be established over time. If an active nest is located in a tree slated for removal or pruning, the nest could be lost and any eggs or young could be destroyed. The No Action Alternative could result in removal of nest trees. As mentioned above, all raptors are protected under the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and Section 3503.5 of the California Fish and Game Code. In addition, construction activities near active nests could disturb nesting raptors, and result in the abandonment of a nest. Consequently, construction near trees containing active nests could result in a **significant** effect. Similarly, Tricolored blackbird and Loggerhead shrike, while not observed on-site, could nest and forage within sections of the project site. Ground disturbing activities and tree removal for project implementation would affect potential nesting habitat of protected bird species. Construction disturbance as part of the project site development could result in active nest abandonment, removal of an active nest, or otherwise injure a raptor or nesting birds. This would be a **significant** effect. **Mitigation Measures ~~4.4-7 and~~ 4.4-6** through **4.4-8** in the PVSP EIR were adopted by Placer County at the time of the approval of the PVSP to address the Proposed Action Base Plan's effects on raptors and nesting birds. The USACE assumes that Placer County would impose the same mitigation measure on the No Action Alternative to address this effect. Placer County concluded that with this mitigation, the effect will be reduced to a less than significant level. The USACE agrees with the conclusion in the PVSP EIR and finds that the effect on raptors would be reduced to a **less than significant** level with mitigation. |
| **Proposed Action (Base Plan and Blueprint Scenarios)** | Ground disturbing activities, which would remove approximately 3,520 acres (1,425 hectares) of grassland foraging habitat, and tree removal for the development of the Proposed Action (both scenarios) would also affect potential nesting habitat of protected bird species in a manner described above for the No Action Alternative. These would be **significant** effects of the Proposed Action.<br><br>**Mitigation Measures ~~4.4-1b,~~ 4.4-5~~, 4.4-7, and~~** through **4.4-8** in the PVSP EIR were adopted by Placer County at the time of the approval of the PVSP to address the Proposed Action Base Plan's effect on burrowing owls, Swainson's hawk, other raptors, and nesting birds. These measures require avoidance and protection of active nest sites. The USACE assumes that Placer County would impose the same mitigation measures on the Proposed Action Blueprint scenario to address these effects. Placer County concluded that with these mitigation measures, the effects will be reduced to a less than significant level. The USACE agrees with the conclusion in the PVSP EIR and finds that the effect on burrowing owls, Swainson's hawk, other raptors, and nesting birds would be reduced to a **less than significant** level with mitigation. |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Alts. 1 through 5** | Ground disturbing activities and tree removal for the development of Alternatives 1 through 5 (individually or combined) would also affect potential nesting habitat and foraging habitat of protected bird species in a manner described above for the No Action Alternative. These would be **significant** effects. The USACE assumes that Placer County would impose the same mitigation measures (**Mitigation Measures ~~4.4-1b,~~ 4.4-5~~, 4.4-7, and~~** through **4.4-8**) on these alternatives to address these effects. Placer County concluded that with this mitigation, the effect will be reduced to a less than significant level. The USACE agrees with the conclusion in the PVSP EIR and finds that the effects of Alternatives 1 through 5, individually or combined, on burrowing owls, Swainson's hawk, other raptors, and nesting birds would be reduced to a **less than significant** level with mitigation. |

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.4-1b on Draft EIS page 3.4-63, which has been renumbered to 4.4-6, 4.4-7, and 4.4-8, is revised as follows:

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.4-~~1b~~6: Swainson's Hawk**
**(*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternative*s)**

~~*Swainson's hawk foraging habitat shall be mitigated according to California Department of Fish and Game Guidelines: 1 acre for each acre lost within 1 mile of a nest, 0.75 acre for each acre lost within one to 5 miles of a nest, and 0.5 acre lost within 5 to 10 miles of a nest, unless otherwise addressed through the Placer County Conservation Plan (PCCP). Additionally, the applicant shall be required to obtain a CESA take permit for any nest tree that may be removed as part of any proposed construction under the Specific Plan. Additional mitigation measures for the loss of active nest trees shall include planting of suitable nest trees at a 15:1 ratio on suitable foraging habitat areas within west Placer County.*~~ *Swainson's hawk foraging habitat shall be mitigated through implementation of* ***Mitigation Measure 4.4-1****. Additionally, the applicant shall be required to obtain a CESA take permit for any active nest tree that may be removed as part of any proposed construction under the Specific Plan. Additional mitigation measures for the loss of active nest trees shall include the planting of suitable nest trees at a 15:1 ratio on suitable foraging habitat areas within west Placer County.*

*The replacement of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat required by this measure shall be entirely ~~included within~~ addressed by* ***Mitigation Measure 4.4-1****. As an alternative to this measure, once the PCCP is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.*

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.4-7 and**
**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.4-8: Other Bird Species, including Raptors, Loggerhead shrike and Tricolored blackbird**
**(*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

***Non Raptor Species:*** ~~*Prior to construction activities, a focused survey for non-raptor special status bird nests and/or nesting colonies shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within 30 days prior to the beginning of construction activities in order to identify active nests within the construction area. If active nests are found, no construction activities shall take place within five hundred feet of the nest and/or nesting colony until the young have fledged. The biologist shall consult with the CDFG, particularly with respect to vegetation removal as a result*~~

*~~of project construction. If no active nests and/or nesting colonies are found during the focused survey, no further mitigation will be required.~~ If construction activities are proposed during the tricolored blackbird breeding season (May to August), a focused survey for nesting colonies shall be conducted within 30 days prior to the beginning of construction activities by a qualified biologist in order to identify active nests within the construction area. If active nests are found, no construction activities shall take place within five hundred feet of the nesting colony until the young have fledged. Vegetation that must be removed as a result of construction shall be removed during the non-breeding season (September to April). If no active nests are found during the focused survey, no further mitigation will be required.*

*This measure would ensure that tricolored blackbird nests ~~and/or nesting colonies~~ are avoided when active, so that eggs and young would be protected. Once the ~~young~~ blackbirds have fledged their nests, the nests can be removed without harm to the birds. As an alternative to this measure, once the PCCP is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.*

***Raptor Species:** When construction is proposed during the raptor breeding season (March to early September), a focused survey for raptor nests shall be conducted within 30 days prior to the beginning of construction activities by a qualified biologist in order to identify active nests on-site. If active nests are found, no construction activities shall take place within five hundred feet of the nest until the young have fledged. Trees containing nests shall be removed during the non-breeding season (late September to March). If no active nests are found during the focused survey, no further mitigation will be required. This measure will ensure that active nests are not moved or substantially disturbed during the breeding season, so that raptor eggs and young are not destroyed or abandoned as a result of construction. As an alternative to this measure, once the PCCP is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.*

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.4-9 on Draft EIS page 3.4-64 is revised as follows:

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.4-9: Roosting Bats**
**(*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)**

*Prior to construction, a qualified biologist shall survey any affected structures for evidence of bat roosts (e.g., bat guano). If roosts are found, they shall be removed in April, September or October in order to avoid the hibernation and maternity seasons. Appropriate exclusion methods will be used, as needed, during habitat removal.*

*The initial assessment will involve looking for bats or bat signs such as guano, urine staining, and culled food parts, and will identify those specific locations that represent potential habitat (i.e., which specific buildings, trees, bridges could support roosting bats). If no potential habitat is identified or no potential habitat will be affected (i.e., removed), no further measures are required.*

*Bat habitat can be removed with minimal impact to the resident bat population if it is done outside of the hibernation season (November through March) and outside of the maternity season (May through August). During the removal period, a roost exit survey shall be conducted prior to habitat removal. If bats are detected, standard humane exclusion methods shall be implemented (e.g., placing plastic over roost entrance areas such that bats can exit the roost but not return). Exclusion shall be conducted for two nights prior to habitat removal and habitat removal shall occur immediately following implementation of these exclusion measures. If there is a delay, then the exclusion measures shall be repeated. During the maternity season (May through August), habitat removal may occur following a roost exit survey that confirms no bats are present; however, if bats are detected they may not be excluded until the end of the maternity season. During the hibernation season (November through March), bats do not exit the roost, so exit surveys cannot be used to assess presence and removal shall be delayed to the end of this time period.*

*If bats must be excluded, the project proponent shall work with a qualified biologist to determine if any additional steps (such as installation of alternative roost habitat in the form of bat boxes) are appropriate for the particular habitat. Determination of these additional measures will depend on the species present and their specific ecological preferences/requirements. Other steps could include improvement of other avoided bat habitat or design of new project elements such as bridges to be "bat-friendly." As an alternative to this measure, once the PCCP is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.*

Mitigation Measure BIO-10 on Draft EIS page 3.4-66 is revised as follows:

**Mitigation Measure BIO-10: Wildlife Movement Protection Policies**
**(*Applicability –Proposed Action, and All Alternatives*)**

*To protect the long-term habitat of the stream channels and the transmission line corridors designated by the Specific Plan as Open Space and their potential use by wildlife as movement corridors, the Applicant(s) shall ensure that movement corridors are not obstructed and human intrusion into the corridor is minimized. These measures shall include, but not be limited to: the use of either bridges or culverts large enough that wildlife have enough space to pass through road crossings without having to travel over the road surface, the implementation of bank stabilization measures, and/or restoration and revegetation of stream corridor habitat that has been damaged due to the project's construction. Furthermore, the recreational trails shall be lined by post and cable fence and signage shall be used to direct trail users to stay within the designated trail corridor and discourage access to the riparian habitat by humans and pets. The trails shall be closed after dark and exterior lighting on the trail shall be minimized to the extent acceptable to the County.*

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.4-12a and 12b on Draft EIS page 3.4-68 is revised as follows:

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.4-12a and**
**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.4-12b: Riparian Habitat**
**(*Applicability – Proposed Action, Alternatives 1 through 5, and Combined Alternatives 1 through 5*)**

*Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a Streambed Alteration Agreement shall be obtained from CDFG, pursuant to Section 1600 et seq. of the California Fish and Game Code, for each stream crossing and any other activities affecting the bed, bank, or associated riparian vegetation of the stream. If required, the project applicant shall coordinate with CDFG in developing appropriate mitigation, and shall abide by the conditions of any executed agreements. All stream crossings shall be performed using a "jack and bore" construction technique, unless otherwise specified by CDFG. Streambed Alteration Agreement measures to protect the channel bank of a stream from erosion and related effects of construction shall be included in all related construction contracts. As an alternative to this measure, once the PCCP is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.*

~~*Implement Mitigation Measure 4.4-1 as it pertains to riparian habitat. Mitigation Measure 4.4-1 requires replacement of all riparian trees removed to accommodate development. New trees and shrubs must be planted within existing riparian areas or improved drainage corridors. The replacement ratios exceed 1:1 in order to ensure that over the long-term the value of new riparian habitat equals or exceeds the value of the habitat that was lost. As an alternative, once the Placer County Conservation Plan is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP, to the extent that it provided adequate mitigation for impacts on riparian areas.*~~

~~*Additional steps shall be taken for properties that require more detailed resource identification prior to development, including: wetlands delineated and submitted to the USACE, habitat types mapped, and special-status species determined to be or potentially be within the Plan area with protocol surveys conducted if required.*~~ *For each riparian tree removed, one 15-gallon tree, one depot-40 seedling for each inch, and three 1-gallon shrubs will be planted within existing riparian or improved drainage corridors in the Specific Plan Area. The replacement ratios exceed 1:1 in order to ensure that over the long-term the value of new riparian habitat equals or exceeds the value of the habitat that was lost. The replacement of riparian trees required by this measure shall be entirely included within* ***Mitigation Measure 4.4-1****, to the extent that the mitigation area includes areas appropriate for such habitat.*

*As an alternative to this measure, once the PCCP is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.*

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.4-30 on Draft EIS page 3.4-71 is revised as follows:

**PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.4-30: Fish Habitat**
**(*Applicability – Proposed Action, Alternatives 1 through 5, and Combined Alternatives 1 through 5*)**

*Implement* ***Mitigation Measures 4.4-12a and 4.4-12b****. As an alternative to this measure, once the PCCP is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.*

*A qualified fish biologist shall be present on-site during any dewatering activities at construction sites to minimize impacts to special-status species (i.e., prevent stranding of special-status species). Individual fish collected during dewatering shall be identified and released in an uninterrupted waterway adjacent to the area of disturbance. As an alternative to this measure, once the PCCP is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.*

*Chinook salmon and steelhead resources shall be protected from potential construction-related activities by adherence to a construction window, whereby construction activities would be precluded from October 15 through June 15. This window corresponds to the time when both adult and juvenile Chinook salmon and steelhead are expected to migrate through the area. Further measures to protect salmon resources include use of Best Management Practices (BMPs) to minimize and localize siltation and other water quality impacts and to provide for riparian restoration activities. Such BMPs may include the use of cofferdams and other structures during dewatering and construction activities. Water quality monitoring shall also be performed to ensure that state and federal water quality standards are met. As an alternative to this measure, once the PCCP is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.*

## 3.6 Cultural Resources

The second to last sentence in the last paragraph on Draft EIS page 3.6-3 is revised as follows:

For purposes of analysis in this EIS, based on the nature of the Proposed Action and the type of residential and non-residential development that would be constructed on the site, it is assumed that in most cases the depth of excavation on the project area ~~(the vertical APE)~~ would be less than 6 feet (1.8 meters) below ground surface.

The second sentence in the second paragraph on Draft EIS page 3.6-4 is revised as follows:

The vertical APE extends from approximately 35 feet (11 meters) above the surface (for the construction of structures) and ~~6 feet (1.8 meters)~~25 feet (7 meters) below the surface, to allow for the deep installation of buried utilities and infrastructure.

Additional information has been added at the end of Project Area Ethnography on Draft EIS page 3.6-6 as follows:

Additional prehistoric and ethnographic accounts and interpretations for the region include those advanced by Littlejohn (1928), Jones and Klar (2007), Moratto (1984), Tatsch (2006), and others. In addition, the regional chronology for the foothills and montane region, known as the Kings Beach and Martis Complex, is described in further detail by Heizer and Elsasser (1953) and Elston et al. (1977).

Additional information has been added at the end of the first paragraph on Draft EIS page 3.6-15 as follows:

The Tribe also requested to receive project environmental documents so that the Tribe may comment. The Tribe stated that the Tribe's Preservation Committee has identified cultural resources in the project area and requested a project area visit to confirm the location of such sites (Windmiller *et al*. 2012). As a result, the USACE contacted the UAIC on June 14, 2012, and received another request to review relevant cultural resources reports. The UAIC also requested a coordination meeting. The USACE met with representatives of the UAIC on September 21, 2012 and provided them with the requested materials. ~~Consultation is ongoing.~~As part of ongoing consultation, the USACE, UAIC, and ECORP carried out a tour of the PVSP on 23 May 2013 to inspect locations of some of the previously recorded sites and verify location and integrity of the previously recorded sites. Copies of the previous technical studies were provided to UAIC in advance of the tour.

The footer in Table 3.6-4 on Draft EIS page 3.6-34 is revised as follows:

* ~~Measures recommended if resource will be adversely affected by the PVSP.~~Measures to be implemented if the resources will be adversely affected by PVSP, or as stipulated through the HPTP.

Mitigation Measure CR-1 on Draft EIS page 3.6-36 is revised as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| **Mitigation Measure CR-1:** | **Prepare, Execute, and Implement a Programmatic Agreement with ~~Programmatic Historic Properties Treatment Plan~~ Historic Property Management Plan and Project-Specific Historic Property Treatment Plans (*Applicability – Proposed Action ~~and~~, Alternatives 1 through 5, and Combined Alternatives 1 through 5*)** |

*For all action alternatives that require federal permitting and authorization, USACE shall satisfy the requirements of Section 106 of the NHPA through the development and execution of a PA. The PA shall be prepared and executed (signed) prior to issuance of any federal permit or authorization for any aspect or component of the specific plan project. ~~Preparation of the phase-specific APE and inventory and evaluation of properties within the APE shall be performed prior to any~~ Determination of the project- or phase-specific APE, and the related inventory, evaluation of eligibility, determination of effect to historic properties, shall be performed prior to permit issuance and any subsequent ground-disturbing work in the APE for any federal permitting or authorization of individual development phases. Implementation of treatment measures for identified historic properties may be performed during construction and ground-disturbing work provided that no ground-disturbing work is performed in the vicinity of resources subject to adverse effects and within an appropriate radius of the resource as determined by USACE, prior to completion of all treatment measures. The exact radius in which construction shall not occur shall be determined based upon the nature of the resource the potential for outlying undiscovered elements of that resource.*

The analysis under Impact CR-2 for Alternatives 1 through 5 on Draft EIS page 3.6-38 is revised as follows:

All of the on-site alternatives, like the No Action Alternative, ~~would reduce the potential to encounter unanticipated buried cultural deposits because~~ have a similar potential to encounter unanticipated buried cultural deposits. However, because the total area of ground disturbance on the site would be reduced and the amount of ground disturbance along Dry Creek (the most sensitive area for potential buried prehistoric deposits) would also be reduced, the frequency and amount of unanticipated discovery would be commensurate with the smaller area of impact. Nonetheless, there would be some potential to encounter buried prehistoric deposits, potentially along stream channels. The effect would be **significant**. **Mitigation Measure CR-2** would reduce the effect to a **less than significant** level.

The first paragraph of the Impact CR-3 analysis on Draft EIS page 3.6-38 is revised as follows:

The construction and operation of off-site water pipeline infrastructure by the Placer County Water Agency (PCWA) which would be used by the No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5 ~~would have **no impact** on Native American archaeological resources and~~ would have unknown effects on historic ~~sites~~ properties. Following the application by the PCWA to the USACE for a Section 404 permit for the pipeline infrastructure project, the USACE will inventory, evaluate eligibility, determine effect, and develop measures to resolve the adverse effect to historic properties. If the PCWA will not seek a Section 404 permit, then the comparable procedures in CEQA or Section 106 of the NHPA will apply, as appropriate.

Additional references have been added under Section 3.6.7 References on Draft EIS page 3.6-39 as follows:

Elston, Robert G., Jonathan O. Davis, Alan Leventhal, and Cameron Covington. 1977. The Archaeology of the Tahoe Reach of the Truckee River. Northern Division of the Nevada Archaeological Survey, University of Nevada, Reno. Submitted to Tahoe-Truckee Sanitation Agency, Reno, Nevada.

Heizer, R.F. and A.B. Elsasser. 1953. Some Archaeological Sites and Cultures of the Central Sierra Nevada. Berkeley: University of California Archaeological Survey Reports, No. 21.

Jones, Terry L. and Kathryn Klar (editors). 2007. California Prehistory: Colonization, Culture, and Complexity. Alta Mira Press.

Littlejohn, H. W. 1928. Nisenan Geography. Ms in Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

Moratto, M. J. 1984. California Archaeology. Academic Press, Orlando.

Tatsch, Sheri Jean. 2006. The Nisenan: Dialects & Districts of a Speech Community. Native American Studies, University of California-Davis.

## 3.7 Environmental Justice, Population, and Housing

The text of Impact EJ-2 on Draft EIS page 3.7-8 is revised as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| **Proposed Action (Base Plan and Blueprint Scenarios)** | Implementation of the Proposed Action would result in the construction of 14,132 (Base Plan scenario) to 21,631 (Blueprint scenario) residential units on the project site, which could accommodate approximately 30,000 to 50,000 additional persons. As discussed above, SACOG projects that unincorporated Placer County (not including the Tahoe Basin) would add approximately 16,475 residential units and 48,000 residents between 2008 and 2035.<br><br>The increase in housing associated with the Base Plan scenario represents approximately 86 percent of SACOG's housing projection while the increase in population associated with the Base Plan scenario represents about 72 percent of SACOG's population projection. As a result, the Base Plan scenario would not exceed housing and population projections for the unincorporated portion of Placer County, and thus would not directly induce substantial population growth in Placer County that was not anticipated.<br><br>Concerning the Blueprint scenario, the increase in housing associated with this scenario represents 131 percent of SACOG's housing projection while the increase in population associated with this scenario represents about 103 percent of SACOG's population projection. Therefore, the Blueprint scenario would exceed housing and population projections for the unincorporated portion of Placer County, and thus would induce substantial population growth in Placer County. However, the additional population |

(about 1,400 persons more than the SACOG projections) represents a small exceedance of the SACOG projections. Furthermore, the housing and population increases that would result from development pursuant to the Blueprint scenario would promote the land use scenario for the region as currently preferred by SACOG and several of its member organizations. By concentrating population closer to the core of the region, a number of environmental and lifestyle benefits would accrue, including shorter commutes, greater potential use of transit, cleaner air, and less open space lost to suburban sprawl. Higher density development under the Blueprint scenario would limit sprawl and the close proximity of amenities would result in shorter vehicle trips. The higher density would encourage the construction and use of alternative transportation facilities such as buses, bicycle lanes, and pedestrian sidewalks and trails, which would reduce the number of vehicle trips. Studies indicate that communities with streets designed for the safety of all users can encourage walking and biking and help people lead healthier lifestyles (Giles et al. 2011), and that residents of transit-oriented developments are two to five times more likely to use transit for commuting and non-work trips than others living in the same region (Arrington and Cervero 2008). In general, the greater the population density of an area, the less the area's residents tend to drive (Transportation Research Board of the National Academies 2003). Therefore, air pollutant emissions under the Blueprint scenario would be reduced compared to the Base Plan scenario. Other potential benefits include (1) improved health[1] due to increased opportunities for walking and biking, (2) residential costs savings from reduced auto-dependence to access jobs and services, and (3) municipal cost savings from sewer and road maintenance, and other local services. Therefore, this effect would be **less than significant**.

Three new references have been added under Section 3.7.7 References on Draft EIS page 3.7-9 as follows:

Arrington, G. B., Cervero, Robert. 2008. Vehicle Trip Reduction Impacts of Transit-Oriented Housing. Journal of Public Transportation, Vol. 11, No. 3.

Giles-Corti B, Wood G, Pikora T et al. 2011. School site and the potential to walk to school: the impact of street connectivity and traffic exposure in school neighborhoods. *Health Place*. 2011; 17(2):545-50.

Kuzmyak, J. Richard, Richard H. Pratt, G. Bruce Douglas, and Frank Spielberg. 2003. Traveler Response to Transportation System Changes: Chapter 15—Land Use and Site Design. Transportation Research Board. 2003. http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/tcrp/tcrp_rpt_95c15.pdf.

1 According to the U.S. EPA, while data are lacking to determine whether the built environment determines levels of physical activity and/or obesity, nearly 90 percent of studies found a positive association, suggesting that the built environment is one of the many factors that could play a role in how much people exercise and levels of obesity (http://www.epa.gov/dced/built.htm).

## 3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The third paragraph of the analysis under Impact HAZ-5 on Draft EIS page 3.9-20 is revised as follows:

Residential uses are proposed adjacent to but not within the transmission line corridors; residential areas would be a minimum of 100 feet (30.5 meters) from ~~the corridor~~existing power lines. Implementation of appropriate setbacks from the ~~corridor~~ power lines would ensure that effects associated with increased exposure to EMF would be minimal.

## 3.10 Hydrology and Water Quality

The analysis under Impact HYDRO-6 on Draft EIS page 3.10-29 is revised as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| **No Action Alt., Proposed Action, Alts. 1 through 5** | The project site is within an area that could experience flooding in the event that Folsom Lake Dikes 4, 5, and 6 fail. The National Inventory of Dams considers the Folsom Lake Dikes high hazard structures, reflecting a potential for loss of human life in the event of a failure. According to the Folsom Dam Safety and Flood Damage Reduction Joint Federal Project, Dikes 4, 5, and 6 could fail due to overtopping during a major storm event. However, the likelihood of reservoir inflows that could cause overtopping is extremely low, and would be reduced upon completion of the new Folsom Dam spillway that is currently under construction and scheduled for completion by 2015. Failure from piping could occur at any water surface elevation within the reservoir. In addition, the increased precipitation as a result of climate change could result in a significant effect on the hydrograph used for the dikes. If the hydrograph changes then some or all of the designed margin of safety, referred to as freeboard, could be lost. With reduced freeboard, dam operators may be forced to release increased volumes earlier in a storm cycle to retain the margins of safety. Early releases or spillway overflow events could increase flooding downstream. However, the project site is near an area where the potential hazards from inundation of the Folsom Dam would be low. Therefore, the risk of damage to property and loss of human life associated with inundation of the Folsom Dam would be low and the impact would be **less than significant**. Mitigation is not required. |

## 3.11 Land Use and Planning

The first sentence under Section 3.11.2.3 Existing and Planned Land Uses in the Vicinity of Project Site, on Draft EIS page 3.11-5 is revised as follows:

Lands to the north of the project site are located in Roseville and unincorporated Placer County, and include the ~~Curry Creek Community Plan area and~~ Sierra Vista Specific Plan area and land identified for the eventual Curry Creek Community Plan.

## 3.14 Transportation and Traffic

The text of the No Action Alternative analysis under Impact TRA-11 on Draft ES page 3.14-43 is revised as follows:

The Public Utilities Commission (PUC) would be responsible for issuing a permit for any roadway widening across the Union Pacific rail line along Riego Road, and could require that a grade separation be constructed as part of the roadway widening. The need and design of the crossing would be determined during planning for the roadway widening. One concern of PUC staff is that adequate land be reserved to provide the right-of-way for the separation. Because the rail line is located outside of the project site and in Sutter County, Placer County cannot ensure that adequate land is reserved. Sutter County would have jurisdiction over the roadway widening, including the right-of-way for the rail crossing. ~~The No Action Alternative would pay its fair share toward the road widening, including a grade separation if needed.~~ Because the contribution of the No Action Alternative to cumulative traffic would not trigger the need for additional widening over the rail line, this effect is considered **less than significant**.

## 3.15 Utilities and Service Systems

The second to last sentence of the second paragraph under Impact UTIL-2 No Action Alternative analysis on Draft EIS page 3.15-24 is revised as follows:

The USACE estimates that the No Action Alternative would have a projected recycled water supply of 2.8 mgd (10.6 mld) at buildout. This leaves a deficit of ~~approximately~~less than 0.7 mgd [2.6 mld] when compared to July average day recycled water demand of 3.5 mgd (13.2 mld).

The Dry Creek WWTP capacity analysis for the Proposed Action (Base Plan and Blueprint Scenarios) under Impact UTIL-3 on Draft EIS page 3.15-29 is revised as follows:

**Dry Creek WWTP**

The USACE estimates that the Proposed Action would generate an ADWF ranging from 2.92 mgd (11.05 mld) to 4.19 mgd (15.86 mld) at buildout (**Table 3.15-2)**, based on unit flow factors established in the Environmental Impact Report prepared for the PVSP (see **Subsection 3.15.4.2**). As discussed above, the planned flow for Shed B is 0.37 mgd (1.40 mld). The projected total flow at buildout under the Proposed Action for Shed B would range from 0.51 mgd (1.93 mld) to 0.79 mgd (2.99 mld). The additional flow would conflict with current planning efforts for the WWTP and is considered a potentially significant effect. However, the WWTP may have the capacity to serve this additional flow from Shed B because actual flows within the SPWA service area have been less than projected due to a 27 percent reduction in flow factors for residential units and a 20 percent overall reduction in development densities (RMC 2005). In addition, the treatment plant is currently constructed to treat 18 mgd (68 mld), but can be expanded to treat 24 mgd (91 mld) (Placer County 2007). In addition, the Roseville Regional Wastewater Treatment Service Area Master Plan included buildout of Placer Vineyards Specific Plan area in the flow projections.

~~The addition of flows from Shed A under the Proposed Action would also result in the need to expand the Dry Creek WWTP, and the current NPDES waste discharge requirements would need to be amended. This is a potentially **significant** effect.~~ Therefore, wastewater flows from the Proposed Action would have a **less than significant** effect on the Dry Creek WWTP**. PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.11.6-2a** through **4.11.6-2c** would ~~address the effect~~ be implemented to further reduce the effect.

## 4.0 Cumulative Impacts

Table 4.0-2 on page 4.0-16 is revised as follows:

**Table 4.0-2**
**Waters of the U.S. Impacts and Mitigation (in Acres) based on Recent Permits Issued by the USACE in the Cumulative Study Area**

| Wetland Type | Total Impact | Total Mitigation | Total Mitigation excluding Preservation | On-Site Mitigation | | | Mitigation Banks within Study Area | | Mitigation Banks Outside of Study Area[a] | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Creation | Restored/ Enhanced | Preserved | Creation | Preservation | Creation | Preservation |
| Vernal Pools | 147.55[b] | 465.24 | 208.73 | 71.33 | 0 | 76.41 | 121.05 | 132.09 | 16.35 | 48.01 |
| Other Waters of U.S. | 291.38[c] | 788.69 | 452.38 | 180.30 | 13.95[d] | 296.36 | 231.68 | 39.95 | 26.45 | 0 |
| **Total** | **438.93** | **1,253.93** | **661.11** | **251.63** | **13.95** | **372.77** | **352.73** | **172.04** | **42.8** | **48.01** |
| Total Delineated | 1,099.51 | | | | | | | | | |

*Note:*
[a] *Includes mitigation sites that are in unknown locations*
[b] *Total impact does not include 0.87 acre of temporary impact to vernal pools.*
[c] *Total impact does not include 13.79 acres of temporary impact to other waters of the U.S.*
[d] *Includes 11.9 acres of restored and 2.05 acres of enhanced wetlands*

Table 4.0-5 on Draft EIS page 4.0-32 is revised as follows:

**Table 4.0-5**
**Other Major DA Permit Projects in the Air Basin –**
**Construction Emissions (Pounds per Day)**

| Project | ROG | NOx | PM10 | PM2.5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Folsom South[a] | **120** | **128** | 579 | 126 |
| Natomas Levee, Phase 2[b] | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Natomas Levee, Phase 3b[c] | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Natomas Levee, Phase 4A[d] | **303** | **1,846** | 15,388 | NA |
| Rio Del Oro[e] | **627** | **2,071** | NA | NA |
| Sunridge Properties[f] | **385** | **501** | 276 | NA |
| Arboretum | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Cordova Hills[g] | **3,616** | **405** | 2,723 | 576 |
| River Islands at Lathrop | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Suncreek[h] | **194** | **141** | 289 | 64 |
| Mather Specific Plan[l] | 739 | **100** | 144 | 32 |
| Folsom Dam Modification Project Approach Channel[j] | 10 | 46 | 126 | 18 |
| Southport Sacramento River Early Implementation Project | 34 | **342** | **12,948** | 14.7 |

*Note:*
*NA – not available*
***Bold:*** *Exceeds Significance Thresholds. Significance Thresholds are not the same for all of the projects listed.*
[a] *Department of the Army Permit SPK-2007-02159. August 11, 2011.*
[b] *Department of the Army Permit SPK-2007-00211. January 21, 2009.*
[c] *Department of the Army Permit SPK-2008-01039. April 2, 2010.*
[d] *Department of the Army Permit SPK-2009-00480. November 8, 2010.*
[e] *Department of the Army Permit SPK-1999-00590. June 13, 2012.*
[f] *Department of the Army Permit SPK-2009-00511. January 25, 2011.*
[g] *Cordova Hills: Sacramento County, Cordova Hills Final EIR, Document Control Number 2008-00142*
[h] *Suncreek Specific Plan Project Draft EIR. Prepared for the City of Rancho Cordova by AECOM, October 2012.*
[l] *Department of the Army Permit SPK-2002-561. June 2012*
[j] *Folsom Dam Modification Project, Approach Channel. Supplemental EIS/EIR, December 2012.*
[k] *Southport Sacramento River Early Implementation Project EIS/EIR. November 2013.*

Table 4.0-7 on Draft EIS page 4.0-35 is revised as follows:

**Table 4.0-7**
**Other Major DA Permit Projects in the Air Basin –**
**Operational Emissions (Pounds per Day)**

| Project | ROG | NOx | PM10 | PM2.5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Folsom South[a] | **2,061** | **709** | 2,433 | 1,529 |
| Natomas Levee, Phase 2[b] | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Natomas Levee, Phase 3b[c] | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Natomas Levee, Phase 4A[d] | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Rio Del Oro[e] | **733** | **676** | 1,115 | NA |
| Sunridge Properties[f] | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | NA |
| Arboretum | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Cordova Hills[g] | **857** | **415** | 1,326 | 252 |
| River Islands at Lathrop | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Suncreek[h] | **523** | **335** | 961 | 185 |
| Mather Specific Plan[i] | **937** | **620** | 2,396 | 724 |
| Folsom Dam Modification Project Approach Channel[j] | **0** | **0** | 0 | 0 |
| Southport Sacramento River Early Implementation Project | NA | NA | NA | NA |

*Note:*
*NA – not available*
*Emissions reported are maximum unmitigated emissions generated.*
*The significance thresholds differ depending on the Air Quality Management District.*
***Bold:*** *Exceeds Significance Thresholds. Significance Thresholds are not the same for all of the projects listed.*
*a. Department of the Army Permit SPK-2007-02159. August 11, 2011.*
*b. Department of the Army Permit SPK-2007-00211. January 21, 2009.*
*c. Department of the Army Permit SPK-2008-01039. April 2, 2010.*
*d Department of the Army Permit SPK-2009-00480. November 8, 2010.*
*e. Department of the Army Permit SPK-1999-00590. June 13, 2012.*
*f. Department of the Army Permit SPK-2009-00511. January 25, 2011.*
*g Cordova Hills: Sacramento County, Cordova Hills Final EIR, Document Control Number 2008-00142*
*h Suncreek Specific Plan Project Draft EIR. Prepared for the City of Rancho Cordova by AECOM, October 2012.*
*l Department of the Army Permit SPK-2002-561. June 2012*
*j Folsom Dam Modification Project, Approach Channel. Supplemental EIS/EIR, December 2012.*
*k Southport Sacramento River Early Implementation Project EIS/EIR. November 2013.*

Additional analysis has been added after the first paragraph on Draft EIS page 4.0-37 as follows:

As the table above shows, even though population and vehicle traffic are projected to increase by 25 percent and 17 percent respectively in the SACOG region, daily emissions of ozone precursors are expected to decrease substantially, with NOx emissions

decreasing by 55 percent and ROG by 35 percent between 2018 and 2035 as a result of vehicle fleet improvements, fuel efficiency measures, transportation control measures in the SIP for the SACOG region, and denser future development pursuant to the SCS. These population and traffic increases represent the best understanding of overall growth projections for the region and include projects such as Placer Vineyards Specific Plan as well as other projects in the region.[2]

On a project level, due to the greater number of dwellings and increased commercial space, the Blueprint scenario would have higher air pollutant emissions than the Base Plan scenario. However, on a cumulative regional basis, it is likely the Blueprint scenario could result in lower emissions. In general, greater development density typically results in reduced vehicle miles traveled (VMT) as residents have a shorter distance to travel to services. The Blueprint results in the provision of an additional 7,502 residential units on approximately the same acreage as the Base Plan scenario. Assuming these 7,502 additional units would be built elsewhere in the air basin, the total cumulative emissions that would result from the Base Plan development plus these 7,502 dwelling units constructed at another site or sites elsewhere in the region would be higher than the Blueprint scenario due to increased VMT. However, this is speculative as it is currently unknown whether or not these additional units would be built elsewhere, and if so whether they would result in more or less VMT than if they were part of the Proposed Action.

## Appendix 3.0 PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures

Draft EIS Appendix 3.0 has been revised to include the revised mitigation measures adopted by the County. The revised appendix is presented in **Final EIS Appendix 3.0** (at the end of this document).

2 Please see SACOG MTP/SCS 2035 Update Appendix E-3 for projected changes in land use, population, and employment in the SACOG region through 2035.

# 4.0 REFERENCES

ECORP Consulting, Inc. 2008. "Placer Vineyards Specific Plan Aquatic Resources Qualitative Assessment and Avoidance and Minimization-Strategy and Criteria." July.

ECORP Consulting, Inc. 2013. "MCSE/EDAW 07/404 Permit Impacts and New Potential Avoidance Areas." September 11.

Reid, T. 2014. TRA Environmental Sciences, Inc. Email communication with Loren Clark, Placer County, dated January 15.

Quad Knopf. 2007. "Second Partially Recirculated Revised Draft EIR, Placer Vineyards Specific Plan." March.

# 5.0 LIST OF PREPARERS

## 5.1 US ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

| Name | Title | Experience |
|---|---|---|
| Nancy A. Haley | Chief, California North Branch, Regulatory | 20 years USACE Environmental |
| Will Ness | Senior Project Manager | 14 years USACE Environmental |
| James T. Robb | Senior Project Manager | 4 years USACE Environmental |
| Nikki Polson | Archaeologist | 4 years USACE Environmental |
| Erin Hess | Cultural Resources Specialist | 12 years USACE Environmental |

## 5.2 IMPACT SCIENCES INC.

| Name | Qualifications | Participation |
|---|---|---|
| Shabnam Barati | B.A., M.A, M.Phil., Ph.D., 25 years of experience | Project Manager |
| Jennifer Millman | B.S., 5 years of experience | Deputy Project Manager, Biological Resources, Environmental Justice , Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Noise, Public Services |
| Sara Morton | B.S., 6 years of experience | Deputy Project Manager, Project Description, Geology, Soils, and Minerals |
| Paul Stephenson, AICP | B.S., M.A., 9 years of experience | Aesthetics, Agricultural Resources, Land Use, Transportation and Traffic, Utility and Service Systems |
| Caitlin Gilleran | B.S., 2 years of experience | Cultural Resources, Cumulative |
| Eric Bell | B.S., M.S., 5 years of experience | Air Quality, Climate Change |
| Ian Hillway | B.S., 16 years of experience | Editing, Production, Graphics |

## 5.3 SUBCONSULTANTS

| Name | Qualifications | Participation |
|---|---|---|
| David M. Tokarski, DKS Associates | B.S., M.S., 16 years of experience | Transportation and Traffic |
| Sally Morgan, Independent Contractor | B.A., M.A., 37 years of experience | Cultural Resources |
| Jeff Glazner, Salix Inc. | B.S., 22 years of experience | Biological Resources |
| Matt Fremont, Helix Environmental | B.A., M.A., 10 years of experience | Biological Resources (GIS) |

# REVISED APPENDIX 3.0

# PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures

# REVISED APPENDIX 3.0 PVSP EIR MITIGATION MEASURES

The following mitigation measures from the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan EIR were incorporated into the Placer Vineyard Specific Plan (PVSP) project by Placer County.

## Land Use

4.1-3 Implement Mitigation Measure 4.4-1 as it pertains to agricultural land and open space. As an alternative to this measure, once the Placer County Conservation Plan (PCCP) is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.

4.1-6 A minimum 100-foot setback shall be maintained between structures intended for permanent residential habitation and the 115 kV utility lines (as measured from the nearest utility line). Similarly, a setback of 150 feet shall be maintained for the substation and 230 kV utility lines.

4.1-13a Comply with all applicable mitigation measures set forth in the Environmental Impact Report, City of Lincoln Wastewater Treatment and Reclamation Facility, certified by the City of Lincoln City Council on March 9, 1999 during construction and operation of the recycled water facility.

4.1-13b Prior to construction of any facilities not within the area assessed by the Environmental Impact Report, City of Lincoln Wastewater Treatment and Reclamation Facility, such as potential future downstream diversion structures, perform an initial study in accordance with CEQA to determine subsequent environmental assessment needs. This should include consideration of site-specific biological, wetland and cultural resource assessments.

4.1-13c Compliance with mitigation measures set forth in this Revised Draft EIR or similar measures proposed by the City of Lincoln designed to reduce impacts to visual quality, water quality, biological resources, soils, cultural resources, air quality, and the noise environment, including Mitigation Measures 4.2-6a, 4.2-6b, 4.3.4-1c, 4.3.4-2a, 4.3.4- 2b, 4.3.4-2c, 4.3.4-3a, 4.3.4-3b, 4.4-1a, 4.4-1b, 4.4-1c, 4.4-1d, 4.4-1e, 4.4-1f, 4.4-1g, 4.4-1h, 4.4-1i, 4.4-14, 4.4-15, 4.4-16, 4.4-17, 4.4-18, 4.4-20, 4.4-21, 4.4-22, 4.4-23, 4.4-24, 4.4-26, 4.4-27, 4.4-29, 4.4-30, 4.5-1a, 4.5-2, 4.5-4a, 4.4-5b, 4.6-2a, 4.6-2b, 4.6- 2c, 4.6-2d, 4.6-2e, 4.6-2f, 4.6-2g, 4-6-2h, 4.6-3a, 4.6-3b, 4.8-1a, 4.8-1b, 4.8-1c, 4.8-1d, 4.8-1e, 4.9-2, and 4.9-3.

4.1-14 Implement Mitigation Measure 4.4-1a as it pertains to agricultural land and open space. As an alternative to this measure, once the Placer County Conservation Plan is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.

## Aesthetics

4.2-3 Water storage tanks shall be subject to review and approval pursuant to the County's Design Review process. In concert with Design Review, a landscaping plan that softens the visual appearance of the tanks from open space areas shall be submitted, and shall conform to the standards contained in the Placer County Landscape Design Guidelines Manual.

4.2-6a All areas containing natural vegetation or landscape material that are disturbed during utility line and roadway construction shall be revegetated upon completion of work utilizing plant materials similar to those disturbed. Revegetated areas shall be actively maintained until

fully established, in accordance with the standards and provisions contained in the County's Landscape Design Guidelines.

4.2-6b All permanent utility line-related structures extending above ground shall be screened where feasible using a combination of berms, mounds, landscape material, decorative fencing/ walls, or other screening feature approved by the Placer County Development Review Committee, consistent with the Placer County Design Guidelines and the Placer County Landscape Design Guidelines. In addition, any proposed roadway and utility pump station lighting shall be directed downward using cut-off fixtures to minimize lighting effects on adjacent areas and the night sky.

## Hydrology, Water Resources, and Water Quality

4.3.2-1a New development applications shall be accompanied by a site-specific project drainage report that is consistent with the approved Master Project Drainage Study. The project drainage report shall be reviewed and approved by the Placer County Public Works Department during the Subsequent Conformity Review Process and prior to improvement plan approval for new development. The drainage report shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and shall be in conformance with the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual and Placer County Code. The project applicant shall be financially responsible for all stormwater drainage facility maintenance requirements. The project drainage report shall include, at a minimum, written text addressing existing conditions, the effects of project improvements, all appropriate calculations, a watershed map, potential increases in downstream flows and volumes, proposed on-site improvements, and drainage easements, if necessary, to accommodate flows from the site. The drainage report shall demonstrate compliance with all mitigation measures included in this Revised Draft EIR.

4.3.2-1b New development within the Specific Plan area shall reduce post-development stormwater runoff peak flows and volumes to pre-development levels for the 2-, 10-, 25- and 100-year storm events through the construction of regional retention and detention facilities for the Curry Creek and Steelhead Creek watersheds. Retention/detention facilities in the Steelhead Creek watershed shall incorporate gates, as described in the Master Project Drainage Study, to control flows during a Sankey Gap spill. A protocol shall be established by Placer County in cooperation with the Sacramento Area Flood Control District for monitoring of the Sankey Gap spill and for operation of the gates. Responsibility for the operation and maintenance of the gates shall be assumed by the County Service Area that will serve the Specific Plan area. Construction of regional retention and detention facilities shall be prior to or concurrent with the initial development of the Specific Plan area. Runoff from development within the Dry Creek watershed shall not be detained or retained. Retention and 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 Department of Public Works. Retention and detention facilities shall be designed to be consistent with the Master Project Drainage Study for the Specific Plan.

4.3.2-1c Drainage facilities, for purposes of collecting runoff on individual lots, 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, to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works. These facilities shall be constructed with subdivision improvements, and easements provided as required by the Department of Public Works. Maintenance of these facilities

shall be provided by a new County Service Area (CSA), an expanded CSA #28, or other responsible entity.

4.3.2-1d The location, size, and ownership of any canals in the Specific Plan area shall be described in the project drainage report and shown on improvement plans. The Department of Public Works shall be provided with a letter from the agency controlling the canal describing any restrictions, requirements, easements, etc. relative to project construction. Said letter shall be provided to the Department of Public Works prior to the approval of improvement plans.

4.3.2-1e New development in the Specific Plan area within the Dry Creek watershed shall be subject to the one-time payment of drainage improvement and flood control fees pursuant to the Dry Creek Watershed Interim Drainage Improvement Ordinance (Ref. Article 15.32, formerly Chapter 4, Subchapter 20, Placer County Code). The actual fees to be paid will be those in effect at the time the payment occurs.

4.3.2-1f New development in the Specific Plan area within the Dry Creek Watershed shall be subject to payment of annual drainage improvement and flood control fees pursuant to the Dry Creek Watershed Interim Drainage Improvement Ordinance (Ref. Article 15.32, formerly Chapter 4, Subchapter 20, Placer County Code). The applicant shall cause the subject property to become a participant in the existing Dry Creek Watershed County Service Area for purposes of collecting these annual special assessments.

4.3.2-1g New development shall not alter the post-development mitigated drainage shed boundaries identified in the Master Project Drainage Study in a way that would increase the peak flow runoff or runoff volume.

4.3.2-1h Prior to any improvement plan approval (including plans for backbone infrastructure), the Master Project Drainage Study shall be submitted to the Placer County Department of Public Works for review and approval. The Master Project Drainage Study shall be in conformance with the requirements of Section 5 of the Land Development Manual and the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal. The report shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and shall include all drainage elements outlined in this Revised Draft EIR. The drainage facilities shall be designed for future, fully developed, unmitigated flows from upstream development. Regional detention and retention basis, regional water quality basins, as well as regional drainage channel improvements shall be incorporated with appropriate design information along with appropriate phasing information.

4.3.2-1i New development in the Specific Plan area within the Steelhead Creek (NEMDC) tributary shall be subject to payment of fair share stormwater volume mitigation fees to the County of Sacramento. The current fees range from $325.00 to $629.00 per acre. (Fee Schedule for Zone 11C) and are adjusted annually. The actual fees to be paid will be those in effect at the time the payment occurs. Prior to improvement plan approval, the applicant shall provide evidence to the Placer County Department of Public Works that the fees have been paid to Sacramento County.

4.3.2-2a New development applications shall be accompanied by a site-specific project drainage report that is consistent with the approved Master Project Drainage Study. The project drainage report shall be reviewed and approved by the Placer County Public Works Department during the Subsequent Conformity Review Process and prior to improvement plan approval for new development. The drainage report shall be prepared by a Registered

Civil Engineer and shall be in conformance with the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual and Placer County Code. The project applicant shall be financially responsible for all stormwater drainage facility maintenance requirements. The project drainage report shall include, at a minimum, written text addressing existing conditions, the effects of project improvements, all appropriate calculations, a watershed map, potential increases in downstream flows and volumes, proposed on-site improvements, and drainage easements, if necessary, to accommodate flows from the site. The drainage report shall demonstrate compliance with all mitigation measures included in this Revised Draft EIR and adopted by the Board of Supervisors.

4.3.2-2b New development within the Specific Plan area shall upsize any existing undersized culverts within the Specific Plan area conveying increased flows from the proposed development. All existing culverts conveying development flow shall be identified with pre- and post-development flow quantities and capacities. All culvert analysis (existing and upsized) shall be designed in conformance with the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual to accommodate the 2-, 10-, 25- and 100-year storms. Flow consideration for debris clogging and sediment transport shall be provided. In addition to the 100-year event, 200-year events shall be evaluated for potential impacts to collector roadways, detention pond failure, and other life-safety impacts.

4.3.2-3a No grading or other disturbance shall occur within the post-project 100-year floodplain limit as identified in the Master Project Drainage Study except, as necessary to construct and maintain drainage improvements. The post-project 100- year floodplain shall be designated as a development setback line on improvement plans and final subdivision maps unless greater setbacks are required by other mitigation measures or conditions of approval.

4.3.2-3b New development applications shall be accompanied by a site-specific project drainage report that is consistent with the approved Master Project Drainage Study. The project drainage report shall be reviewed and approved by the Placer County Public Works Department during the Subsequent Conformity Review Process and prior to improvement plan approval for new development. The drainage report shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and shall be in conformance with the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual and Placer County Code. The project applicant shall be financially responsible for all stormwater drainage facility maintenance requirements. The project drainage report shall include, at a minimum, written text addressing existing conditions, the effects of project improvements, all appropriate calculations, a watershed map, potential increases in downstream flows and volumes, proposed on-site improvements, and drainage easements, if necessary, to accommodate flows from the site. The drainage report shall demonstrate compliance with all mitigation measures included in this Revised Draft EIR.

4.3.2-3c New development applications within the Specific Plan area shall identify the limits of existing and proposed floodplains in the site-specific project drainage report. Channel/swale construction and/or improvements with new development shall be designed in accordance with the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual and provide sufficient freeboard for the 100-year event and shall be identified with floodplain delineations.

4.3.2-3d The developer shall construct flood warning devices (e.g., rain gauges, stream gauges with radio transmitters) within floodplains as indicated in the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual and Placer County Code. The flood warning devices shall be shown on the improvement plans.

4.3.2-3e The Master Project Drainage Study shall demonstrate that the proposed development will not increase the 100-year floodplain water surface elevation.

4.3.2-3f The low dam, intake structure, pump, and pipeline withdrawing water from Dry Creek shall be removed in its entirety, and the streambed returned to a natural condition, at the time irrigation of existing pasture land located within Property Group #5 of the Specific Plan area ceases. Upon removal of the dam, an effective combination of erosion and sediment control shall be implemented which may include measures such as covering exposed areas with mulch, temporary seeding, soil stabilizers, binders, fiber rolls or blankets, temporary vegetation or permanent seeding. In addition, best management practices (BMPs) shall be implemented during construction to reduce or eliminate sedimentation and reduce erosion in result of dam removal activities. BMPs may include sediment control practices such as filtration devices and barriers (e.g., fiber rolls, straw bale barriers, and gravel inlet filters) and/or settling devices (e.g., sediment traps or basins). BMPs shall be developed in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local agencies. Additionally, the dam removal shall be done in accord with all applicable federal, State and local requirements and/or permit conditions existing at the time of removal. Prior to removal of the structure, a drainage report shall be prepared demonstrating that the removal of the structure will not adversely increase flows downstream.

4.3.2-11a Prior to any development pursuant to the Specific Plan within the Dry Creek Drainage Shed, the developer shall submit to the Placer County Department of Public Works project-specific drainage reports, calculations and plans addressing up-gradient and project flows within the Dry Creek drainage shed for review and approval. Placer County Storm Water Management Manual and the Placer County Code require developments to not cause adverse impacts to upstream or downstream properties.

4.3.2-11b The Master Project Drainage Study and project-specific drainage reports shall design for conveyance of future, fully-developed, unmitigated flows from upstream development outside of the Specific Plan area.

4.3.3-8a Municipal wells constructed for purposes of a backup groundwater supply for development under the Specific Plan shall not be constructed within 800 feet of any existing private well.

4.3.3-8b Prior to operation of any municipal wells constructed for purposes of a backup groundwater supply for development under the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan, the developer/applicant shall construct groundwater monitoring wells to monitor the impacts of the operation of the municipal wells on local groundwater elevations and any groundwater contaminant movement. The number, location, and design of said monitoring wells shall be subject to the approval of PCWA.

4.3.3-8c To address potential scenarios in which, despite best efforts to avoid well failure, any of the existing wells in the area fails as a result of the pumping for development under the Specific Plan, the owners of failed wells, upon submission of proof of such failure, shall be compensated through a well insurance program funded through development within the Specific Plan area. No small lot tentative map shall be approved until the developer, working with PCWA, puts in place a legal and financial mechanism for funding a Placer Vineyards Well Insurance Program, to be administered by PCWA, to insure against failure for up to an estimated replacement cost to be determined. Said Well Insurance Program shall include payment of a fee at the issuance of a building permit. Such fee shall be determined based on the number of private wells eligible for the program (existing wells within a two-mile radius

of each municipal well to be constructed) multiplied by the cost of a typical residential well construction (to be determined) and divided by the total number of equivalent dwelling units (edu) in the Specific Plan area. Additional components of the Well Insurance Program will be developed prior to approval of the first small lot tentative subdivision map.

4.3.3-9 Prior to installation of any municipal wells for purposes of a backup groundwater supply for development under the Specific Plan, the County, in consultation with PCWA and CDFW, shall determine the appropriate separation distances between wells and nearby surface water bodies. In no case shall these municipal wells be constructed within 800 feet of the Dry Creek riparian corridor, or any other on-site area where established riparian vegetation is observed.

4.3.3-10 Pumps required for any municipal wells for purposes of a backup groundwater supply for development under the Specific Plan shall be located within sound attenuating acoustical shelters to reduce generated noise levels below noise thresholds established by the Placer County General Plan Noise Element for the affected sensitive receptors.

4.3.4-1a Prior to submission of applications for new development within the Specific Plan area, the precise location, and preliminary design of the regional water quality detention/sedimentation basins, as described in the Master Project Drainage Study shall be submitted to Placer County for review and approval. This plan shall also include the method or methods for funding the long-term maintenance of regional water quality maintenance measures. Finally, the plan shall also include sanctions available to enforce the implementation and maintenance of measures, should measures fail or not be maintained over time.

4.3.4-1b Plans for construction of backbone infrastructure shall include construction of regional basins in sequence and location determined by the Master Project Drainage Study required by Mitigation Measure 4.3.4-1a.

4.3.4-1c Plans for construction of backbone infrastructure shall include SWPP plans prepared in conformance with the requirements of Mitigation Measure 4.5-4b.

4.3.4-1d Prior to improvement plan approval for new development other than that for backbone improvements, each applicant shall include site specific plans for accomplishment of long-term reductions in water quality impacts. The applicant shall also propose a method of financing the long-term maintenance of such facilities, such as a County Service Area or the expansion of CSA #28, in conformance with Mitigation Measure 4.3.4-1a. Such plans shall conform to all mitigation measures set forth in this Revised Draft EIR and adopted by the Board of Supervisors.

4.3.4-1e New development shall submit a site-specific BMP plan showing the on-site locations and effectiveness of the BMP facilities proposed for long-term water quality impact reduction during the Subsequent Conformity Review process and prior to improvement plan approval. Storm drain inlet cleaning shall occur semi-annually (at a minimum) and parking lots shall include the installation of oil/sand/grit separators or as otherwise approved by the Placer County Department of Public Works. The plan shall include a method for financing the long-term maintenance of the proposed facilities and BMPs. The plan shall conform to the Master Project Drainage Study required by Mitigation Measure 4.3.4-1a and the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbook for Construction and New Development/Redevelopment (or other similar source approved by the Department of Public Works). BMPs shall reflect improvements in techniques and

opportunities made available over time and shall also reflect site-specific limitations. The County shall make the final determination as to the appropriate BMPS for each project.

4.3.4-1f Storm drainage from all new development impervious surfaces (including roadways) shall be collected and routed through specially designed catch basins, vaults, filters, etc. for entrapment of sediment, debris and oils/greases as approved by the Placer County Department of Public Works. Maintenance of these facilities shall be provided by the project owners/permittees unless and until a County Service Area is created and said facilities are accepted by the County for maintenance. Contractual evidence of a monthly parking lot sweeping and vacuuming and catch basin cleaning program shall be provided to the Placer County Department of Public Works upon request. Prior to improvement plan or final subdivision map approval, easements shall be created and offered for dedication to the County for maintenance and access to these facilities in anticipation of possible County maintenance.

4.3.4-1g New development (including roadways) within the Specific Plan area shall design water quality treatment facilities (BMPs) such that the treatment of runoff occurs, at a minimum, before discharge into any receiving waters, or as otherwise determined by the Placer County Department of Public Works.

4.3.4-2a Projects with ground disturbance exceeding one acre that are subject to construction stormwater quality permits of the NPDES program shall obtain such permits from the SRWQCB and shall provide the Placer County Department of Public Works evidence of a State-issued Waste Discharge Identification (WDID) number of filing of a Notice of Intent and fees prior to start of construction.

4.3.4-2b During the Subsequent Conformity Review Process and prior to improvement plan approval, new development projects shall submit to the Placer County Department of Public Works, for review and approval, an erosion control plan consistent with the County's Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance (reference pages 4-3-9 through 4-3-12). The erosion control plan shall indicate that proper control of siltation, sedimentation and other pollutants will be implemented per NPDES permit requirements and County ordinance standards. The plan shall address storm drainage during construction and proposed BMPs to reduce erosion and water quality degradation. All on-site drainage facilities shall be constructed to County specifications. BMPs shall be implemented throughout the construction process.

4.3.4-2c All BMPs for water quality protection, source control, and treatment control shall be developed in accordance with the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbook for Construction and New Development/Redevelopment (or other similar source approved by the Department of Public Works) for the applicable type of development and/or improvement. Provisions shall be included for long-term maintenance of BMPs.

4.3.4-3a New development applications shall be accompanied by a site-specific project drainage report that is consistent with the approved Master Project Drainage Study. The project drainage report shall be reviewed and approved by the Placer County Department of Public Works during the Subsequent Conformity Review Process and prior to improvement plan approval for new development. The drainage report shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and shall be in conformance with the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual and Placer County Code. The project applicant shall be financially responsible for all stormwater drainage facility maintenance requirements. The project drainage report shall

include, at a minimum, written text addressing existing conditions, the effects of project improvements, all appropriate calculations, a watershed map, potential increases in downstream flows and volumes, proposed on-site improvements, and drainage easements, if necessary, to accommodate flows from the site. The drainage report shall demonstrate compliance with all mitigation measures included in this Revised Draft EIR.

4.3.4-3b New development shall submit a revegetation plan for disturbed swale and channel areas and banks to the Placer County Department of Public Works for review and approval. The revegetation plan shall be designed to minimize erosion potential while emphasizing use of native or endemic species. The plan shall include provision for regular watering between April 1 and October 1 to ensure continuous coverage of 95 percent of disturbed areas and survival of species during the first year.

4.3.4-4 All existing groundwater wells within the Specific Plan area shall be abandoned and sealed in accordance with Placer County Environmental Health Division standards upon abandonment of use, prior to any project-related construction activity within one hundred feet of any affected well. Wells that will remain within the SPA or other adjoining areas that are within 100 feet of active development within the Specific Plan area shall, where landowner permission is granted, be inspected and, if found to be improperly sealed, properly sealed, or destroyed and replaced, in accordance with Placer County Environmental Health Division Standards. Seals, inspections, and well destruction and construction shall be at the expense of the Specific Plan area developer.

4.3.4-7a Prior to approval of improvement plans for improvement projects of one acre or greater, the developer/project proponent shall submit a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPP), obtain from the SWRCB a General Construction Activity Stormwater Permit under the NPDES and comply with all requirements of the permit to minimize pollution of stormwater discharges during construction activities.

4.3.4-7b Prior to construction of any off-site infrastructure within Placer County, the project developer/project proponent shall submit to the Placer County Department of Public Works, for review and approval, an erosion control plan consistent with the County's Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance (reference pages 4-3-9 through 4- 3-12). The erosion control plan shall indicate that proper control of siltation, sedimentation and other pollutants will be implemented per NPDES permit requirements and County ordinance standards. The plan shall address storm drainage during construction and proposed BMPs to reduce erosion and water quality degradation. All on-site drainage facilities shall be constructed to Placer County specifications. BMPs shall be implemented throughout the construction process. The developer shall comply with all similar requirements within other affected jurisdictions.

4.3.4-7c BMPs for construction shall be developed in accordance with the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbook for Construction and New Development/Redevelopment (or other similar source approved by the County Department of Public Works.

4.3.4-9a Install advanced treatment facilities (DCWWTP Master Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 7-2).

4.3.4-9b Institute metals source controls/pre-treatment (DCWWTP Master Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 7-3).

4.3.4-9c Install cooling towers if necessary (DCWWTP Master Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 7-4).

## Biological Resources

4.4-1a A Project Level Open Space, Agricultural Land and Biological Resource Mitigation Plan for implementing the Open Space, Agricultural Land and Biological Resource Mitigation Strategy must be approved by the County at the time of the approval of any improvement plans for subdivision improvements or off site infrastructure, recordation of a final map (not including a large lot final map that results in no disturbance of any existing natural condition) or issuance of any project-level discretionary approval for non-residential land uses that do not require a tentative subdivision map. A Project Level Open Space, Agricultural Land, and Biological Resource Mitigation Plan may cover a development project or group of projects and must include any required off-site infrastructure unless covered by a separate project level mitigation plan for that infrastructure improvement. A tentative map may have more than one Project Level Open Space, Agricultural Land, and Biological Resource Mitigation Plan if the development authorized by the map is intended to occur in phases.

Each Project Level Open Space, Agricultural Land, and Biological Resource Mitigation Plan shall include all of the following:

1. Identification and quantification of land cover and wetland take and applicable mitigation requirements as required under this mitigation strategy.
2. Identification and quantification of proposed mitigation with sufficient detail to allow for County evaluation, including plans for any restoration, enhancement, and/or creation of wetlands.
3. Identification of any conservation or mitigation bank credits or assignment of excess mitigation from other projects in the Specific Plan.
4. Draft conservation easements and draft management and monitoring plans, if applicable.
5. Proposed funding for long term management, if applicable.

4.4-1b Each project (including off-site infrastructure) must demonstrate compliance with an approved Open Space, Agricultural Land, and Biological Resource Mitigation Plan prior to approval of a grading permit that results in land cover or wetland take. Such compliance may be phased with the actual development of the project. Demonstration of compliance shall include:

1. Demonstrate ownership and/or recordation of required easements for land conservation.
2. Demonstrate ownership of applicable credits and/or assignment of any applicable excess mitigation from other projects in the Specific Plan.
3. Demonstrate implementation of any required funding for long term management.
4. Demonstrate approval of construction and monitoring plans for any required restoration, enhancement, or creation of wetlands. Provide proof of executed contracts and initiation of construction.
5. Documentation and approval of any excess mitigation eligible for future use or assignment.

4.4-1c The following criteria shall be applied in the formulation and implementation of Project Level Open Space, Agricultural Land, and Biological Resource Mitigation Plan with respect

to land cover take. This measure will not apply to the Special Planning Area (SPA) where no urban development is proposed.

i. Mitigation Ratio

For every 1.0 acres of land cover taken, 1.35 acres of land will be conserved. The take area shall be calculated to the nearest one-tenth (0.1) acre. The total amount of required acreage will be automatically reduced by any and all off-site conservation or mitigation land required by any permitting agency, specifically including upland areas required in association with wetland mitigation whether acquired through mitigation bank credits or other means.

Because the vast majority of land targeted for conservation in the Reserve Acquisition Area (RAA) is suitable for agriculture and because continued agricultural use will be allowed and encouraged by the conservation easements required under this mitigation measure, no additional agricultural mitigation will be required beyond the 1.35 to 1 requirement for the take of land cover noted above. Likewise, the land cover mitigation criteria is such that it will also provide suitable foraging habitat mitigation for Swainson's hawk and will provide suitable land to meet mitigation requirements for habitat loss contained in measures 4.1-3, 4.1-14, 4.4-2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 23, 25, 26, 27, and 30. No additional land mitigation will be required beyond the 1.35 to 1 requirement for take of land cover noted above for these impacts.

ii. Calculation of Land Cover Take

All land within the Specific Plan (not including the SPA area) will be included in the calculation of take, with the exception of land that will be maintained in or restored to a natural or semi-natural condition as required by the County and/or any state or federal permitting agency. Figure A-2 and Table A-3 show the take area and take calculation by property based upon the proposed land use and avoidance required for compliance with County standards through adoption of the Specific Plan, prior to consideration of any additional avoidance that may be required by a permitting agency. For purposes of this mitigation measure, the take acreage may only be reduced below that shown on Figure A-2 and Table A-3 to the extent that additional avoidance is required by the County and/or any state or federal permitting agency. Similarly the take acreage and corresponding mitigation requirements will be increased to the extent that the County and the state and federal permitting agencies allow future development of any area not included in the take calculations as shown in Figure A-2 and Table A-3.

iii. Mitigation Land Criteria

Land conserved under this measure shall, to the fullest extent feasible, as determined by the County, be located within the Reserve Acquisition Area (RAA) targeted for conservation or restoration of the proposed PCCP (Figure A-1).

Impacts to annual grassland, vernal pool grassland, and pasture lands cover shall be mitigated on existing and restorable grassland (as identified in Figure A-4). All other land cover impacts may be mitigated on any natural or semi-natural land within the Reserve Acquisition Areas "RAA," specifically including agricultural land. Vernal pool grassland will be mitigated by any grassland without regard to wetted area density. Actual wetted area is accounted for by the separate requirement for wetland mitigation discussed below. The wetland mitigation described below can only be carried out if much of the grassland acquired to mitigate land conversion does in fact have a high density of preserved and restored vernal

pool habitat. Application of two measures – land area and wetland area – will jointly provide for conservation of wetland dependent natural communities.

In general, the minimum area for a vernal pool conservation site is 200 acres if the site is not contiguous with other reserve lands. The County, at its discretion, may accept sites of less than 200 acres if they determine that the proposed site has key strategic value for the County's overall conservation strategy or has especially high resource value that can be reasonably protected from edge effects. The area may consist of one or more properties. There is no minimum size for conservation sites that are adjacent to other reserve lands or the Stream System (as identified in Figure A-5). There is also no minimum size for conservation sites incorporating vernal pools that occur on Mehrten Formations. Mehrten vernal pools will only be excluded from consideration if the County determines that existing or future hydrologic, land use, or other characteristics threaten long-term viability.

iv. Conservation Easement/Management Plans

Conservation sites shall be subject to recorded conservation easements and management plans with an identified funding source for long term management of conserved lands. The conservation easements and management plans are subject to approval by the County and shall provide for the long term maintenance of biological functions and values while, whenever feasible, also providing for compatible agricultural use. The County shall accept as satisfactory mitigation any conservation easement and/or management plan required and approved by the terms and conditions of any permit issued by a state or federal resource agency.

v. Use of Mitigation Bank Credits

Project applicants may use credits from approved conservation or mitigation banks to meet all or part of the conservation required by this strategy. Specifically, the uplands associated with any bank wetland preservation, restoration, enhancement or creation may be applied towards the Land Cover mitigation requirement provided that the uplands are subject to an appropriate conservation easement and the applicant can demonstrate that the approved mitigation credits include both wetland and upland land cover to the satisfaction of the County.

Mitigation and conservation banks must be approved by USFWS, USACE, or CDFW. Credits can count toward mitigation obligations if the banks are consistent with the requirements of state and federal natural resource agencies, as accepted by the County. Any out of county bank must have a service area that extends into the Plan area.

vi. Use of Excess Mitigation Assigned From Other Projects in Specific Plan

It is anticipated that, depending on the availability and relative parcel size of potential conservation sites, some projects within the Specific Plan may provide land cover mitigation in excess of the acreage required by this strategy. Excess mitigation may be freely assigned by private agreement between projects within the Specific Plan. Such assignment will be documented and tracked by the County. Project applicants may apply excess mitigation assigned from other projects in the Specific Plan to meet all or a part of the land cover mitigation required by this measure provided proof of assignment can be provided to the satisfaction of the County.

vii. Out of County Mitigation

At its sole discretion, the County may allow a limited amount of out of County mitigation that advances the County's conservation goals and meets the biological intent of this mitigation measure. In addition, the County may accept credits from out of county conservation or mitigation banks towards full or partial compliance with this strategy, if the project is within the agency-approved service area for the credits. Such mitigation will be fully credited towards any mitigation required by this mitigation strategy.

In order to receive credits towards the obligations of this Mitigation Strategy, any conservation outside the PCCP Plan Area, including the purchase of credits from a mitigation bank, must adhere to the criteria below:

It is intended that the main part of the Reserve System will be established within the RAA. There are several places outside the PCCP area and/or Placer County where conservation management activities to improve watershed integrity would serve the mitigation strategy and be compatible with the PCCP. Cooperative conservation actions in these areas could also benefit the reserve system by expanding the resource available for a reserve, increasing contiguous reserve size, or improving connectivity, particularly in a high priority watershed. Figure A-6 depicts the location where acquisition and management of conservation could occur. Lands that may meet these needs are:

- Lands along the Placer/Sutter County border, in particular, the lower portion of the Coon Creek and Auburn Ravine.
- Portions of the floodplain along the Bear River that is within the Coon Creek watershed within Sutter County.
- Lands contained within the levees of the Natomas East Main Drainage, Cross Canal, Pleasant Grove Creek Canal, and East Side Canal for conservation actions which improve fish passage and water quality for salmonids in Placer County.
- Mitigation and Conservation Banks approved by the Wildlife Agencies and/or the USACE that contains the Plan area within the service boundary. Mitigation and Conservation Banks locations are not depicted on Figure A-6.

4.4-1d The following criteria shall be applied in the formulation and implementation of Project Level Open Space, Agricultural Land and Biological Resource Mitigation Plan with respect to the take of Specific Plan Area wetlands. Applicants for projects developed under the Specific Plan shall obtain applicable permits from the state and federal resource agencies, as needed:

i. Overlap with Land Cover Mitigation

Because of their particular regulatory status and their biological importance, wetlands will be accounted for separately through mitigation ratios requiring preservation and/or restoration of a set amount of wetted area calculated as a proportion of wetland take. These wetted acres, along with any upland area that is conserved in association with the wetted acres, will be fully credited towards the required land cover mitigation. It is intended that all of the wetland mitigation will be counted towards land cover mitigation requirements. Likewise, all wetted acres contained within land cover mitigation shall be counted towards wetland mitigation.

ii. Calculation of Wetland Take

Wetland take is calculated as all wetland area that falls in the Land Cover take area as defined in Mitigation Measure 4.4-1c(ii) above.

In practice, certain wetland types are not easily distinguished and often intergrade. This mitigation strategy minimizes the effect of field interpretation by applying the same ratios for all wetland types and by allowing broad latitude for out of kind mitigation. For the purposes of applying mitigation requirements, the definition of vernal pool wetland habitat includes vernal pools and depressional areas within vernal swales, ephemeral drainages, and other seasonal wetlands.

Any wetland area required to be avoided, restored, and/or enhanced on site by the County and/or any permitting agency is automatically excluded from the take calculation. Mitigation at the time of impact will be subject to a finding of baseline consistency with land cover conditions as of 2009/11 (based upon 2009 LIDR and 2011 air photos). If the County suspects, based on inconsistency with this information or other similar information utilized for the PCCP, that wetland area may have changed from baseline conditions, it may require that a baseline consistency analysis be prepared and submitted to the County for review and approval. The baseline consistency finding requires all of the following:

a. Property land uses are essentially the same property land uses present in 2009/11 as determined by available data.

b. There is no evidence that the property has been mass graded without proper authorization.

c. The micro-topography and hydrology of the property are substantially unchanged from 2009/11 conditions.

d. Creeks, swales and other drainages in same location (within 100 feet).

e. At least 70 percent of ponded water and/or other wetlands are still present on the property.

f. The proportion of parcel area in a topographic depression (depressional index) has not been diminished by more than 20 percent from the 2009/2011 index.

The baseline consistency finding establishes a comparison of resources. A finding of non-consistency does not establish responsibility for changes to the land-cover type. Foreseeable changes such as drought, arson fire, or flood may result in non-consistency. However, if an apparent significant change in baseline land-cover is detected, the County will review the changes to determine if baseline land-cover information was inaccurate in 2009/11 or if land-cover conditions have in fact changed significantly. If land-cover conditions have changed significantly, the baseline land-cover conditions will be used as the basis for determining these mitigation strategy requirements. If a mapping error occurred, then mitigation will be based on existing land cover type at the time the consistency finding was requested.

iii. Mitigation Ratio: Preservation

For each 1.00 acres of vernal pool take, 1.00 acres of vernal pool will be preserved. For the purposes of both take and mitigation under this strategy, vernal pools include seasonal depressional wetlands. For each 1.00 acres of take of any other wetland type, the preservation requirement may be met by preserving 1.00 acres of take of any wetland type without regard

for in-kind mitigation. The preservation requirement for open water may be met through preservation of 1.00 acres of open water or any wetland type for each 1.00 acres of take. The total amount of required wetland preservation under this strategy will be automatically reduced by any and all wetland preservation required by any permitting agency. For the purposes of calculating the amount of preservation, the take calculation shall include any identifiable quantity of the resource affected.

iv. Mitigation Ratio: Compensatory Restoration, Enhancement, and Creation

As indicated in Table 2, below, for each 1.00 acre of vernal pool take, 1.25 acres of compensatory wetlands will be restored, enhanced, or created including a minimum of 0.75 acres of vernal pool and no more than 0.50 acres of other wetlands. For the purposes of both take and mitigation under this strategy, vernal pools include seasonal depressional wetlands. For each 1.00 acres of take of any other wetland type, the restoration, enhancement, and creation requirement may be met by restoring, enhancing, and/or creating 1.25 acres of any wetland type without regard for in-kind mitigation. The compensatory requirement for open water may be met through restoration, enhancement or creation of 1.25 acres of open water or any wetland type for each 1.00 acres of take. The total amount of required compensatory wetland restoration, enhancement, or creation under this measure will be automatically reduced by any and all wetland restoration, enhancement and creation required by any permitting agency as well as any wetland preservation required by a permitting agency greater than the wetland preservation amount required by this mitigation strategy. However, in no event shall the compensatory requirement be reduced to below 1.00 by excess preservation. For the purposes of calculating the amount of restoration, enhancement, or creation, the take calculation shall include any identifiable quantity of the resource affected.

In some circumstances, enhancement of existing wetland habitat may add greater wetland function and value to the aquatic system and conserved natural communities than restoration of previously existing or degraded features or creation of new wetland habitat.

At its discretion, consistent with the criteria below, the County may allow enhancement to apply towards the restoration requirement, provided that the enhanced features may not all be applied towards the preservation requirement. In limited circumstances, creation of new wetland features may also be appropriate and beneficial. If approved by the County and/or required by any permitting agency, created wetlands will apply towards the restoration requirement.

v. Restoration

Vernal pool habitat will be restored where soils and hydrologic conditions will support long-term viability, natural topography can be reproduced, and evidence indicates the historical presence of vernal pools. Restoration plans will use nearby, natural, high quality pools as well as historical evidence as models. Restoration plans will consider the size and depth of pools to be constructed, hydrologic connections within complexes, depth from soil surface to hardpan, and upland area to pool-area ratios (USFWS 2005).

Restoration of previously disturbed vernal pool complexes is to be based on whether restoration is likely to increase vernal pool density (as measured in wetted-per-total acre) without exceeding the density present in 1937 aerial photos or other information approved by USFWS and/or CDFW and without harming existing vernal pools. Additional criteria will include whether or not sites occur outside of the Stream System, historically supported

vernal pools (based on 1937 and 1938 aerial photos or other information approved by USFWS and/or CDFW), have hydrological conditions that ensure vernal pool complexes can be restored and protected in perpetuity, and have not been laser-leveled for agriculture or other uses.

Clearly defined objectives will be identified for all restoration projects. Success criteria will be established before each restoration plan is implemented. Monitoring of restored and created vernal pools in Placer County indicates that future restoration in the proposed locations has a high potential for success. It is essential that the Mitigation Strategy require an effective monitoring and adoptive management program in order to ensure the success of vernal pool restoration, enhancement, and creation.

**Table 2**
**Mitigation Ratios for Impacts to Wetlands: Valley and Foothills**

| | Preservation Ratio | Restoration Ratio | Mitigation Community Type |
|---|---|---|---|
| Vernal Pool (1) | 1:1 | 1.25:1 | Preservation: All vernal pools<br>Restoration: 0.75 minimum vernal pool, up to 0.50 may be any wetland |
| Open Water | 1:1 | 1.25:1 | Open-water or any wetland type |
| Fresh emergent wetland | 1:1 | 1.25:1 | Any wetland (2) |
| Other seasonal wetland Spring and seep | 1:1 | 1.25:1 | Any wetland |

*(1) Vernal pools include seasonal depressional wetland.*
*(2) California Black rail habitat must be mitigated in-kind where it occurs.*

vi. Enhancement

The County will on a case-by-case basis approve enhancement actions and will consider whether the proposed enhancement will ameliorate the specific threats that occur on each site. Specific threats to vernal pool grasslands include: modification to the duration of inundation and hydroperiod due to changes in the hydrology of surface flows and perched groundwater flows; non-native vegetation (including annual grasses and noxious weeds); impacts from recreational use; impacts to water quality; non-native predators; and decreased pollination and dispersal of vernal pool species due to impacts to vernal pool uplands. Therefore, actions for maintaining and enhancing preserves with vernal pool grasslands may include: restoration of vernal pool topography; restoration of vernal pool isolation; re-introduction of vernal pool cysts, seeds, and/or plants; restoring and enhancing vernal pool water quality; and invasive plant control.

vii. Creation

Creation is generally considered more appropriate for other wetland types than for vernal pools. Therefore the County will minimize the use of vernal pool creation as a strategy to mitigate for lost resources. Rather, conservation efforts will focus on preservation and enhancement of existing high quality vernal pools, with restoration serving to supplement preservation to protect and restore vernal pool complexes at the levels of the landscape and

local watershed and to mitigate for resources lost to covered activities. Creation of vernal pools must be approved by the appropriate resource agencies to receive credit for mitigation under this measure. Vernal pool creation credits from an approved mitigation bank may apply towards this mitigation requirement. The bank must be consistent with the requirements of state and federal natural resource agencies, as acceptable to the County. Any out of county bank must include a service area that extends into the Plan Area.

viii. Uplands and Buffer Requirements

Wetland preservation, restoration, enhancement, and creation shall be accompanied by the associated uplands and hydrology necessary to sustain long-term viability in a natural or restored environmental setting. To minimize edge effects from adjacent urban and suburban land, vernal pools should be no closer than 250 feet from existing or planned urban or suburban development or located such that adequate hydrology can be maintained in the event of future development.

ix. Conservation Easements/Management Plans

It is anticipated that most wetland preservation, restoration, enhancement and creation will be accomplished on land conserved to meet the land cover mitigation requirement and will be subject to the required conservation easements and management plans. However, if additional lands are conserved to meet the wetland mitigation requirement, the same requirements for conservation easements and management plans shall apply. As with the Land Cover Mitigation, the County shall accept as adequate mitigation any conservation easement and/or management plan required by a permitting agency or associated with an approved conservation or mitigation bank.

x. Use of Mitigation Bank Credits

Consistent with the requirements listed above, project applicants may use credits from approved conservation or mitigation banks to meet all or a part of the wetland mitigation required by this strategy.

xi. Use of Excess Mitigation Assigned From Other Projects in Specific Plan

It is anticipated that, depending on the density of wetlands on land conserved to meet the land cover mitigation requirement, some projects within the Specific Plan may provide wetland mitigation in excess of the acreage required by this strategy. Excess mitigation may be freely assigned by private agreement between projects within the Specific Plan. Such assignment will be documented and tracked by the County. Project applicants may apply excess mitigation assigned from other projects in the Specific Plan to meet all or part of the wetland mitigation required by this measure provided proof of assignment can be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the County.

xii. Out of County Mitigation

At its sole discretion, the County may allow a limited amount of out of County mitigation that advances the County's conservation goals and meets the biological intent of this mitigation strategy. In addition, the County may accept credits from out of county conservation or mitigation banks towards full or partial compliance with this strategy, if the project is within the agency-approved service area for the credits.

In order to receive credit towards the obligations of this mitigation strategy, any conservation outside the PCCP Plan Area, including the purchase of credits from a mitigation bank, must adhere to the criteria below:

It is intended that the main part of the Reserve System will be established within the RAA. There are several places outside the PCCP area and/or Placer County where conservation management activities to improve watershed integrity would serve the mitigation strategy and be compatible with the PCCP. Cooperative conservation actions in these areas could also benefit the reserve system by expanding the resource available for a reserve, increasing contiguous reserve size, or improving connectivity, particularly in a high priority watershed. Figure A-6 depicts the location where acquisition and management of conservation could occur. Lands that may meet these needs are:

- Lands along the Placer/Sutter County border, in particular, the lower portion of the Coon Creek and Auburn Ravine.
- Portions of the floodplain along the Bear River that is within the Coon Creek watershed within Sutter County.
- Lands contained within the levees of the Natomas East Main Drainage, Cross Canal, Pleasant Grove Creek Canal, and East Side Canal for conservation actions which improve fish passage and water quality for salmonids in Placer County.
- Mitigation and Conservation Banks approved by the Wildlife Agencies and/or the USACE that contains the Plan area within the service boundary. Mitigation and Conservation Banks locations are not depicted on Figure A-6.

4.4-2 Implement Mitigation Measure 4.4-1. As an alternative to this measure, once the Placer County Conservation Plan is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.

4.4-3 Prior to approval of grading/engineering plans for any property within the Specific Plan area, a focused survey for elderberry shrubs shall be conducted to determine the presence/absence of the shrubs. The survey shall be completed by a qualified biologist anytime throughout the year. If elderberry shrubs are found, locations of these occurrences shall be mapped. If these resources can be avoided, no further studies are required. However, if projects within the Plan area will likely adversely affect these shrubs, then a detailed mitigation/conservation plan that includes long-term strategies to ensure no net loss of VELB habitat shall be developed.

The replacement of elderberry shrubs required by this measure shall be entirely included within Mitigation Measure 4.4-1, to the extent that the mitigation area includes areas appropriate for elderberry shrubs and VELB. As an alternative to these measures, once the Placer County Conservation Plan is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.

4.4-4 Construction shall be designed to avoid impacts to potential habitat for western pond turtle, if feasible. If construction is required in areas of potential habitat, then a focused survey for this species shall be conducted prior to approval of engineering plans. The survey is required to determine the presence or absence of this species on the properties surveyed. If pond turtles are found on the properties surveyed, locations of these occurrences shall be mapped.

A detailed mitigation/conservation plan that provides for "no net loss" of individuals of the species or its habitat shall be developed upon confirming the presence of this species on the properties surveyed. If this species is not found on the properties surveyed, no further studies are necessary.

The replacement of western pond turtle habitat required by this measure shall be entirely included within Mitigation Measure 4.4-1, to the extent that the mitigation area includes areas appropriate for western pond turtle. As an alternative to these measures, once the Placer County Conservation Plan is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.

4.4-5 When construction is proposed during the burrowing owl breeding season (April-September), a focused survey for burrows shall be conducted within 30 days prior to the beginning of construction activities by a qualified biologist in order to identify any active burrows. If active nests are found, no construction activities shall take place within five hundred feet of the nest until the young have fledged. Burrows that must be removed as a result of Specific Plan implementation shall be removed during the non-breeding season (October to March). If no active nests are found during the focused survey, no further mitigation will be required.

If burrows are removed as a result of implementation and there is suitable habitat on-site, on-site passive relocation shall be required. Owls will be encouraged to move from occupied burrows to alternate natural or artificial burrows that are beyond 50 meters from the impact zone and that are within or contiguous to a minimum of 6.5 acres of foraging habitat for each pair of relocated owls. Relocation of owls should only be implemented during the non-breeding season. On-site habitat shall be preserved in a conservation easement and managed to promote burrowing owl use of the site.

If there is not suitable habitat on-site, off-site passive relocation shall be required. Off-site habitat must provide suitable burrowing owl habitat. Land shall be purchased and/or placed in a conservation easement in perpetuity and managed to maintain suitable habitat. Off-site mitigation shall use one of the following ratios:

1. Replacement of occupied habitat with occupied habitat: 1.5 times 6.6 (9.75) acres per pair or single bird.
2. Replacement of occupied habitat with habitat contiguous to currently occupied habitat: 2 times 6.5 (13.0) acres per pair or single bird.
3. Replacement of occupied habitat with suitable unoccupied habitat: 3 times 6.5 (19.5) acres per pair or single bird.

The replacement of burrowing owl habitat required by this measure could be partially or entirely included within Mitigation Measure 4.4-1, to the extent that the mitigation area includes areas appropriate for burrowing owl.

4.4-6 Swainson's hawk foraging habitat shall be mitigated through implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.4-1. Additionally, the applicant shall be required to obtain a CESA take permit for any active nest tree that may be removed as part of any proposed construction under the Specific Plan. Additional mitigation measures for the loss of active nest trees shall include the planting of suitable nest trees at a 15:1 ratio on suitable foraging habitat areas within west Placer County.

The replacement of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat required by this measure shall be entirely included within Mitigation Measure 4.4-1. As an alternative to this measure, once the Placer County Conservation Plan is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.

4.4-7 If construction activities are proposed during the tricolored blackbird breeding season (May to August), a focused survey for nesting colonies shall be conducted within 30 days prior to the beginning of construction activities by a qualified biologist in order to identify active nests within the construction area. If active nests are found, no construction activities shall take place within five hundred feet of the nesting colony until the young have fledged. Vegetation that must be removed as a result of construction shall be removed during the non-breeding season (September to April). If no active nests are found during the focused survey, no further mitigation will be required.

This measure would ensure that tricolored blackbird nests are avoided when active, so that eggs and young would be protected. Once the blackbirds have fledged their nests, the nests can be removed without harm to the birds. As an alternative to this measure, once the Placer County Conservation Plan is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.

4.4-8 When construction is proposed during the raptor breeding season (March to early September), a focused survey for raptor nests shall be conducted within 30 days prior to the beginning of construction activities by a qualified biologist in order to identify active nests on-site. If active nests are found, no construction activities shall take place within five hundred feet of the nest until the young have fledged. Trees containing nests shall be removed during the non-breeding season (late September to March). If no active nests are found during the focused survey, no further mitigation will be required. This measure will ensure that active nests are not moved or substantially disturbed during the breeding season, so that raptor eggs and young are not destroyed or abandoned as a result of construction. As an alternative to this measure, once the Placer County Conservation Plan is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.

4.4-9 Prior to construction, a qualified biologist shall survey any affected structures for evidence of bat roosts (e.g., bat guano). If roosts are found, they shall be removed in April, September, or October in order to avoid the hibernation and maternity seasons. Appropriate exclusion methods will be used, as needed, during habitat removal.

The initial assessment will involve looking for bats or bat signs such as guano, urine staining, and culled food parts, and will identify those specific locations that represent potential habitat (i.e., which specific buildings, trees, bridges could support roosting bats). If no potential habitat is identified or no potential habitat will be affected (i.e., removed), no further measures are required.

Bat habitat can be removed with minimal impact to the resident bat population if it is done outside of the hibernation season (November through March) and outside of the maternity season (May through August). During the removal period, a roost exit survey shall be conducted prior to habitat removal. If bats are detected, standard humane exclusion methods shall be implemented (e.g., placing plastic over roost entrance areas such that bats can exit the roost but not return). Exclusion shall be conducted for two nights prior to habitat removal and habitat removal shall occur immediately following implementation of these exclusion

measures. If there is a delay, then the exclusion measures shall be repeated. During the maternity season (May through August), habitat removal may occur following a roost exit survey that confirms no bats are present; however, if bats are detected they may not be excluded until the end of the maternity season. During the hibernation season (November through March), bats do not exit the roost, so exit surveys cannot be used to assess presence and removal shall be delayed to the end of this time period.

If bats must be excluded, the project proponent shall work with a qualified biologist to determine if any additional steps (such as installation of alternative roost habitat in the form of bat boxes) are appropriate for the particular habitat. Determination of these additional measures will depend on the species present and their specific ecological preferences/requirements. Other steps could include improvement of other avoided bat habitat or design of new project elements such as bridges to be "bat-friendly." As an alternative to this measure, once the Placer County Conservation Plan is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.

4.4-10a For each oak tree greater than six inches DBH that is removed, one 15-gallon planting, one depot-40 seedling for each inch removed and three 1-gallon shrubs will be planted. De minimus impacts to area containing oak trees, not including actual tree removal, associated with passive trail use shall not be considered an impact requiring mitigation.

The replacement of oak trees required by this measure shall be entirely included within Mitigation Measure 4.4-1, to the extent that the mitigation area includes areas appropriate for such habitat.

As an alternative to this measure, once the Placer County Conservation Plan is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.

4.4-10b Trees that are not planned for removal shall be preserved and protected. These oak trees shall be preserved and avoided by implementation of the following measures:

- Trees that are not proposed for removal and that are within two hundred feet of grading activities shall be protectively fenced five feet beyond the dripline and root zone of each oak tree (as determined by a certified arborist). This fence, which is meant to prevent activities that result in soil compaction beneath the canopies or over the root zone, shall be maintained until all construction activities are completed. No vehicles, construction equipment, mobile offices, or materials shall be placed within this fenced area.
- Grade changes shall be minimized to the extent feasible within or adjacent to the drip line of existing trees. No soil surface removal greater than one foot in depth shall occur within the drip lines of oak trees to be preserved. No cuts shall occur within five feet of their trunks. No earthen fill greater than one foot deep shall be placed within the drip lines of preserved oak trees, or within five feet of their trunks.
- Paving shall not be placed in the drip lines of oak trees to be preserved.
- Underground utility line trenching shall be not be placed within the drip lines of oak trees to be preserved. If it is absolutely necessary to install underground utilities within the drip lines of oak trees, the trench shall either be bored or drilled, but not within five feet of the trunk.

- For trees that will be removed, the project applicant shall submit a tree survey map of oaks to be removed or disturbed during project construction. Within these impact areas, an inventory of the location, number and health of oaks shall be prepared by a certified arborist. A certified arborist shall also prepare a monitoring and management plan for each project disturbing or removing oak trees. The plan shall address planting techniques, proposed mitigation sites, monitoring requirements, management recommendations, and minimization and avoidance measures.
- Annual monitoring shall be included to ensure that an 80 percent survival rate is achieved over a five-year period. During monitoring, the following information shall be evaluated: average tree height, percent canopy cover, and percent survival. An oak tree mitigation and monitoring plan shall be submitted that includes a description of irrigation methods that will be used to ensure that saplings survive the first several years of growth. During the revegetation process, tree survival shall be maximized by using gopher cages, deer screens, regular maintenance, and replanting as needed. Monitoring reports shall be submitted to Placer County on an annual basis.

As an alternative to this measure, once the Placer County Conservation Plan is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.

4.4-11a Since all potential jurisdictional waters of the U.S. will not be avoided in the Specific Plan design, the wetland delineation shall be finalized and the results shall be mapped and submitted to the Corps for verification through the section 404 permit process. Completion of the delineation will ensure precise acreage of various wetland types occurring in within properties surveyed.

4.4-11b Implement Mitigation Measure 4.4-1 as it pertains to non-vernal pool wetlands. For every acre of non-vernal pool wetland (jurisdictional or non-jurisdictional) lost directly to development, Mitigation Measure 4.4-1 requires replacement, re-creation, or restoration of the appropriate amount of acreage necessary to meet the no net loss standard. Assuming that the project will result in the direct loss of 29.7 acres of non-vernal pool complex habitat-type wetlands, Mitigation Measure 4.4-1 would require the preservation and/or replacement, re-creation or restoration of similar wetlands. Mitigation acreage amounts are reflected in Table 4.4-12 based on typical mitigation bank ratios. The total required acreage shall be determined by the County.

Additional steps shall be taken for properties that require more detailed resource identification prior to development, including: wetlands delineated and submitted to the USACE, habitat types mapped, and special-status species determined to be or potentially be within the Specific Plan area with protocol surveys conducted if required to the extent that development is proposed on these properties that may be subject to 404 permit and FESA requirements.

4.4-12a Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a Streambed Alteration Agreement shall be obtained from CDFW, pursuant to Section 1600 et seq. of the California Fish and Game Code, for each stream crossing and any other activities affecting the bed, bank, or associated riparian vegetation of the stream. If required, the project applicant shall coordinate with CDFW in developing appropriate mitigation, and shall abide by the conditions of any executed agreements. All stream crossings shall be performed using a "jack and bore" construction technique, unless otherwise specified by CDFW. Streambed Alteration

Agreement measures to protect the channel bank of a stream from erosion and related effects of construction shall be included in all related construction contracts. As an alternative to this measure, once the Placer County Conservation Plan is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.

4.4-12b For each riparian tree removed, one 15-gallon tree, one depot-40 seedling for each inch, and three one-gallon shrubs will be planted within existing riparian or improved drainage corridors in the Specific Plan Area. The replacement ratios exceed 1:1 in order to ensure that over the long-term the value of new riparian habitat equals or exceeds the value of the habitat that was lost. The replacement of riparian trees required by this measure shall be entirely included within Mitigation Measure 4.4-1, to the extent that the mitigation area includes areas appropriate for such habitat.

As an alternative to this measure, once the Placer County Conservation Plan is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.

4.4-13 If construction activities are proposed during the Loggerhead shrike breeding season (March to July), a focused survey for nesting pairs shall be conducted within 30 days prior to the beginning of construction activities by a qualified biologist in order to identify active nests within the construction area. If active nests are found, no construction activities shall take place within five hundred feet of the nesting colony until the young have fledged. Vegetation that must be removed as a result of construction shall be removed during the non-breeding season (March to July). If no active nests are found during the focused survey, no further mitigation will be required.

This measure would ensure that Loggerhead shrike nests are avoided when active, so that eggs and young would be protected. Once the birds have fledged, their nests can be removed without harm to the birds. As an alternative to this measure, once the Placer County Conservation Plan is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.

4.4-15 Installation of infrastructure within off-site infrastructure areas shall be designed to avoid impacts to potential special-status plant species habitat, if feasible. If special-status plant habitat cannot be avoided, then a mitigation/conservation plan shall be prepared and implemented. The plan shall include measures to ensure "no net loss" of special-status plant species habitat.

If installation of infrastructure is required in areas of potential habitat, then a focused rare plant survey for these species shall be conducted prior to approval of grading/engineering plans. The survey is required to determine the presence or absence of these species in these areas. The survey shall be completed by a qualified botanist during the appropriate peak blooming period for these species. If special-status plants are found, locations of these occurrences shall be mapped. A detailed mitigation/conservation plan that includes long-term strategies for the conservation of the species shall be developed upon confirming the presence of these species. The plan shall provide for preservation and restoration at ratios that would ensure "no net loss" of the affected plant habitat. If these species are not found, no further studies will be necessary.

The mitigation acreage required by this measure could be partially or entirely included within Mitigation Measure 4.4-1, to the extent that the mitigation area includes vernal pools that provide equal or greater habitat value for the affected special-status species plants.

Avoidance and/or loss of habitat for special-status plants outside of Placer County would be regulated by the USACE, CDFW, Sutter County, Sacramento County, and/or the City of Roseville, depending on the location of such plants and whether they are federal or state listed species. These jurisdictions can and should implement similar measures to ensure "no net loss" of special-status plant habitat.

As an alternative to this measure, once the Placer County Conservation Plan is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.

4.4-16 Installation of off-site infrastructure shall be designed to avoid vernal pools, if feasible. If pools will be filled or degraded by off-site infrastructure areas, implement Mitigation Measure 4.4-2.

The mitigation acreage required by this measure shall be entirely included within Mitigation Measure 4.4-1.

Avoidance and/or fill of vernal pools outside of Placer County will be regulated by the USACE, Sutter County, Sacramento County, and/or the City of Roseville, depending on the location and type of vernal pools that would be affected. Federal policy (for jurisdictional wetlands), Sacramento County policy and Sutter County policy all call for "no net loss" of wetlands. These jurisdictions can and should implement measures similar to those provided in Mitigation Measure 4.4-1 to ensure "no net loss" of vernal pools.

As an alternative to this measure, once the Placer County Conservation Plan is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.

4.4-17 Prior to approval of grading/engineering plans, a focused survey for elderberry shrubs shall be conducted to determine the presence/absence of the shrubs. The survey shall be completed by a qualified biologist anytime throughout the year. If elderberry shrubs are found, locations of these occurrences shall be mapped. If these resources can be avoided, no further studies are required. However, if projects within the off-site infrastructure areas will likely adversely affect these shrubs, then a detailed mitigation/conservation plan that includes long-term strategies to ensure "no net loss" of VELB habitat shall be developed.

The replacement of elderberry shrubs required by this measure shall be entirely included within Mitigation Measure 4.4-1, to the extent that the mitigation area includes areas appropriate for elderberry shrubs and VELB.

This measure would ensure "no net loss" of VELB habitat within Placer County. If elderberry shrubs are present in off-site infrastructure areas in Sutter County, Sacramento County, and/or the City of Roseville, these jurisdictions could also require measures to ensure "no net loss" of VELB habitat.

As an alternative to this measure, once the Placer County Conservation Plan is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.

4.4-18 Implement Mitigation Measure 4.4-4, which requires that construction be designed to avoid impacts to potential habitat for western pond turtle, if feasible. If installation is required in areas of potential habitat, then a focused survey for this species shall be conducted prior to approval of engineering plans. The survey is required to determine the presence or absence of this species in the off-site infrastructure areas. If pond turtles are found in the off-site infrastructure areas, locations of these occurrences shall be mapped.

A detailed mitigation/conservation plan that provides for "no net loss" of individuals of the species or its habitat shall be developed upon confirming the presence of this species in the off-site infrastructure areas. If this species is not found in the off-site infrastructure areas, no further studies are necessary.

The replacement of western pond turtle habitat, if necessary, shall be entirely included within Mitigation Measure 4.4-1, to the extent that the mitigation area includes areas appropriate for western pond turtle. If western pond turtle is present in off-site infrastructure areas in Sutter County, Sacramento County, and/or the City of Roseville, these jurisdictions could also require measures to ensure "no net loss" of its habitat.

As an alternative to this measure, once the Placer County Conservation Plan is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.

4.4-19 Implement Mitigation Measure 4.4-5, which requires nesting surveys prior to construction, so if burrowing owls establish nests in the off-site infrastructure areas, they would be detected. This measure also prohibits construction activities within five hundred feet of a nest, so that nesting owls would not be disturbed. Once the young have fledged, the nests can be removed, because the owls would then establish nests in a new area. Therefore, with implementation of this measure, the impact on nesting burrowing owls would be less than significant. Similar measures could be implemented by Sutter County, Sacramento County, and/or the City of Roseville, if needed, to protect nesting burrowing owls.

As an alternative to this measure, once the Placer County Conservation Plan is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.

4.4-21 If installation of infrastructure is proposed in areas where identified non-raptor special status bird species may occur, a focused survey for non-raptor special-status bird nests and/or nesting colonies shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within 30 days prior to the beginning of construction activities by a qualified biologist in order to identify nests within the construction area. If active nests and/or nesting colonies are found, no construction activities shall take place within five hundred feet of the nest and/or nesting colony until the young have fledged and the biologist has consulted with the CDFW, particularly with respect to vegetation removal as a result of installation of project infrastructure. If no active nests are found during the focused survey, no further mitigation will be required. This measure would ensure that bird nests are avoided when active, so that eggs and young would be protected. Once the birds have left their nests, the nests can be removed without harm to the birds. Similar measures could be implemented by Sutter County, Sacramento County, and/or the City of Roseville, if needed, to protect nesting non-raptor special status bird species.

As an alternative to this measure, once the Placer County Conservation Plan is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.

4.4-22 Implement Mitigation Measure 4.4-8, which requires nesting surveys prior to construction, so if raptor nests are present in the off-site infrastructure areas, they will be detected. This measure also prohibits construction activities within five hundred feet of a nest, so that nesting raptors will not be disturbed. Once the young have fledged, the nests can be removed, because the raptors would then establish nests in a new area. Therefore, with implementation of this measure, the impact on nesting raptors would be less than significant. Similar measures could be implemented by Sutter County, Sacramento County and/or the City of Roseville, if needed, to protect nesting raptors. As an alternative to this measure, once the Placer County Conservation Plan is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.

4.4-23 Installation of off-site infrastructure shall be designed to avoid impacts to potential habitat for California horned lizard, if feasible. If installation is required in areas of potential habitat, a focused survey for this species shall be conducted prior to approval of engineering plans. The survey is required to determine the presence or absence of this species in the off-site infrastructure areas. If horned lizards are found in the off-site infrastructure areas, locations of these occurrences shall be mapped.

A detailed mitigation/conservation plan that provides for "no net loss" of individuals of the species or its habitat shall be developed upon confirming the presence of this species in the off-site infrastructure areas. If this species is not found in the off-site infrastructure areas, no further studies are necessary.

This measure would protect the California horned lizard, if present, from harm. Surveys of proposed impact areas shall be conducted during the active season for the lizard (generally April to October). During the spring, lizards are typically active during midday. During summer, activity transitions to morning and late afternoon.

The replacement of habitat, if necessary, shall be entirely included within Mitigation Measure 4.4-1, to the extent that the mitigation area includes areas appropriate for the affected habitat. If California horned lizard is present in off-site infrastructure areas in Sutter County, Sacramento County and/or the City of Roseville, these jurisdictions could also require measures to ensure "no net loss" of its habitat.

As an alternative to this measure, once the Placer County Conservation Plan is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.

4.4-24 Prior to construction, a qualified biologist shall survey any affected structures for evidence of bat roosts (e.g., bat guano). If roosts are found, they shall be removed in April, September or October in order to avoid the hibernation and maternity seasons. Appropriate exclusion methods will be used, as needed, during habitat removal.

The initial assessment will involve looking for bats or bat sign such as guano, urine staining, and culled food parts and will identify those specific locations that represent potential habitat (e.g., which specific buildings, trees, bridges could support roosting bats). If no potential habitat is identified or no potential habitat will be impacted (i.e., removed), no further measures are required.

Bat habitat can be removed with minimal impact to the resident bat population if it is done outside of the hibernation season (November through March) and outside of the maternity season (May through August). During the removal period, a roost exit survey shall be conducted prior to habitat removal. If bats are detected, standard humane exclusion methods shall be implemented (e.g., placing plastic over roost entrance areas such that bats can exit the roost but not return). Exclusion shall be conducted for two nights prior to habitat removal and habitat removal shall occur immediately following implementation of these exclusion measures. If there is a delay, then the exclusion measures shall be repeated. During the maternity season (May through August), habitat removal may occur following a roost exit survey that confirms no bats are present; however, if bats are detected they may not be excluded until the end of the maternity season. During the hibernation season (November through March), bats do not exit the roost, so exit surveys cannot be used to assess presence and removal shall be delayed to the end of this time period.

If bats must be excluded, the project proponent shall work with a qualified biologist to determine if any additional steps (such as installation of alternative roost habitat in the form of bat boxes) are appropriate for the particular habitat. Determination of these additional measures will depend on the species present and their specific ecological preferences/requirements. Other steps could include improvement of other avoided bat habitat or design of new project elements such as bridges to be "bat-friendly." Similar measures to those described in this mitigation measure could be used by Sutter County, Sacramento County, and/or the City of Roseville.

As an alternative to this measure, once the Placer County Conservation Plan is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.

4.4-25 Implement Mitigation Measures 4.4-10a and 4.4-10b. The applicant is to provide a tree survey map of all trees that would be removed or disturbed during construction of the off-site infrastructure areas. These trees shall be replaced as specified in Mitigation Measure 4.4-1. Replacement trees shall be monitored annually to ensure that the new oaks and oak woodland are successful. Mitigation Measure 4.4-10b specifies measures to be taken to protect remaining trees from damage during construction. Similar measures could be implemented by Sutter County, Sacramento County, and/or the City of Roseville, if needed to protect oak woodland and individual trees.

As an alternative to this measure, once the Placer County Conservation Plan is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.

4.4-26 Infrastructure installations shall be redesigned to avoid impacts to wetlands, and other waters of the U.S., if feasible. If wetlands cannot be feasibly avoided, implement Mitigation Measures 4.4-1 Successful restoration of vernal pools and other wetlands under Mitigation Measures 4.4-1 would result in more wetland acreage than would be lost to development. Sutter County, Sacramento County and/or the City of Roseville could require similar measures to ensure "no net loss" of wetlands.

The mitigation acreage required by these measures shall be entirely included within Mitigation Measure 4.4-1. As an alternative to this measure, once the Placer County Conservation Plan is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.

4.4-27 Implement Mitigation Measure 4.4-12, which requires a Streambed Alteration Agreement from CDFW whenever a road (bridge) or utility line would be constructed across a stream. The Agreement would include measures to protect the channel and bank of a stream from erosion and related effects of construction. The measure also requires that Mitigation Measure 4.4-1 be implemented as it pertains to riparian habitat. New trees and shrubs would be planted to replace those removed for development. The replacement ratios would exceed 1:1 in order to ensure that over the long-term the value of new riparian habitat equals or exceeds the value of the habitat that was lost. Any stream crossings proposed in Sutter County, Sacramento County, and/or the City of Roseville would also likely be required to obtain a Streambed Alteration Agreement.

As an alternative to this measure, once the Placer County Conservation Plan is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.

4.4-28 All construction activity involving disturbance of habitat, shall be restricted to the period between May 1 and September 30. This is the active period for Giant Garter snake and direct mortality is lessened, because snakes are expected to actively move and avoid danger.

24-hours prior to construction activities, the project area shall be surveyed for Giant Garter snake. Survey of the project area shall be repeated if a lapse in construction activity of two weeks or greater has occurred. If a snake is encountered during construction, activities shall cease until appropriate corrective measures have been completed or it has been determined that the snake will not be harmed. Any incidental take and any sightings shall be reported to the USFWS immediately.

Movement of heavy equipment shall be confined to existing roadways to minimize habitat disturbance.

Construction personnel shall (to the extent practical) receive USFWS-approved worker environmental awareness training. This training instructs workers to recognize Giant Garter snakes and their habitat(s), and what to do if a Giant Garter snake is encountered during construction activities.

No plastic, monofilament, jute, or similar erosion control matting that could entangle snakes will be placed on a project site when working within 200 feet of snake aquatic or rice habitat. Substitutions include coconut coir matting, tactified hydroseeding compounds, or other material approved by the Wildlife Agencies.

Between April 15 and September 30, all irrigation ditches, canals, or other aquatic habitat shall be completely dewatered, with no puddle water remaining, for at least 15 consecutive days prior to the excavation or filling in of the dewatered habitat. Make sure dewatered habitat does not continue to support Giant Garter snake prey, which could detain or attract snakes into the area. If a site cannot be completely dewatered, netting and salvage of prey items may be necessary.

Confine clearing to the minimal area necessary to facilitate construction activities. Flag and designate avoided Giant Garter snake habitat within or adjacent to the project as Environmentally Sensitive Areas. This area shall be avoided by all construction personnel.

If a live Giant Garter snake is found during construction activities, immediately notify the USFWS and the project's manager. The manager shall do the following:

- Stop construction in the vicinity of the snake. Monitor the snake and allow the snake to leave on its own. A monitor shall remain in the area for the remainder of the work day to make sure the snake is not harmed or if it leaves the site, does not return. Escape routes for Giant Garter snake should be determined in advance of construction and snakes should always be allowed to leave on their own. If a Giant Garter snake does not leave on its own within one working day, further consultation with USFWS is required.

Fill or construction debris may be used by Giant Garter snake as an over-wintering site. Therefore, upon completion of construction activities, remove any temporary fill and construction debris. If this material is situated near undisturbed Giant Garter snake habitat and it is to be removed between October 1 and April 30, it shall be inspected by a qualified biologist to assure that Giant Garter snake are not using it as hibernaculae. Wherever feasible, restore disturbed areas to pre-project conditions. Restoration work may include such activities as replanting species removed.

As an alternative to this measure, once the Placer County Conservation Plan is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.

4.4-29 If installation of infrastructure is proposed during the Loggerhead shrike breeding season (March to July), a focused survey for nesting pairs shall be conducted within 30 days prior to the beginning of construction activities by a qualified biologist in order to identify active nests within the construction area. If active nests are found, no construction activities shall take place within five hundred feet of the nesting colony until the young have fledged. Vegetation that must be removed as a result of installation shall be removed during the non-breeding season (March to July). If no active nests are found during the focused survey, no further mitigation will be required.

This measure would ensure that Loggerhead shrike nests are avoided when active, so that eggs and young would be protected. Once the birds have left their nests, the nests can be removed without harm to the birds. Similar measures could be implemented by Sutter County, Sacramento County, and/or the City of Roseville, if needed, to protect nesting tricolored blackbirds.

As an alternative to this measure, once the Placer County Conservation Plan is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.

4.4-30a Implement Mitigation Measures 4.4-12a and 4.4-12b. As an alternative to this measure, once the Placer County Conservation Plan is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.

4.4-30b A qualified fish biologist shall be present on-site during any dewatering activities at construction sites to minimize impacts to special-status species (i.e., prevent stranding of special-status species). Individual fish collected during dewatering shall be identified and released in an uninterrupted waterway adjacent to the area of disturbance. As an alternative to this measure, once the Placer County Conservation Plan is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.

4.4-30c Chinook salmon and steelhead resources shall be protected from potential construction-related activities by adherence to a construction window, whereby construction activities would be precluded from October 15 through June 15. This window corresponds to the time

when both adult and juvenile Chinook salmon and steelhead are expected to migrate through the area. Further measures to protect salmon resources include use of Best Management Practices (BMPs) to minimize and localize siltation and other water quality impacts and to provide for riparian restoration activities. Such BMPs may include the use of cofferdams and other structures during dewatering and construction activities. Water quality monitoring shall also be performed to ensure that state and federal water quality standards are met. As an alternative to this measure, once the Placer County Conservation Plan is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP to mitigate affected resources impacts covered in the PCCP.

4.4-59 Implementation of the following measure would substantially lessen the severity of the Specific Plan contribution to the cumulative loss of open space, but not to a less than significant level. Therefore, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable, and the project's incremental contribution to this impact would itself be cumulatively considerable (i.e. significant). Implement Mitigation Measure 4.4-1 as well as Mitigation Measures 4.4-2, 4.4-3, 4.4-4, 4.4-5, 4.4-6, 4.4-9, 4.4-10a, 4.4-11a, 4.4-12b, 4.4-15, 4.4-16, 4.4-17, 4.4-18, 4.4-23, 4.4-24, 4.4-25, 4.4-26, and 4.4-27.

Mitigation Measure 4.4-1 would reduce the magnitude of the Specific Plan contribution to the cumulative loss of biological habitat by requiring the off-site preservation of open space at a ratio of 1:1.35, most of which is likely to provide a mosaic of habitats similar to the Specific Plan area. The other measures identified above would further protect special-status plant and wildlife from harm by requiring appropriate habitat and/or nesting surveys, avoidance of habitat and/or nests, and compensation for loss of habitat. While individual members of special-status species would be protected from harm, and required off-site open space would not be developed, there would still be a net loss in land available for plant and wildlife habitat as a result of the Specific Plan. Therefore, this mitigation would reduce, but would not fully offset, the project's incremental contribution to the significant cumulative loss of biological habitat.

## Geology, Soils, Minerals, and Paleontological Resources

4.5-1a New development within the Specific Plan area shall submit a geotechnical report prepared by a California Registered Civil or Geotechnical Engineer to the Department of Public Works for review prior to improvement plans approval. The report shall meet all relevant requirements of the most recently adopted version of the Uniform Building Code 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, corrosiveness, expansive/unstable soils), and
- Slope stability.

If the geotechnical report indicates the presence of critically expansive or other soils problems which, if not corrected, would lead to structural defects, a certification of completion of the

requirements of the report will be required for subdivisions and other entitlements, prior to issuance of building permits. The certification may be completed on a lot-by-lot basis, tract basis, or other defined project basis. This shall also be noted in the covenants, conditions and restrictions and on the information sheet filed with the final subdivision map(s). It shall be 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.

4.5-1b For non-pad graded lots, prior to approval of improvement plans, a soil investigation of each lot in the subdivision produced by a California Registered Civil or Geotechnical Engineer shall be submitted to the Department of Public Works for review and approval (Sections 17953-17955 of the California Government Code). For pad-graded lots, prior to final acceptance of project improvements or consideration of early building permits, and after completion of pad grading for all lots, a soil investigation of each lot produced by a California Registered Civil or Geotechnical Engineer shall be submitted to the Department of Public Works for review and approval (Sections 17953-17955 of the Government Code).

The soil investigations shall include recommended corrective action to prevent structural damage to each proposed dwelling. In addition, any soil problems encountered on each specific lot, as well as the recommended corrective actions, shall be included in a Development Notebook.

4.5-4a New development within the Specific Plan area shall prepare and submit to the Department of Public Works a preliminary grading and erosion control (winterization)/ground instability plan prepared by a California Registered Civil Engineer. Erosion and ground instability mitigation measures shall include conformance to the Uniform Building Code and Placer County grading ordinances. The preliminary grading plan shall include methods to control soil erosion and ground instability.

4.5-4b A Notice of Intent (NOI) and supporting documents shall be submitted to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall be prepared for inclusion with the construction plans and for regulation of construction activities. The SWPPP shall include Best Management Practices (BMPs) which address source reduction and sediment capture and retention. BMPs shall be developed in accordance with the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practices Handbook for Construction and New Development/Redevelopment (or other similar source).

Uncemented silty soils are prone to erosion. According to requirements, as set forth in Section 402 (p) of the Clean Water Act as amended in 1987, and as administered by the SWRCB, erosion control measures (appropriate Best Management Practices) shall be implemented during construction which conform to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, Storm Drain Standards, and local standards, consistent with Best Management Practices contained in the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practices Handbook for Construction and New Development/Redevelopment (or other similar source).

4.5-4c 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 Department of Public Works for review and approval for each new development phase within the Specific Plan. The plans shall show all conditions for each phase, 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, that could be affected by

planned construction, shall be shown in the plans. All landscaping and irrigation facilities within sight distance areas at intersections shall be included in the improvement plans. The applicant shall pay plan check and inspection fees. The cost of the above-noted landscape and irrigation facilities shall be included in the estimates used to determine these fees. It shall be the applicant's responsibility to obtain all required agency signatures on the plans and to secure department approvals. If the Design/Site Review process and/or Design Review Committee 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 Department of Public Works prior to acceptance by the County of site improvements.

4.5-4d All proposed grading, drainage improvements, and vegetation and tree removal shall be shown on the improvement plans and all work shall conform to provisions if the Placer County Grading Ordinance (Ref. Article 15.48, formerly Chapter 29, 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 Design Review Committee. All cut/fill slopes shall be at 2:1 (horizontal:/vertical) unless a soils report supports a steeper slope and the Department of Public Works 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. Erosion control shall be provided where roadside drainage is off of the pavement, to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works.

A letter of credit or cash deposit shall be submitted to the Department of Public Works 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 Design Review Committee/Department of Public Works for a determination of substantial conformance to the project approvals prior to any further work proceeding. Failure of the Design Review Committee/Department of Public Works to make a determination of substantial conformance may serve as grounds for appropriate punitive action by the appropriate hearing body, including the revocation of a site-specific project approval in extreme circumstances. In determining what constitutes appropriate punitive action in this context, the hearing body shall be guided by the penalty options set forth in Article 15.48 and Article 17.62 of the Placer County Code.

4.5-4e Stockpiling and/or vehicle staging areas shall be identified prior to any discretionary entitlement and shown on improvement plans and located as far as practical from existing dwellings and protected resources in the area.

4.5-4f New development with ground disturbance exceeding one acre that is subject to construction stormwater quality permit requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program shall obtain such permit from the State Regional Water Quality Control Board (SRWQCB) and shall provide to the Department of Public Works evidence of a state-issued Waste Discharge Identification (WDID) number or filing of a Notice of Intent and fees prior to start of construction.

4.5-5a Restore ground surface and topography.

4.5-5b Require soil stockpiling and disposal standards.

4.5-5c Prepare erosion and sedimentation control plan.

4.5-5d Implement recommendations of geotechnical report.

4.5-5e For the SRWTP, consult Division of Oil and Gas records prior to excavation, for excavation depths greater than five feet below the surface.

## Cultural Resources

4.6-1 Prior to any ground-disturbing activity within five hundred feet of historical resources and unique archaeological resources,, archaeological surface inspections shall be completed to determine if each respective site still exists and, if so, archaeological test excavations shall be conducted to the extent necessary to determine if further mitigation is necessary. If determined to be necessary, a data recovery plan, which makes provision for adequately recovering the scientifically consequential information from and about the archaeological resources, shall be prepared by a qualified professional archaeologist and adopted by the County prior to any excavation. The data recovery plan shall be deposited with the California Historical Resources Regional Information Center.

4.6-2a In the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains, until compliance with the provisions of Section 15064.5 (e)(1) and (2) of the *State CEQA Guidelines* has occurred.

4.6-2b If any artifacts or other indications of cultural resources 45 years old or older are found once ground-disturbing activities are underway, the find shall be immediately evaluated by a qualified archaeologist. If the find is determined to be an historical or unique archaeological resource, contingency funding and a time allotment to allow for implementation of avoidance measures or appropriate mitigation shall be made available, as provided in Section 15064.5 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*. Work may continue on other parts of the project site while historical or unique archaeological resource mitigation takes place.

4.6-2c Prior to the issuance of any permits for construction, including demolition permits, for properties that have not been previously inspected by an archaeologist or previously inspected by an architectural historian, a qualified archaeologist and/or architectural historian, as appropriate, shall be retained to identify and evaluate any cultural resources, and determine if further mitigation, may be necessary, and recommend any such potential mitigation to the County for its consideration. The County will assess the feasibility of any

proposed mitigation (e.g., avoidance of the historical resource) and impose the mitigation where feasible in light of Specific Plan policies and land use assumptions. The necessity of inspection by an architectural historian includes any buildings potentially eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources, but for which the identification and evaluation process (the filling out of Primary, Building and Location record forms distributed by the California Office of Historic Preservation) has not been completed.

4.6-2d An orange construction fencing shall be placed around the California Register-eligible sites located in open space, if construction, including trail and fire break building, is conducted within one hundred feet of the archaeological resource. Placement of the fencing must be done in consultation with an archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in prehistoric archaeology.

4.6-2e An archaeologist shall participate in the preconstruction meeting(s) to inform the participants of the sensitivity and location of any California Register-eligible sites in the vicinity of grading or construction.

4.6-2f Any California Register-eligible site located in the open space that will be within one hundred feet or closer to public access (e.g., road, trail or firebreak), public facility or private residence shall be enclosed with permanent fencing designed to help prevent trespass. Each enclosure shall be constructed with a locked gate. A sign at each enclosure shall explain site values, interpret site history (or prehistory), identify prohibited uses and warn of penalties for violations.

4.6-2g To help insure the long-term preservation of those California Register-eligible archaeological resources located in the open space, the CC&Rs shall include a clause that prohibits the collecting, digging or removal of any stone, artifact or other prehistoric or historic object from the open space.

4.6-2h If human remains are discovered, all work shall stop in the immediate vicinity of the find and the County Coroner must be notified, according to Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code. If the remains are Native American, the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission, which in turn will inform a most likely descendant. The descendant will then recommend to the landowner appropriate disposition of the remains and any grave goods.

4.6-3a Should paleontological resources be identified at a particular site, the project manager shall cease operation until a qualified professional can provide an evaluation. Mitigation shall be conducted as follows: 1. Identify and evaluate paleontologic resource by intense field survey where impacts are considered high; 2. Assess effects on identified sites; 3. Consult with the institutional/academic paleontologists conducting research investigations within the geological formations that are slated to be impacted; 4. Obtain comments from the researchers; 5. Comply with researchers' recommendations to address any significant adverse effects where determined by the County to be feasible pursuant to Mitigation Measure 4.6-3b.

4.6-3b In considering any suggested mitigation proposed by the consulting paleontologist, County Planning Department Staff shall determine whether avoidance is necessary and feasible in light of factors such as the nature of the find, project design, costs, Specific Plan policies and land use assumptions, and other considerations. If avoidance is unnecessary or infeasible, other appropriate measures (e.g., data recovery) shall be instituted. Work may proceed on other parts of the project site while mitigation for paleontological resources is carried out.

4.6-5 Prior to any ground disturbing or demolition work for intersection improvements, road widenings and utilities construction, an on-the-ground inspection shall be conducted of the areas outside existing public rights-of-way by a qualified archaeologist and/or architectural historian, as appropriate. Such inspections will at a minimum include a field inspection, the recording on forms distributed by the California Office of Historic Preservation of any cultural resources 45 years old or older, an assessment of eligibility for the California Register of Historical Resources and qualification as a "unique archaeological resource," and a technical report that follows California Office of Historic Preservation guidelines for contents and format. The report shall contain any feasible mitigation measures to be implemented by the applicant. In some cases, an updated records search by the appropriate information center of the California Historical Resources Information System may be necessary if the proposed routes change or if there is more than a year delay between the present study (2005) and said field inspection(s).

4.6-6 Placer County shall coordinate with Roseville Public Cemetery District to facilitate the reinterrment of any burials affected by the Watt Avenue road widening prior to any physical disturbance of Cemetery frontage. Project applicants shall fully compensate the Cemetery and County for any costs incurred during the grave site testing and reinterrment process.

4.6-10 If the Off-Site Gravity Sewer Alternative "A" is selected, then disturbance of the California Register-eligible segment of CA-PLA-946-H, the Sacramento Northern Railroad grade, shall be avoided by using jack and bore construction techniques under the railroad grade for placement of the sewer line.

4.6-13a Halt work if cultural resources are discovered. If concentrations of prehistoric or historic period cultural materials are encountered, all work in the vicinity of the find(s) should halt until a qualified archaeologist is retained, evaluates the material, and makes recommendations for further action.

4.6-13b Halt work if human remains are encountered. If human remains are encountered, all work should stop in the vicinity of the bone and the County Coroner should be notified immediately. The procedures outlined in the *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5(e) should be followed, if human burials are judged to be Native American origin.

4.6-13c Should any cultural resources, such as structural features, unusual amounts of bone, shell, artifacts, human remains, or architectural remains be encountered during any development activities, work shall be suspended and the Department of Environmental Review and Assessment (DERA) shall be immediately notified. At that time, DERA shall coordinate any necessary investigation of the find with appropriate specialists as needed. The SRCSD shall be required to implement any mitigation deemed necessary by DERA for the protection of cultural resources. In the event of discovery of human remains, all work is to stop and the County Coroner shall be immediately notified pursuant to Section 5097.97 of the California Public Resources Code and Section 70950.5 of the California Health and Safety Code. If the remains are determined to be Native American, guidelines of the Native American Heritage Commission shall be adhered to in the treatment and disposition of the remains.

4.6-14 Prior to any ground disturbing or demolition work for intersection improvements, road widenings and utilities construction, an updated records search through the California Historical Resources Information System shall be performed and on-the-ground inspection will be conducted by a qualified archaeologist and/or architectural historian, as appropriate. Such inspections will at a minimum include a field inspection, the recording on forms

distributed by the California Office of Historic Preservation of any cultural resources 45 years old or older, an assessment of eligibility for the California Register of Historical Resources and qualification as a "unique archaeological resource," and a technical report that follows California Office of Historic Preservation guidelines for contents and format. The report shall contain any feasible mitigation measures to be implemented by the applicant.

## Traffic

4.7-1 Prepare and implement construction traffic management plans for on-site and off-site construction activities for all development projects, including coordination with appropriate agencies, and implement a community relations program during construction period. The purpose of the construction traffic management plan is to minimize adverse Level of Service or neighborhood traffic impacts during the various phases of construction.

4.7-2a Developers of property within the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan area shall be responsible for the project's fair share of all feasible physical improvements necessary and available to reduce the severity of the project's significant transportation-related impacts, as identified in this traffic analysis, consistent with the policies and exceptions set forth in the Transportation and Circulation Element of the 1994 Placer County General Plan as amended. The project's contribution toward such improvements, which the County recognizes will not be sufficient to mitigate all transportation-related impacts to less than significant levels, may take any, or some combination, of the following forms:

1. Construction of roads and related facilities within and adjacent to the boundaries of the Specific Plan area, which may be subject to fee credits and/or reimbursement, coordinated by the County, from other fee-paying development projects with respect to roads or other facilities that would also serve fee-paying development projects other than Placer Vineyards;
2. Construction of roads and/or road improvements or other transportation facilities outside the boundaries of the Specific Plan area but within unincorporated Placer County, subject in some instances to future reimbursement, coordinated by the County, from other fee-paying development projects where the roads or improvements at issue would also serve fee-paying development projects other than Placer Vineyards;
3. The payment of impact fees to Placer County in amounts that constitute the Specific Plan's fair share contributions to the construction of transportation facilities to be built or improved within unincorporated Placer County, consistent with the County's CIP;
4. The payment of impact fees to the South Placer Regional Transportation Authority (SPRTA) in amounts that constitute the Project's fair share contribution to the construction of transportation facilities funded through fees collected by the SPRTA for Tier 1 and/or Tier 2 projects;
5. The payment of other adopted regional impact fees that would provide improvements to roadways, intersections and/or interchanges that are affected by multiple jurisdictions (e.g., Walerga/Fiddyment/Baseline);
6. The payment of impact fees to Placer County in amounts that constitute the Specific Plan's fair share contributions to the construction of transportation facilities and/or improvements within the City of Roseville, Sacramento County and/or Sutter County needed in whole or in part because of the Specific Plan, to be made available to the City

of Roseville, Sacramento County, and/or Sutter County, if and when those jurisdictions and Placer County enter into an enforceable agreement consistent with Placer County General Plan Policy 3.A.15(c). At the time of issuance of building permits for individual development projects within the Specific Plan area, the County shall collect fair share fee payments for improvements or facilities addressed by its CIP as it exists at that time;

7. Developers of property within the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan area shall pay impact fees to Placer County in amounts that constitute the Specific Plan's fair share contributions to the construction of transportation facilities and/or improvements on federal or State highways or freeways needed in part because of the Specific Plan, to be made available to Caltrans if and when Caltrans and Placer County enter into an enforceable agreement consistent with State law and Placer County General Plan Policy 3.A.15; and

8. In pursuing a single agreement or multiple agreements with the City of Roseville, Sacramento County, Sutter County, and Caltrans, Placer County shall negotiate in good faith with these other jurisdictions to enter into fair and reasonable arrangements with the intention of achieving, within a reasonable time period after approval of the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan, commitments for the provision of adequate fair share mitigation payments from the Specific Plan for its out-of-jurisdiction traffic impacts and its impacts on federal and State freeways and highways.

4.7-2b Consistent with Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a, the proposed project shall contribute its fair share toward the widening of Walerga Road to four lanes from Baseline Road to PFE Road to provide LOS "A" (V/C 0.43).

4.7-3a Implement Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a.

4.7-3b Consistent with Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a, the proposed project shall contribute its fair share toward the following improvements:

i. Construct a second through lane on the southbound approach, a right turn lane to the eastbound approach and construct a second left turn lane on both the eastbound and westbound approaches to improve the intersection of Fiddyment Road and Baseline Road to LOS "C" (V/C 0.80) in the PM peak hour.

ii. Convert the southbound right turn lane into a free right turn lane, to improve the intersection of Fiddyment Road and Baseline Road to LOS "D" (V/C 0.87) in the AM peak hour.

iii. Construct a second through lane on both the northbound and southbound approaches, to improve the intersection of Walerga Road and PFE Road to LOS "B" (V/C 0.66) in the AM peak hour and LOS "D" (V/C 0.80) in the PM peak.

4.7-4a Implement Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a.

4.7-4b Consistent with Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a, the proposed project shall contribute fees toward the following improvements, which are part of the City of Roseville's 2020 CIP:

- A second through lane on the eastbound approach, to improve the intersection of Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard and Baseline Road to LOS "A" (V/C 0.57).
- A second left turn lane on both the northbound, southbound and westbound approaches, a third through lane to the northbound approach and fourth through lane to the

southbound approach to improve the intersection of Foothills Boulevard and Baseline Road to LOS "C" (V/C 0.71).

- A second left turn lane on all of the approaches, a second through lane on both the northbound and southbound approaches, and a third through lane on the eastbound and westbound approaches to improve the intersection of Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard and Pleasant Grove Boulevard to LOS "A" (V/C 0.50).
- A second left turn lane on the westbound approach, a third left turn lane on the southbound approach, and second through lane on both the northbound and southbound approaches, to improve the intersection of Foothills Boulevard and Cirby Way to LOS "B" (V/C 0.70).
- Implement Mitigation Measure 4.7-3(b)(ii), which would result in LOS "C" (V/C 0.78) at the intersection of Fiddyment Road and Baseline Road using the Roseville methodology.

4.7-5a Implement Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a.

4.7-5b Consistent with Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a, the proposed project shall contribute its fair share toward the following improvements in Sacramento County:

1. Widen Watt Avenue to six lanes from the Placer County line to Elverta Road to provide LOS "D" (0.87).
2. Widen Watt Avenue to six lanes from Elverta Road to Antelope Road to provide LOS "C" (0.71).
3. Widen Watt Avenue to six lanes from Antelope Road to Elkhorn Boulevard to provide LOS "D" (0.90).
4. Widen Watt Avenue to six lanes from Elkhorn Boulevard to Don Julio Boulevard to provide LOS "D" (0.87).
5. Widen Elkhorn Boulevard to six lanes from Walerga Road to I-80 to provide LOS "E" (0.96)

4.7-6a Implement Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a.

4.7-6b Consistent with Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a, the proposed project shall contribute its fair share toward the following intersection improvements in Sacramento County:

1. Install a traffic signal to improve the intersection of Elwyn Avenue and Elverta Road to LOS "C" (V/C 0.74) in the AM peak hour and LOS "D" (V/C 0.82) in the PM peak hour.
2. Install a traffic signal to improve the intersection of 16th Street and Elverta Road to LOS "E" (V/C 0.90) in the AM peak hour and LOS "D" (V/C 0.87) in the PM peak hour.
3. Construct a second exclusive left turn lane on the southbound approach to improve the intersection of Watt Avenue and Antelope Road to LOS "E" (V/C 0.93) in the PM peak hour.
4. Construct a second exclusive right turn lane on the westbound approach to improve the intersection of Walerga Road and Elkhorn Boulevard to LOS "D" (V/C 0.87) in the PM peak hour.
5. Construct a third northbound through lane to improve the intersection of Watt Avenue and Don Julio Boulevard to LOS "D" (V/C 0.87) in the PM peak hour.

6. Construct a third northbound through lane to improve the intersection of Watt Avenue and Air Base Drive to LOS "C" (V/C 0.80) in the AM peak hour and LOS "D" (V/C 0.86) in the PM peak hour.
7. Construct a second westbound left turn lane to improve the intersection of Watt Avenue and Roseville Road to LOS "E" (V/C 0.92) in the PM peak hour.

4.7-8a Implement Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a.

4.7-8b Consistent with Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a, the proposed project shall contribute its fair share toward the following improvements in Sutter County:

1. Install a signal at the intersection of Riego Road and Natomas Road to provide LOS "A" (V/C ratio 0.60) in the AM peak and LOS "B" (V/C 0.62) in the PM peak.
2. Install a signal at the intersection of Riego Road and Pleasant Grove Road (North) to provide LOS "C" (V/C ratio 0.70) in the AM peak and LOS "B" (V/C 0.64) in the PM peak.
3. Install a signal at the intersection of Riego Road and Pleasant Grove Road (South) to provide LOS "C" (V/C ratio 0.77) in the AM peak and LOS "C" (V/C 0.74) in the PM peak.
4. At the intersection of Highway 99/77 and Riego Road, construct a third northbound and southbound through lane (2,000 to 3,000 feet long) to provide LOS "D" (V/C ration of 45.5 seconds) in the AM peak Or Construct the Highway 77/99 interchange at Riego Road.

4.7-9a Implement Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a.

4.7-9b Consistent with Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a, the proposed project shall contribute its fair share toward the following improvements:

1. Widen Hwy 65 to six lanes from Blue Oak Boulevard to Galleria Boulevard.
2. Widen Interstate 80 to ten lanes from Antelope Road to Riverside Avenue.
3. Widen Interstate 80 to eight lanes from Riverside Avenue to Douglas Boulevard.
4. Widen Business 80 to eight lanes from Fulton Avenue to Watt Avenue.
5. Consider construction of additional lanes on Interstate 80 from Auburn Boulevard to Madison Avenue, or other improvements.

4.7-10a A Community Service Area (CSA) shall be established to fund the cost of transit services listed in this section, and any related capital costs for buses, passenger amenities, and facilities.

4.7-10b Bus shelters shall be placed along major roadways at one-half-mile intervals serving Medium-Density, High-Density, Commercial and Office land use designations.

4.7-12 Implement Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a.

4.7-13a Implement Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a.

4.7-13b Consistent with Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a, the proposed project shall contribute its fair share toward the following improvements:

i. A third northbound and southbound through lane, a second eastbound and westbound through lane, a second northbound, an eastbound and westbound left turn lane and a

free eastbound right turn lane to improve the intersection of Walerga Road and PFE Road to LOS "F" (V/C 1.19 ) in the PM peak hour.

ii. A third northbound and southbound through lane to improve the intersection of Walerga Road and Town Center Drive to LOS "B" (V/C ratio 0.61) in the AM peak hour and LOS "C" (V/C 0.73) in the PM peak hour.

iii. Conversion of the northbound right turn lane into a free right turn lane to improve the intersection of Watt Avenue and Dyer Lane to LOS "E" (V/C 0.94) in the AM peak hour and LOS "F" (V/C 1.03) in the PM peak hour.

iv. Convert the northbound right turn lane into a free right turn lane to improve the intersection of East Dyer Lane and Baseline Road to LOS "E" (V/C 0.92) in the AM peak hour.

4.7-14a Implement Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a.

4.7-14b Consistent with Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a, the proposed project shall contribute its fair share toward construction of a third southbound and northbound through lanes to the intersection of Fiddyment Road and Baseline Road to improve operations from LOS "E" to LOS "D." 4.7-14c Consistent with Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a, participate in the City of Roseville ITS/TDM program on a fair share basis as determined by the County in consultation with the City of Roseville.

4.7-15a Implement Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a.

4.7-15b Consistent with Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a, the proposed project shall contribute its fair share toward the following improvements in Sacramento County:

1. Widen Watt Avenue to six lanes from the Placer County line to Antelope Road, to reduce the V/C from 1.75 to 1.17 (LOS "F").
2. Widen Watt Avenue to eight lanes from Antelope Road to Elkhorn Blvd, to provide LOS "E."
3. Widen Sorento Road to four lanes from the Placer County line to Elverta Road, to provide LOS "A."
4. Widen Elwyn Avenue to four lanes from the Placer County line to Elverta Road, to provide LOS "A."
5. Widen 16th Street to four lanes from the Placer County line to Elverta Road, to provide LOS "B."
6. Widen Dry Creek Road to four lanes from the U Street to Ascot Avenue, to provide LOS "C."

4.7-16a Implement Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a.

4.7-16b Consistent with Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a, the proposed project shall contribute its fair share toward the following improvements in Sacramento County:

1. Construct a second left turn lane on the eastbound approach to improve the intersection of Sorento Road and Elverta Road to LOS "F" conditions (V/C 1.11) during the AM peak hour.

2. Construct a second left turn lane on the eastbound approach to improve the intersection of Elwyn Avenue and Elverta Road to LOS "E" conditions (V/C 0.94) during the PM peak hour.
3. Construct a second left turn lane on the eastbound approach to improve the intersection of Palladay Road and Elverta Road to LOS "F" conditions (V/C 1.07) during the PM peak hour.
4. Construct a second through lane on the northbound and southbound approaches, and a right turn lane on the eastbound and westbound approaches to improve the intersection of 16th Street and Elverta Road to LOS "B" conditions (V/C 0.66) during the AM peak hour and to LOS "C" conditions (V/C 0.77) during the PM peak hour.
5. Construct a third through lane on the eastbound and westbound approaches at the Watt Avenue and Elverta Road intersection to provide LOS "F" conditions (V/C 1.11) during the PM peak hour.
6. Construct a third through lane on the northbound and southbound approaches at the Walerga Road and Elverta Road intersection to provide LOS "F" conditions (V/C 1.16) during the AM peak hour.
7. Construct a third through lane on the northbound and southbound approaches, and second left turn lane on the westbound approach at the Watt Avenue and Antelope Road intersection to provide LOS "C" (V/C 0.80) conditions during the PM peak hour.
8. Construct a second through lane on the northbound approach at the Dry Creek Road and Elkhorn Boulevard intersection to provide LOS "E" conditions (V/C 0.99) during the PM peak hour.
9. Construct a fourth through lane on the northbound and southbound approaches at the Watt Avenue and Elkhorn Boulevard intersection to provide LOS "E" (V/C 0.94) in the AM peak hour and LOS "F" conditions (V/C 1.14) during the PM peak hour.
10. Construct a second left turn lane and a second right turn lane on the westbound approach at the Walerga Road and Elkhorn Boulevard intersection to provide LOS "E" conditions (V/C 0.94) during the PM peak hour.
11. Construct a third through lane on the northbound approach and a second westbound right turn lane at the Watt Avenue and Air Base Drive intersection to provide LOS "E" conditions (V/C 0.91) during the PM peak hour.
12. Construct a second left turn lane on the westbound approach at the Watt Avenue and Roseville Road intersection to provide LOS "F" conditions (V/C 1.24) during the PM peak hour.

4.7-17a Implement Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a.

4.7-17b Consistent with Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a, the proposed project shall contribute its fair share toward the following improvements in Sutter County:

1. Widen Pleasant Grove Road to four lanes from Riego Road to the Sacramento County line.

4.7-18a Implement Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a.

4.7-18b Consistent with Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a, the proposed project shall contribute its fair share toward the following improvements in Sutter County:

i. Construct a second left turn lane on the southbound approach, to improve the intersection of Pleasant Grove Road (North) and Riego Road to LOS "D" (VC ratio 0.83) in the AM peak LOS "D" conditions (V/C 0.87) in the PM peak.

ii. Construct a second left turn lane on the northbound and westbound approaches, to improve the intersection of Pleasant Grove Road (South) and Riego Road to LOS "C" (VC ratio 0.78) in the AM peak LOS "D" conditions (V/C 0.87) in the PM peak.

4.7-19a Implement Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a.

4.7-19b Consistent with Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a, the proposed project shall contribute its fair share toward the following improvements on State highway.

1. Widen Hwy 70/99 to six lanes from Riego Road to Elkhorn Boulevard.
2. Widen Hwy 65 to six lanes from Blue Oak Boulevard to Galleria Boulevard.
3. Widen Interstate 80 to twelve lanes from Longview Drive to Watt Avenue.
4. Widen Interstate 80 to ten lanes from Antelope Road to Douglas Boulevard.
5. Consider construction of additional lanes on Interstate 80 from Auburn Boulevard to Madison Avenue or other improvements.

4.7-21 Placer County shall coordinate with the City of Roseville, Sacramento County, Sutter County and Caltrans to ensure that roadway improvements implemented in whole or in part as mitigation for the proposed project are designed to minimize impacts on existing and future roadways and intersections.

4.7-22 Implement the following or similar Mitigation Measures:

- 4.3.2-2a and b, which require site-specific drainage studies and measures to ensure that project flows can be accommodated by storm drainage infrastructure;
- 4.3.2-3e, which requires that new development demonstrate that there will be no increase in the water surface elevation of the 100-year flood plain;
- 4.4-15, -16, -17, -18, -20, -21, -22, -23, -24, -25, and -26, which require surveys for special status species and their habitat, habitat avoidance and compensation where needed, and protection of nesting raptors;
- 4.6-2a-h, requiring archaeological surveys and appropriate treatment of cultural resources encountered during construction;
- 4.9-3, which limits the hours during which noisy equipment can be used and requires effective mufflers;
- 4.9-4, which requires site-specific acoustical analyses during roadway design and noise attenuation features as needed; and
- 4.12-21a-f, which require Phase 1 Site Assessments to identify potential contamination, and specify how to handle potential hazards to minimize the risk of exposure.

6.7-15a Consistent with Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a, construct Watt Avenue to eight lanes (or a one-way couplet) from Antelope Road to Don Julio Boulevard, to provide LOS "D" (V/C 0.90).

## Air Quality

4.8-1a Construction contractors shall be required to submit a construction emission/dust control plan for approval by the PCAPCD prior to any ground disturbance. At a minimum, this plan shall include the following measures:

- Water exposed earth surfaces as necessary to eliminate visible dust emissions (at least one water truck will be available for every three pieces of earthmoving equipment);
- Suspend grading operations when wind is sufficient to generate visible dust clouds;
- Pave, use gravel cover or spray a dust control agent on all haul roads;
- Wash down all earthmoving construction equipment daily, and wash down all haul trucks leaving the site;
- Cover all trucks delivering or exporting soil, sand, and other loose materials to ensure that all trucks hauling such materials maintain at least two feet of freeboard;
- Institute measures to reduce wind erosion when site preparation is completed;
- Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff onto public roadways;
- Provide graveled, paved or grass-covered areas for construction employee vehicle parking; and
- The site contractor shall retain a CARB certified individual to routinely perform Visible Emissions Evaluations (VEE) to ensure compliance with Rule 228, Fugitive Dust. Fugitive dust shall not exceed 40 percent opacity and shall not go beyond property boundaries at any time. The designee's duties shall include holiday and weekend periods when work may not be in progress.

Immediately following any mass grading phase, the following dust control measures shall be implemented:

- Apply soil stabilizers or commence reestablishing ground cover to construction areas within 96 hours of completing grading activities;
- Develop and implement a wind erosion monitoring program for areas which will remain inactive for extended periods; this program should at a minimum provide for weekly monitoring of inactive sites to assess the effectiveness of wind erosion controls.

4.8-1b Contractors shall be required to reduce NOx and ROG emissions by complying with the construction vehicle air pollutant control strategies developed by the PCAPCD. Contractors shall include in the construction contracts the following requirements or measures shown to equally effective:

- Construction equipment operators shall shut off equipment when not in use to avoid unnecessary idling. Generally, vehicle idling should be kept below 10 minutes.
- Contractor's construction equipment shall be properly maintained and in good working condition.
- The site contractor shall retain a CARB certified individual to routinely evaluate project related off-road and heavy duty on-road equipment emissions for compliance with Rule 202, Visible Emissions.

- The prime contractor shall ensure that emissions from all off-road diesel powered equipment used in the Specific Plan area do not exceed 40 percent opacity for more than three minutes in any one hour. Any equipment found to exceed the 40 percent opacity shall be repaired immediately, and the County of Placer and the PCAPCD shall be notified within 48 hours of identification of non-compliant equipment. A visual survey of all in-operation equipment shall be made at least weekly, and a monthly summary of the visual results shall be submitted to the County of Placer and the PCAPCD throughout the duration of construction in the Specific Plan area, except that a monthly summary shall not be required for any 30-day period in which no construction activity occurs. The monthly summary shall include the quantity and type of vehicles surveyed as well as the dates of each survey. The PCAPCD and/or other officials may conduct periodic site inspections to determine compliance. Nothing in this section shall supersede other PCAPCD or state rules or regulations.
- The prime contractor shall submit to the PCAPCD a comprehensive inventory (i.e. make, model, year, emission rating) of all heavy-duty off-road equipment (50 horsepower or greater) that will be used an aggregate of 40 hours or more for the construction project. PCAPCD personnel, with assistance from the California Air Resources Board, will conduct initial Visible Emissions Evaluations of all heavy duty equipment on the inventory list.

4.8-1c The project shall provide a plan, for approval by the Placer County Air Pollution Control District, demonstrating that the heavy-duty (>50 horsepower) off-road vehicles to be used for any construction projects undertaken within the Specific Plan area over its planning lifetime, including owned, leased and subcontractor vehicles, will achieve a project-wide fleet-averaged 20 percent NOx reduction and 45 percent particulate reduction compared to the most recent annual CARB off-road construction fleet average for western Placer County. Acceptable options for reducing emissions may include use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as they become available. Contractors can access the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District's web site to determine if their off-road fleet meets the requirements listed in this measure.

(See http://www.airquality.org/ceqa/Construction_Mitigation_Calculator.xls)

4.8-1d Construction contractors shall be required to use low-VOC architectural coatings and asphalt in compliance with District Rules and Regulations. Contractors shall also be required to fuel stationary construction equipment with low-sulfur fuels, and use existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or clean fuel generators in place of temporary diesel power generators whenever feasible.

4.8-1e Construction contractors shall be required to provide management of construction traffic. Contractors shall include in the construction contracts the following requirements:

- Contractors shall provide temporary traffic control during all phases of construction activities to improve traffic flow (i.e. flag person);
- Contractors shall configure construction parking to minimize traffic interference;
- Contractors shall endeavor to schedule construction activities that affect traffic flow to off-peak hours (e.g., between 7:00 PM and 6:00 AM and between 10:00 AM and 3:00 PM);
- Contractors shall reroute construction traffic off congested streets; and

- Contractors shall provide dedicated turn lanes for movement of construction equipment on- and off-site.

4.8-3a The following guidelines shall be used by the County during review of future project-specific submittals for non-residential development within the Specific Plan area in order to reduce generation of air pollutants with intent that specified measures be required where feasible and appropriate:

- Include in all new parking lots tree plantings designed to result in 50 percent shading of parking lot surface areas within 15 years. Incorporated by reference in this measure are the City of Sacramento Parking Lot Tree Shading Design and Maintenance Guidelines dated June 17, 2003 (see EIR Appendix U). Also, see Specific Plan Policy 6.25;
- Equip HVAC units with a PremAir or similar catalyst system, if reasonably available and economically feasible at the time building permits are issued. Catalyst systems are considered feasible if the additional cost is less than 10 percent of the base HVAC unit cost;
- Install two 110/208 volt power outlets for every two loading docks;
- Promote passive solar building design and landscaping conducive to passive solar energy use (i.e., building orientation in a south to southwest direction where feasible, encouraging planting of deciduous trees on western sides of structures, landscaping with drought-resistant species, and including groundcovers rather than pavement to reduce heat reflection). Landscaping plans shall prohibit the use of liquidambar and eucalyptus trees that produce smog-forming compounds (high emission factors for isoprenes); and
- Implement the following, or equivalent measures, as determined by the County in consultation with the APCD:
  - Establish building guidelines that encourage the use of low-absorptive coatings on all building surfaces and Energy Star roofing products on all roofs, if reasonably available and economically feasible, at the time building permits are issued;
  - Establish paving guidelines that require businesses, if feasible, to pave all privately-owned parking areas with a substance with reflective attributes (albedo = 0.30 or better) similar to cement concrete. The use of a paving substance with reflective attributes similar to concrete is considered feasible under this measure if the additional cost is less than 10 percent of the cost of applying a standard asphalt product; and
  - Power all off-road equipment used at office, industrial, and commercial uses by the lowest-emission technology reasonably available at the time building permits are issued.

4.8-3b The following measures shall be used singularly or in combination to accomplish an overall reduction of 10 to 20 percent in residential energy consumption relative to the requirements of State of California Title 24:

- Use of air conditioning systems that that are more efficient than Title 24 requirements;
- Use of high-efficiency heating and other appliances, such as water heaters, cooking equipment, refrigerators, and furnaces;
- Installation of photovoltaic rooftop energy systems; and

- Establishment of tree-planting guidelines that require residents to plant trees to shade buildings primarily on the west and south sides of the buildings. Use of deciduous trees (to allow solar gain during the winter) and direct shading of air conditioning systems shall be included in the guidelines.

4.8-3c Promote a reduction in residential emissions through implementation of the following measure:

- Prohibit any wood-burning fireplaces, woodstoves, or similar wood-burning devices. Homes may be fitted with UL rated natural gas burning appliances if desired. This prohibition shall be included in any CC&Rs that are established.

4.8-3d For all projects, use the lowest-emitting architectural coatings during construction. When zero-VOC coatings are commercially available, they should be used. When only low-VOC coatings are available, they shall be used in lieu of higher-emitting formulations. Design review submittals shall include information concerning the coatings products proposed for use in the project.

4.8-3e Bicycle usage shall be promoted by requiring the following:

- All non-residential projects shall provide bicycle lockers and/or racks;
- All apartment complexes or condominiums without garages shall provide at least two Class I bicycle storage spaces per unit;
- Require residential neighborhoods to be interconnected, with easy access to commercial and recreational land uses. All neighborhoods shall have access to the Class I bicycle trails without having to travel on an arterial street. All schools and public parks (except neighborhood tot lots) shall be connected with a Class I bicycle trail through the open space and greenbelts;
- A pedestrian/bikeway (P/B) Master Plan shall be developed for the entire Specific Plan area. This master plan shall be consistent with the guidelines established in the Placer County Regional Bikeway Plan and in the Specific Plan; and
- As each residential phase is constructed, each subdivision shall install its share of the overall P/B network, and ensure that the layout of each residential phase does not interfere with completion of the overall P/B network. Residential areas adjacent to open space corridors shall provide reasonable access to the Class I P/B trails located in the corridors. These Class I corridors shall provide linkages with the comprehensive network of other trails throughout the Specific Plan area. The P/B Master Plan shall provide linkages from all residential neighborhoods to all commercial areas. Non-vehicular access shall consist of a network of convenient linkages of Class I, II and III trails.

4.8-3f Transit usage and ride sharing shall be promoted by requiring participation in the development of a regional transit system at such time as a system is established and setasides of land for park-and ride facilities. Fair share participation may consist of dedication of right-of-way, easements, capital improvements, and/or other methods of participation deemed appropriate. In addition, future project design shall ensure that an adequate number of developers in the Specific Plan area provide reservations for future installations of bus turnouts and passenger benches and shelters, to be installed at such time as transit service is established and as demand and service routes warrant. The two transit centers shall be connected with the Class I bicycle trail. The Specific Plan shall provide for set-asides of land

for two separate park-and-ride facilities. Construction of the park-and-ride facilities shall be phased over the buildout period of the project, with the first 50 spaces in place prior to issuance of the 3,000th residential building permit. Prior to issuance of the 6,000th residential building permit another 50 spaces shall be provided, followed by 50 more prior to the 9,000th residential building permit. Forty-three more spaces shall be provided prior to issuance of the 12,000 residential building permit for a total of 193 spaces to be constructed (equal to 0.1 percent of the anticipated daily trip generation of the project). A public transit development fee shall be required for all development projects. The amount of this fee shall be based upon the traffic generation potential of each project. A dial-a-ride transportation system shall be established to reduce individual vehicle trips and establish data for the eventual formation of a transit system within the Specific Plan area.

An Air Quality and Transportation System Management (TSM) Plan shall be prepared for the Specific Plan to implement all feasible means of reducing Specific Plan area emissions. This plan shall provide for eventual public transit and implementation of trip reduction strategies that coordinate with surrounding areas. A Transportation Management Association (TMA) shall be established that shall be funded by the developer and all businesses located within the Specific Plan area. The TSM plan shall be updated annually by TMA staff to demonstrate compliance with all air quality requirements, and to incorporate the latest state-of-the-art techniques and strategies to reduce emissions. Initially, the TMA shall provide each home and business with an information packet that will contain, at a minimum, the following information:

- Commute options: to inform Specific Plan area occupants of the alternative travel amenities provided, including ridesharing and public transit availability/schedules;
- Maps showing Specific Plan area pedestrian, bicycle, and equestrian paths to community centers, shopping areas, employment areas, schools, parks, and recreation areas;
- Instructions on how to use TMA services that will facilitate trip reduction opportunities; and
- Information regarding PCAPCD programs to reduce county-wide emissions.

4.8-3g All projects requiring issuance of residential and non-residential building permits shall participate in an off-site mitigation program coordinated through the PCAPCD to offset NOx and ROG emissions not mitigated through on-site measures.

The PCAPCD, on behalf of Placer County, will determine air quality mitigation fees using calculation methodology established in practice and routinely applied to other, similar, contemporaneous land use development projects. The off-site mitigation program, coordinated through the PCAPCD, is designed to offset the project's long-term ozone precursor emissions. Monetary incentives shall be provided to sources of air pollutant emissions within the project's general vicinity that are not required by law to reduce their emissions. Therefore, the reductions are real, quantifiable and implement provisions of the 1994 State Implementation Plan. The off-site mitigation program reduces emissions within the region that would not otherwise be eliminated and thereby "offsets" the project's increase to regional emissions.

4.8-3h School districts shall be encouraged to incorporate the following measures into the design, construction, and operation of elementary, middle and high school buildings and facilities: • Install bicycle lockers and racks at all appropriate locations;

- Post signage prohibiting the idling of diesel vehicles for longer than five minutes;
- Construct at least one bus stop at a convenient location to be used for either fixed route service within the Specific Plan area or commuter service;
- Provide a community notice board and information kiosk with information about community events, ride-sharing, and commute alternatives;
- Provide preferential parking for carpools and hybrid vehicles (vehicles with self-charging electric engines); and
- Incorporate solar water heating systems and HVAC PremAir or similar catalyst systems in building design.

4.8-3i The following measures shall be incorporated into the design, construction, and operation of public park areas:

- The pedestrian/bikeway (P/B) master plan shall provide at least one Class I linkage to all school sites;
- Additional Class I and II linkages shall be provided so as to provide convenient access to/from the park sites;
- Install bicycle lockers and racks at all appropriate locations;
- Provide a community notice board and information kiosk with information about community events, ride-sharing, and commute alternatives;

4.8-3j Prohibit open burning throughout the Specific Plan area. Include this prohibition in any project CC&Rs that are established.

4.8-3k The County may substitute different air pollution control measures for individual projects, that are equally effective or superior to those proposed herein, as new technology and/or other feasible measures become available in the course of buildout of the Specific Plan area.

4.8.5 Notice shall be provided in the recorded Covenants, Codes and Restrictions of all lots created within 500 feet of the proposed lift station that there is the potential for odors to result from lift station operations and maintenance.

4.8-6a The operators shall obtain an Authority to Construct/NSR permit and a Permit to Operate from the air district with jurisdiction prior to addition and operation of new facilities.

4.8-6b Potential odor effects shall be mitigated by installing or maintaining existing odor control systems, including odor scrubbers or chemical addition, for all screening facilities and grit/primary sedimentation facilities.

4.8.6c The County shall ensure that notice is provided in the recorded Covenants, Codes and Restrictions of all lots created within 500 feet of the proposed lift stations that there is the potential for odors to result from lift station operations and maintenance.

## Noise

4.9-2 When specific uses are proposed, they shall be reviewed for their potential to produce significant noise impacts and, as required, noise studies shall be conducted to determine the most effective and practical mitigation measures. Mitigation measures shall be applied to assure that new stationary sources do not exceed adopted noise standards. Mitigation

measures shall be consistent with the Noise Element of the Placer County General Plan, including use of setbacks, barriers, and other standard noise mitigation measures.

4.9-3 The hours of operation of noise-producing equipment shall comply with Placer County's "Standard Construction Noise Condition of Approval." Effective mufflers shall be fitted to gas- and diesel- powered equipment to reduce noise levels as much as possible.

4.9-4 Site-specific acoustical analyses shall be conducted when actual roadway design and tentative subdivision map design are proposed and grading is established to determine setbacks and any other measures (e.g., berms, site design, location of structures, noise walls/barriers) required to reduce traffic noise to level that meet County and Specific Plan noise standards, and Specific Plan design standards.

## Population, Employment, and Housing

No mitigation measures

## Public Services

4.11.2-1 The staffing ratios contained in Table 4.11-1 shall be maintained for the Specific Plan area during all phases of development concurrent with demand. The applicants shall be required to establish a special benefit assessment district or other funding mechanism to assure adequate funding for the ongoing maintenance and operation of fire protection and related services, with funding responsibilities imposed on residential and commercial properties within the Specific Plan area, including the costs for services required to satisfy Placer County Fire Department staffing requirements set forth above. The funding mechanism shall be subject to the prior review and approval of Placer County, and shall be approved by the affected landowners prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map. It shall be maintained until such time as the County determines that property tax revenues are adequate to maintain the required staffing.

4.11.2-2a A minimum of two fire stations shall be provided to serve the Specific Plan area at buildout, which shall be fully funded and equipped (i.e., desks, computers, telephones, radio systems, beds, refrigerators and all other needs).

4.11.2-2b The western fire station shall be constructed and equipped, at a location approved by the Placer County Fire Department, prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the first dwelling unit located west of Watt Avenue. This first station may initially be located in a temporary building or location; however, a permanent station shall be available for occupancy within 18 months of issuance of the certificate of occupancy for the first dwelling unit located West of Watt Avenue. The eastern fire station shall be constructed and equipped, at a location approved by the Placer County Fire Department, prior to issuance of a building permit for the 5,000$^{th}$ dwelling unit.

4.11.2-2c Formation of a County Services Area (CSA), a Community Facilities District (CFD), or expansion of CSA #28, including a landowner-approved special tax of an adequate amount or other financing mechanism acceptable to the County, shall be required prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map to ensure that a funding mechanism for fire protection infrastructure and equipment is in place to provide adequate fire safety services in the Specific Plan area during all stages of development. Required fire stations shall be completed and fully staffed and equipped prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy. Fire stations

shall be located on sites readily accessible to service areas and final fire station locations shall be subject to approval by the Placer County Fire Department.

4.11.2-3a Development and subdivision design shall include adequate setbacks, as determined by the Placer County Fire Department, between open space/corridor areas and structures. Fire pre-suppression and suppression access easements to utility corridors and open space areas shall be required as part of the subdivision map process. Building envelopes or another method shall ensure separation of structures, and shall ensure access, as deemed appropriate by the Placer County Fire Department prior to approval of any tentative subdivision map.

4.11.2-3b A County Service Area (CSA), Community Facilities District (CFD), or Zone of Benefit under CSA #28, or other entity for sustainable park maintenance shall be formed for the Specific Plan area prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map. Funds for a fuels reduction program for open spaces and corridors shall be included in the financing arrangement by a vote of the landowners prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map. The maintenance entity shall establish and identify ongoing funding for a continuous maintenance program for vegetation (both wildland and landscaped) in any and all open space, vacant areas, and landscape trail, easement and corridor areas within the Specific Plan area prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map.

4.11.2-3c The developers shall fund a fire-safe plan for the subdivisions adjacent to wildland (natural, landscape, and corridor) areas. The fire-safe plan shall include a fuels management plan, and recommend building separations and distances from wildland areas, evacuation and access routes, fire safety zones and maintenance schedule prior to approval of tentative subdivision maps.

4.11.3-1 The staffing ratios contained in Table 4.11-2 shall be maintained for the Specific Plan area. The applicants shall be required to establish a special benefit assessment district or other funding mechanism to assure adequate funding for the ongoing maintenance and operation of law enforcement services, with funding responsibilities imposed on residential and commercial properties within the Specific Plan area, including the costs for services required to satisfy the staffing standards set forth above and General Plan standards now in existence or as later amended. The funding mechanism shall be subject to the prior review and approval of Placer County.

4.11.3-2a The project developer(s) shall comply with Placer County Policy 4.H.4, which requires that all future development either fund or develop law enforcement facilities. The project developer(s) shall dedicate land for development of a 19,000-square foot substation prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map. Said development shall be consistent with the requirements of the County, the needs of the County Sheriff's Department and the County Facilities Services Department. Compliance with Policy 4.H.4 shall include formation of a County Service Area (CSA), Community Facilities District (CFD), or expansion of CSA #28 for the construction of an equipped Sheriff's substation prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map.

4.11.3-2b The project developer(s) shall enter into a Development Agreement with Placer County prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map for facilities, staffing, and the purchase and scheduled replacement of the number of equipped vehicles needed as determined by the Sheriff in the same frequency and manner currently used by the County in its patrol vehicle replacement program. All patrol vehicles shall include the necessary equipment to

accomplish the mission of the Placer County Sheriff's Department or as otherwise required by the Sheriff.

4.11.3-3 Law enforcement personnel shall have access to and visibility of schools, parks and open spaces, pedestrian areas shall be well lighted and designed in such a manner as to maximize the safety of pedestrians, and buildings shall be designed and sited to provide a safe environment. Improvement plans submitted for review and approval by the Placer County Planning Department shall be accompanied by a written explanation regarding the manner in which the design of the improvements achieves compliance with these requirements.

4.11.5-1a Contractors shall be required to provide on-site separation of construction debris to assure a minimum 50 percent diversion of this material from the landfill.

4.11.5-1b Projects in the Specific Plan area shall contribute a fair share amount toward expansion of the MRF (including accommodation of a greenwaste program for Placer Vineyards) and landfill to the Western Placer Waste Management Authority. A mechanism for ensuring that this is implemented shall be described in the Development Agreement for the Specific Plan.

4.11.5-1c A source-separated greenwaste program shall be implemented within the Specific Plan area, subject to review and approval by the Western Placer Waste management Authority.

4.11.5-1d The Specific Plan proponents shall present a plan for County approval that meets the requirements of Placer County Code Section 8.16.080. The plan shall ensure the development and continuous operation and maintenance of recycling centers within the Specific Plan area. Recycling centers shall accept all types of recyclable waste, shall be fenced and screened from view, and shall be located in commercial or industrial areas dispersed throughout the Specific Plan area. The first recycling center shall be established upon issuance of the 1500th residential building permit.

4.11.6-1a Prior to recordation of any large-lot final subdivision map, all required steps shall be taken to initiate formation of a new County Service Area (CSA, or expansion of CSA #28. Major core backbone infrastructure as shown on Figure 3-17A or Figure 3-17B in Chapter Three of this Revised Draft EIR shall be in place prior to recordation of the first final small lot subdivision map. Other on-site collection and conveyance facilities shall be constructed as necessary to serve actual development (except as required in Mitigation Measure 4.11.6-1g).

4.11.6-1b All new commercial, industrial, institutional, and residential subdivisions in the Specific Plan area shall install collection systems and connect to a public wastewater system.

4.11.6-1c All new development in the Specific Plan area shall comply with General Plan Policy 4.D.2, which requires written certification from the service provider that either existing services are available or needed improvements will be made prior to occupancy to meet wastewater demands of the Specific Plan.

4.11.6-1d Approval of the Specific Plan shall be premised on concurrent County approval of a financing plan that will provide for funding the necessary wastewater collection facilities needed to serve the Specific Plan area, and implemented through approval for formation of a County Service Area (CSA) or expansion of CSA #28 and a corresponding funding mechanism.

4.11.6-1e The Specific Plan proponents shall construct or participate financially in the construction of off-site wastewater conveyance capacity, including lift stations, to accommodate projected wastewater flows that would be generated by development of the Specific Plan.

4.11.6-1f Adequately sized on-site collection facilities, including lift stations, shall be installed for each subdivision in the Specific Plan area concurrent with road construction for individual subdivisions. A "backbone" conveyance system sufficient to serve each subdivision shall be installed prior to issuance of building permits for that subdivision.

4.11.6-1g The Sewer Master Plan shall be revised prior to submission of any wastewater--related improvement plans to include a detailed description of necessary lift station components on-site as well as off-site. The Master Plan shall include a plan for dealing with power and pump failure, and pump maintenance. The plan shall identify how necessary pumping capacity will be replicated in the event of pump failure or pump maintenance, and shall provide for on-site back-up power sufficient to run pumps and any odor scrubbers, in the event of power failure. Each lift station shall include a wastewater storage component in the form of an enclosed reservoir or tank sufficient to deal with temporary emergency conditions while backup systems are brought on line, in accordance with sizing standards utilized by the County Department of Facility Services.

4.11.6-2a Commitments from the wastewater treatment provider to receive anticipated flows from the Specific Plan area at the DCWWTP and/or the SRWTP shall be secured by Placer County prior to County approval of improvement plans for wastewater collection and transmission infrastructure. The County shall comply with General Plan Policy 4.D.2, which requires written certification from the service provider that either existing services are available or needed improvements will be made prior to occupancy to meet wastewater demands of the Specific Plan area.

4.11.6-2b Specific Plan proponents shall participate financially through connection fees and other financial mechanisms in the construction of additional wastewater treatment capacity sufficient to accommodate projected flows and treatment at the DCWWTP and/or the SRWTP. In addition, Specific Plan proponents shall prepare, or shall provide a fair share contribution toward the preparation of any additional CEQA analysis that may be required for plant modifications and/or expansions.

4.11.6-2c For each increment of new development within the Specific Plan area, the County shall confirm that all necessary permits (e.g., NPDES) are in place for either the DCWWTP or the SRWTP to discharge additional treated effluent in the amounts associated with the new development. This shall include a determination that development timing will not impede other development for which entitlements have been issued. The requirement for such a showing shall be made a condition of any small lot tentative map approval associated with the new development and shall be verified by the County prior to recordation any final map associated with the new development. Where no small lot tentative map and final map are required prior to non-residential development having the potential to increase wastewater flows, the requirement for such verification, to be demonstrated no later than the time of issuance of building permits, shall be made a condition of approval of project-level discretionary approvals analogous to issuance of small-lot tentative maps.

4.11.6-3a Design of on- and off-site sewer pipelines shall have watertight joints and be in accordance with design standards adopted by Placer County in order to minimize the potential for accidental discharge.

4.11.6-3b Paved access shall be provided to all sewer system access points to allow for pipeline maintenance and repair.

4.11.6-6 Should expansion of the SRWTP treatment plant be pursued to serve the Specific Plan area, a Treatment Plant Master Plan Update will be needed and additional analysis of water quality impacts on the Sacramento River will be required in a cumulative context. This analysis shall be performed in a manner similar to and at the same level of detail as the analysis contained in the EIR for the current Master Plan, and shall be consistent with standards established by RWQCB and SRCSD. All recommendations of the analysis shall be implemented utilizing a fair share funding arrangement with Placer Vineyards project proponents.

4.11.7-1a Prior to approval of any small lot tentative subdivision map for a proposed residential project of more than five hundred dwelling units, the County shall comply with Government Code Section 66473.7. Prior to approval of any small lot tentative subdivision map for a proposed residential project of 500 or fewer units, the County need not comply with Section 66473.7, or formally consult with PCWA or other public water system, but shall nevertheless make a factual showing or impose conditions similar to those required by Section 66473.7 in order to ensure an adequate water supply for development authorized by the map. Prior to recordation of any final small lot subdivision map, or prior to County approval of any similar project-specific discretionary approval or entitlement required for nonresidential uses, the applicant shall demonstrate the availability of a long-term, reliable water supply from a public water system for the amount of development that would be authorized by the final subdivision map or project-specific discretionary nonresidential approval or entitlement. Such a demonstration shall consist of a written certification from the water service provider that either existing sources are available or that needed improvements will be in place prior to occupancy.

4.11.7-1b The Specific Plan proponents shall, comply with PCWA water conservation strategies as described in PCWA's Urban Water Management Plan.

4.11.7-1c Prior to approval of any small lot tentative subdivision map or similar project level discretionary approval for land uses that do not require a tentative subdivision map, the Placer County Water Agency (PCWA) shall perform an analysis of the remaining wheeling capacity in the City of Roseville's system. This analysis shall consider all of the previously committed demand to Morgan Creek, Placer Vineyards, Regional University or other projects within southwest Placer County that rely on water conveyed through City of Roseville facilities and/or pursuant to the wheeling agreement between the City of Roseville and PCWA, as amended from time to time. The analysis shall be submitted to both the County and the City of Roseville. The County shall confirm with PCWA that uncommitted capacity remains to wheel the required amount of PCWA-supplied water to the Specific Plan area prior to approval of discretionary actions. In the event sufficient uncommitted capacity does not exist, the County shall not grant the proposed tentative subdivision map or other project level discretionary approval until the County determines that a water supply not dependent on water from PCWA that is wheeled thru the Roseville system becomes available for the area at issue.

4.11.8-3a Plans for site-specific recycled water storage facilities shall include provisions for emergency storage, including redundant in-ground storage ponds or enclosed tanks capable of holding one day peak demand for the area served. All recycled water storage ponds shall be bermed to prevent inflow from surface sources and shall not be located where a direct discharge to a drainage course or natural waterway could occur if the pond should experience a containment failure. All storage ponds for recycled water shall be fenced to restrict access

and posted with warning signs to reduce the potential for direct human contact with recycled water.

4.11.8-3b The project applicants shall be responsible for completing the Engineering Report that is required to be submitted to the State for the production, distribution and use of recycled water. Recycled water shall not be used until the Engineering Report is approved by the State.

4.11.8-3c Adequate storage and pumping facilities must be provided prior to connection to the recycled water system.

4.11.9-1a The Master Project Drainage Study shall be incorporated as part of Specific Plan approval by reference or other similar means.

4.11.9-1b Individual project drainage reports consistent with the County's Stormwater Management Manual and Grading Ordinance shall be submitted for each development project, including installation of backbone infrastructure. Drainage reports shall identify the proposed detention/retention basins that will serve the new development area or submit an interim detention basin design with supporting calculations subject to approval by County staff.

4.11.9-1c Drainage reports for development projects within the Specific Plan area shall comply with the current permit requirements of the NPDES Phase II (Attachment 4).

4.11.9-1d The Master Project Drainage Study shall be submitted to the Placer County Department of Public Works and reviewed and approved by the Department of Public Works prior to the recordation of the first large lot tentative map.

4.11.9-1e Individual project drainage reports shall be consistent with the approved Master Project Drainage Study.

4.11.9-2 Prior to recordation of the first small lot final subdivision map in the Specific Plan area, a drainage service area under a new County Service Area (CSA), existing CSA #28, or a Community Facilities District (CFD) shall be established for the Specific Plan area in compliance with law. The CSA or CFD shall identify and establish ongoing funding for a continuous drainage facility maintenance program.

4.11.10-1a The Specific Plan applicants and subsequent developers shall work closely with PG&E and SMUD to ensure that development of electrical and natural gas infrastructure with the capacity to service the entire Specific Plan area is located and provided concurrently with roadway construction and in accordance with PUC regulations. The applicant(s) shall grant all necessary easements for installation of electrical and natural gas facilities, including utility easements along existing and future on-site major arterial roads for the development of area-wide utility corridors. Coordination with SMUD and/or PG&E shall occur, and any required agreements shall be established prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map.

4.11.10-1b Implement Mitigation Measures 4.8-3a through 4.8-3g as set forth in Section 4.8 of this Revised Draft EIR.

4.11.10-2a All locations and continuous maintenance access points for natural gas and electrical infrastructure are to be clearly marked or noted on tentative subdivision maps. Dedicated easements for utility maintenance equipment shall be recorded prior to or concurrent with acceptance and recordation of final maps.

4.11.10-2b Clear, unrestricted access shall be maintained beneath existing transmission lines that traverse the Specific Plan area. This may include provision for unobstructed access to gates in proposed fences that may surround such uses as the County corporation yard. Any realignment of transmission line paths shall be negotiated with PG&E. Structures shall only be allowed in those areas that do not restrict access and meet the requirements of PG&E.

4.11.12-1a Formation of a County Service Area (CSA), Community Facilities District (CFD), or expansion of CSA #28, or other financing mechanism acceptable to the County shall be required prior to recordation of the first final small lot subdivision map to ensure that immediate funding for adequate library infrastructure consistent with County standards is in place. The Specific Plan developers shall enter into a Development Agreement to ensure a fair share contribution to adequate library facilities, and that such facilities are available prior to demonstrated need.

4.11.12-1b Completion of one or more branch libraries to provide a minimum of 0.4 square feet per capita, dedication of land, and stocking with books and other materials necessary for a functioning library with a minimum of 2.2 volumes per capita and otherwise meeting the standards of the Auburn-Placer County Library Long-Range Plan, including any subsequent amendments, shall occur concurrent with demand.

4.11.12-1c Project developers shall be required to establish a special benefit assessment district or other funding mechanism to ensure adequate funding of the Specific Plan's fair share for the ongoing operation and maintenance of library facilities. Such funding mechanism shall be established prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map to ensure that immediate funding for adequate library operations and maintenance is in place.

4.11.13-1 Project developers in the Specific Plan area shall comply with the requirements of the General Plan by dedication and improvement of a minimum of 174 acres of active parkland and 174 acres of passive parkland. Project developers shall be responsible for dedicating and fully developing parks and or portions thereof, concurrent with demand in accordance with County levels of service. The County may require oversizing of neighborhood and larger type recreation parks, trails and facilities on a subdivision basis when it is deemed necessary and practical to serve the needs of future residents. In such cases, the County will enter into reimbursement agreements whereby future developments will pay initial developers for oversizing.

Concurrent with the construction of the community parks, project developers shall construct a park maintenance building and yard and provide maintenance equipment. The design and building materials, location and quantity of equipment shall be subject to the approval of the Department of Facility Services.

All plans and specifications shall be approved by the Department of Facility Services and/or the managing agency prior to the recordation of each final small lot subdivision map. A procedure or agreement to govern the acquisition of parklands and completed park improvements acceptable to the County and/or managing agency, and in compliance with applicable General Plan standards and policies, shall be in place prior to recordation of the first final small lot subdivision map.

The specific park plans shall be submitted to the County for approval prior to the final decision as to the number and location of facilities.

4.11.13-3 Project developers shall cause a new County Service Area (CSA) or Community Facilities District (CFD) to be formed, or expand CSA #28 for sustainable park maintenance and recreation programs for the Specific Plan area prior to recordation of the first final small-lot subdivision map. A procedure or agreement to govern park maintenance and local recreation programs shall also be finalized prior to recordation of the first final small-lot subdivision map within the Specific Plan area. This entity would thus have the ability to participate in design, inspection and acceptance of facilities, and determination of appropriate funding levels necessary to maintain these facilities and operate recreational programs. A park maintenance special tax or special assessment with a provision for increases indexed to the CPI shall be approved by the landowners (voters) of the Specific Plan area, to be developed prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map in the Specific Plan area. An indexing formula for maintenance and operation of recreational facilities and programs shall be in place prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map.

4.11.13-4 As a condition of Specific Plan approval, proponents shall submit a phased schedule for providing community recreation facilities for approval by the County Parks Division. This phasing plan shall comply with County levels of service for parks and recreational facilities. Funding for construction, operation and maintenance of these improvements shall be provided in accordance with Mitigation Measures 4.11.13-1 and 4.11.13-3.

4.11.14-2 Project developers shall establish a special benefit assessment district or other funding mechanism to ensure fair share funding for the ongoing operation and maintenance of general County services serving the Specific Plan area. This funding mechanism shall be established prior to recordation of the first final small lot subdivision map in the Specific Plan area to ensure that immediate funding for adequate general County services is in place.

4.11.14-3 The Specific Plan proponents shall submit a phased schedule for providing the above described general government facilities for approval by the County Executive Office. Funding for construction, operation and maintenance of these improvements shall be provided in accordance with Mitigation Measure 4.11.14-2.

## Hazards and Hazardous Materials

4.12-1 The two USTs shall be removed and soil samples shall be collected and analyzed. In the event soil or water contamination has occurred above regulatory clean-up thresholds, remediation shall be performed consistent with State and County regulations. All required remediation shall be completed prior to recordation of any final small lot subdivision map on Property #7 (now Properties #4 and #7).

4.12-2 If sampling during removal of the UST for the Hilltop site should confirm concentrations of potential motor oil and/or TPH diesel contamination at or above the level of concern, the site shall be remediated as described in Mitigation Measure 4.12- 1.

4.12-3 Prior to recordation of any final small lot subdivision map on Property #7 (now Property #4), the open well shall be abandoned/destroyed according to California Well Standards, California Department of Water Resources Bulletin 74-90 Section 23, and Placer County Environmental Health Services requirements.

4.12-4 Additional sampling shall be performed at the Dyer Lane and Tanwood Avenue area of illegal dumping. If test results show that the level of concern is exceeded, remediation shall be required to meet State and County regulations. All remediation shall be completed prior to recordation of any final small lot subdivision map on Property # 9.

4.12-5 Prior to recordation of any final small lot subdivision map on Property #9, unused wells on-site shall be destroyed according to California Well Standards, California Department of Water Resources Bulletin 74-90 Section 23, and according to Placer County Division of Environmental Health Services requirements.

4.12-6a Additional sampling shall be performed on sites #10-1 and #10-2. If test results show that regulatory clean-up thresholds are exceeded, remediation shall be required to meet State and County regulations. All remediation shall be completed prior to recordation of any final small lot subdivision map on Property #10.

4.12-6b Prior to recordation of any final maps on Property #10, unused wells on-site shall be destroyed according to California Well Standards, California Department of Water Resources Bulletin 74-90 Section 23, and according to Placer County Division of Environmental Health Services requirements.

4.12-7a Additional sampling shall be performed on sites #11-1 and #11-2. If test results show that levels of concern are exceeded, remediation shall be required to meet State and County regulations. All remediation shall be completed prior to recordation of any final small lot subdivision map on Property #11.

4.12-7b Prior to recordation of any final maps on Property #11, unused wells on-site shall be destroyed according to California Well Standards, California Department of Water Resources Bulletin 74-90 Section 23, and according to Placer County Division of Environmental Health Services requirements.

4.12-8 Disposal of refrigerators, tires, batteries and similar materials by licensed waste haulers at approved waste disposal facilities shall be completed prior to recordation of any final maps on Property #15A (now Property # 22).

4.12-9 Additional sampling shall be performed on sites #15-1, #15-2, #15-3, #15-4, #15-5, #15-6, #15-7, #15-8, #15-9, #15-10, #15-11, #15-12, and #15-13. If test results show that levels of concern, or regulatory clean-up thresholds are exceeded, remediation shall be required to meet State and County regulations. All remediation shall be completed prior to recordation of any final small lot subdivision map on Property #15A (now Property # 22).

4.12-10 Disposal of auto parts, debris, household waste and similar materials by licensed waste haulers at approved waste disposal facilities shall be completed prior to recordation of any final small lot subdivision map on Property #19.

4.12-11a Soil in the storage area and below the concrete slab in the workshop shall be inspected by a California Registered Environmental Assessor II for indications of impacts to soil at the time of the demolition of the site buildings and concrete slab. Recommendations for soil sampling and analysis shall be determined at that time. If sampling results show that regulatory clean-up thresholds are exceeded, remediation shall be required to meet State and County regulations. All demolition and remediation shall be completed prior to recordation of any final small lot subdivision map on Property #20 (now Property #21).

4.12-11b Disposal of auto parts, debris, household waste and similar materials by licensed waste haulers at approved waste disposal facilities shall be completed prior to recordation of any final small lot subdivision map on Property #20 (now Property #21).

4.12-11c The in-service well shall be abandoned/destroyed according to California Well Standards, California Department of Water Resources Bulletin 74-90 Section 23, and Placer County Environmental Health Services (EHS) requirements upon discontinuation of use.

4.12-12a During construction, all grading shall be performed in a manner to prevent the occurrence of standing water or other areas suitable for breeding of mosquitoes and other vectors.

4.12-12b The Placer Mosquito Abatement District shall be granted access to perform vector control in all common areas including drainage, open space corridor and park areas in perpetuity. Such access shall be a condition of approval of all tentative maps approved within the Specific Plan area.

4.12-13 Site-specific evaluation by a California Registered Environmental Assessor II shall be conducted at each identified existing and former dwelling area to identify surface indications and locations of septic tanks or cesspools prior to demolition of existing residences. Identified septic tanks shall be destroyed according to Placer County Division of Environmental Health criteria prior to recordation of final small lot subdivision map for the affected property.

Surface conditions shall be evaluated by a California Registered Environmental Assessor II when the dwellings are vacated, and prior to demolition of the structures, regarding the possibility of previous site uses which may have included hazardous materials that could have been disposed of in on-site wastewater disposal systems.

Tank or cesspool destruction shall be monitored by a California Registered Environmental Assessor II regarding the likelihood of hazardous materials disposal in the systems. Any required remediation work shall be completed in accordance with State and County regulations prior to recordation of final small lot subdivision map for the affected property.

4.12-14a Surveys of structures that are planned for demolition (that were not surveyed in the Phase II ESA) during Specific Plan development shall be conducted by a Certified Asbestos Consultant licensed with the California Department of Occupational Safety and Health to determine if friable Regulated Asbestos Containing Materials or nonfriable asbestos containing materials are present within the structure demolition areas. Any regulated asbestos materials found in the investigated areas shall be removed and disposed of by a California licensed asbestos abatement contractor. All removal of asbestos material shall be completed prior to recordation of Final Maps for the affected property.

4.12-14b A California licensed asbestos abatement contractor shall be hired to remove the exterior wall shingles prior to demolition of the abandoned radio beacon structure on Property #7.

4.12-15 Prior to submittal of a small lot tentative subdivision map or plans for industrial/commercial development, properties not previously evaluated with a current Phase I Environmental Site Assessment may be required to complete a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, as determined by Environmental Health Services. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment shall be conducted by a qualified professional. If past commercial agricultural uses are disclosed that could have resulted in persistent contamination, such as orchards or vineyards, then soil sampling shall be conducted within former commercial agriculture areas. In these instances, prior to setting conditions for subdivision or industrial/commercial development soil investigation shall be conducted according to guidelines developed by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) and contained in the DTSC August 2002 "Interim Guidance for Sampling Agricultural Fields for School Sites," or equivalent protocol. Sampling and site investigation shall be conducted by a California registered environmental

professional, performed with oversight from Placer County Environmental Health Services, and with applicable permits.

As a result of soil investigation, a limited and confined area of contamination may be identified and found to be suitable for simple removal. If this is the case, remediation will be required to meet State and County regulations and be completed prior to recordation of the final small lot subdivision map or equivalent final Placer County approval for commercial/industrial projects.

As a result of soil investigation, unconfined and/or widespread residual concentrations of agricultural chemicals may be identified at levels where they individually or in combination meet or exceed US EPA, CalEPA Preliminary Remediation Goals, or equivalent screening levels, thereby indicating the need for risk assessment. Any indicated risk assessment shall be completed prior to improvement plans or equivalent approval. Risk assessments shall include a DTSC Preliminary Endangerment Assessment or no further action determination, or equivalent.

Any remedial action indicated by a risk assessment shall be completed and certified prior to recordation of the small lot tentative subdivision final map or equivalent final Placer County approval for commercial/industrial projects. Remediation shall include a DTSC Remedial Action Workplan, or equivalent, and can include a range of activities, including restrictions on use, soil excavation and disposal off-site, or encapsulation in appropriate areas away from sensitive receptors in the Specific Plan area.

4.12-16 Any unused well encountered during subsequent exploration or development of the Specific Plan area shall be destroyed according to California Well Standards, California Department of Water Resources Bulletin 74-90 Section 23, and according to Placer County Division of Environmental Health Services requirements.

4.12-17 Prior to submittal of a small lot tentative subdivision map or plans for industrial/commercial development, properties not previously evaluated with a current Phase I Environmental Site Assessment may be required to complete a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, as determined by Environmental Health Services. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment shall be conducted by a qualified professional. If past commercial uses are disclosed that could have resulted in persistent contamination then soil sampling shall be conducted within former commercial areas. In these instances, prior to setting conditions for subdivision or industrial/commercial development soil sampling shall be conducted according to guidelines developed by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Phase II Environmental Site Assessment and/or Preliminary Endangerment Assessment with DTSC, or equivalent protocol. Sampling and site investigation shall be conducted by a California registered environmental professional, performed with oversight from Placer County Environmental Health Services, and with applicable permits.

As a result of soil investigation, a limited and confined area of contamination may be identified and found to be suitable for simple removal. If this is the case, remediation will be required to meet State and County regulations and be completed prior to recordation of the small lot tentative subdivision final map or equivalent final Placer County approval for commercial/industrial projects.

As a result of soil investigation, unconfined and/or widespread residual concentrations of chemicals or other contaminants maybe identified at levels where they individually or in

combination meet or exceed US EPA, CalEPA Preliminary Remediation Goals, or equivalent screening levels, thereby indicating the need for risk assessment. Any indicated Risk Assessment shall be completed prior to improvement plans or equivalent approval. Risk assessments shall include a DTSC Preliminary Endangerment Assessment or no further action determination, or equivalent.

Any remedial action indicated by a risk assessment shall be completed and certified prior to recordation of the small lot tentative subdivision final map or equivalent final Placer County approval for commercial/industrial projects. Remediation shall include a DTSC Remedial Action Workplan, or equivalent, and can include a range of activities, including restrictions on use, soil excavation and disposal off-site, or encapsulation in appropriate areas away from sensitive receptors in the Specific Plan area.

4.12-19a The design of the substation shall implement no cost and low cost EMF reduction measures on new and upgraded transmission, substation, and distribution facilities. These measures shall reduce the magnetic field strength in the area by 15 percent or more at the fence line as compared to traditional installations.

4.12-19b PG&E proposes to prepare an EMF Field Management Plan that will specifically delineate the no-cost and low-cost EMF measures to be installed as part of the final engineering design for the substation. PG&E shall submit to the California Public Utilities Commission the EMF Field Management Plan for the project, prior to construction activity on the substation.

4.12-19c The site shall be graded to direct drainage to a pond that meets Federal Guidelines (40 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 112) for the facility so that, in the event a transformer becomes damaged and leaks oil, the oil would drain into the pond. The pond shall be designed to be impermeable and designed to contain 100 percent of the largest transformer oil volume plus 10 percent to contain rainwater and prevent discharge to surface water.

4.12-19d Storage batteries shall be located inside a dedicated metal-enclosed compartment in the switchgear.

4.12-19e Access to the site shall be restricted by fencing and warning signs posted to alert persons of the potential electrical hazards.

4.12-19f The power lines shall be designed in accordance with California Public Utilities Commission General Order 95 Guidelines for safe ground clearances that have been established to protect the public from electric shock.

4.12-19g The substation shall be fitted with an automated central alarm system that will immediately alert PG&E to any change in equipment condition.

4.12-21a Any USTs that are encountered during off-site utility line/roadway survey or construction, or wastewater treatment or storage facility construction shall be removed and soil samples shall be collected and analyzed. If a UST is subject to UST regulation, then a UST removal permit from Environmental Health Services shall be obtained. In the event soil or water contamination has occurred above regulatory clean-up thresholds, remediation shall be performed consistent with State and County regulations.

4.12-21b Prior to any utility, roadway, or wastewater treatment or storage facility construction on properties not previously evaluated in a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment shall be conducted by a Registered Environmental Assessor.

If contaminant concentrations are found to be at or above regulatory clean-up thresholds, the site shall undergo remediation in accordance with State and County standards.

4.12-21c Any unused well encountered during construction of off-site utilities, roadways, or wastewater treatment and storage facilities shall be destroyed according to California Well Standards, California Department of Water Resources Bulletin 74-90 Section 23, and local requirements.

4.12-21d Surveys of any structures that are planned for demolition during off-site utility line, roadway, or wastewater treatment or storage facility construction shall be conducted by a Certified Asbestos Consultant licensed with the California Department of Occupational Safety and Health to determine if friable Regulated Asbestos Containing Materials or non-friable asbestos containing materials are present within the structure demolition areas. Any regulated asbestos materials found in the investigated areas shall be removed and disposed of by a California licensed asbestos abatement contractor.

4.12-21e Site-specific evaluation by a California Registered Environmental Assessor II shall be conducted at each identified existing and former dwelling area that may be affected by off-site utility line, roadway, or wastewater treatment and storage facility construction to identify surface indications and locations of septic tanks or cesspools prior to demolition of existing residences. Identified septic tanks shall be destroyed under permit of either the County Environmental Health Services Division or the Public Works Department.. Surface conditions shall be evaluated by a California Registered Environmental Assessor II when the dwellings are vacated, and prior to demolition of the structures, regarding the possibility of previous site uses which may have included hazardous materials that could have been disposed of in on-site wastewater disposal systems. Tank or cesspool destruction shall be monitored by a California Registered Environmental Assessor II regarding the likelihood of hazardous materials disposal in the systems. Any required remediation work shall be completed in accordance with State and County regulations prior to recordation of final small lot subdivision maps for the affected property.

4.12-21f Disposal of auto parts, debris, household waste and similar materials by licensed waste haulers at approved waste disposal facilities shall be completed prior to any construction within off-site utility corridors.

## Climate Change

4.13-1a Implement Mitigation Measure 4.8-3, establishing guidelines for County review of future project-specific submittals for non-residential development within the Specific Plan area in order to reduce generation of air pollutants.

4.13-1b Implement Mitigation Measure 4.8-3b, requiring implementation measures to accomplish an overall reduction of 10 to 20 percent in residential energy consumption relative to the requirements of State of California Title 24.

4.13-1c Implement Mitigation Measure 4.8-3c, promoting a reduction of residential emissions.

4.13-1d Implement Mitigation Measure 4.8-3e, requiring measures to promote bicycle usage.

4.13-1e Implement Mitigation Measure 4.8-3f, requiring measures to promote transit usage and ride sharing.

4.13-1h Implement Mitigation Measure 4.8-3h, encouraging school districts to incorporate energy saving measures into the design, construction, and operation of elementary, middle and high school buildings and facilities.

4.13-1i Implement Mitigation Measure 4.8-3i, requiring measures to promote bicycle use, ride sharing, and commute alternatives to be incorporated into the design, construction and operation of public park areas.

4.13-1j Implement Mitigation Measure 4.6-3j, prohibiting open burning throughout the Specific Plan Area and requiring this prohibition in any project CC&Rs that are established.

4.13-1k Implement Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a-b; 4.7-5a-b, 4.7-6a-b; 4.7-12; and 4.7-13a-b, 4.7-15a-b, 4.7-16a-b, 4.7-17a-b, 4.7-19a-b, mitigating traffic impacts (see Recirculated RDEIR, July 2006).

4.13-1l Implement Mitigation Measures 4.11.5-1a -4.11.5-1d, requiring waste diversion and recycling.

4.13-1m Placer County and the project applicant shall work together to publish and distribute an Energy Resource Conservation Guide describing measures individuals can take to increase energy efficiency and conservation. The applicant shall be responsible for funding the preparation of the Guide. The Energy Resource Conservation Guide shall be updated every 5 years and distributed at the public permit counter.

4.13-1n The project applicants shall pay for an initial installment of Light Emitting Diode (LED) traffic lights in all Specific Plan area traffic lights.

4.13-1o The project applicants and Placer County shall jointly develop a tree planting informational packet to help project area residents understand their options for planting trees that can absorb carbon dioxide.

4.13-1p Prioritized parking within commercial and retail areas shall be given to electric vehicles, hybrid vehicles, and alternative fuel vehicles.