
CHAPTER 3

REVISIONS TO DRAFT EIR

conditioning emissions. The project's daily short and long-term air pollutant emissions are expected to be below the District's significance thresholds and therefore the project alone will not result in significant air quality impacts. The project would however, contribute to significant cumulative air quality impacts within Placer County. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 5.1 through 5.12 as identified in *Table 2.3* in **CHAPTER 2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY** and in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program would ensure that this project's contribution to short term and cumulative air quality impacts remain less than significant, and no further analysis in this EIR is needed. At the time the NOP was circulated, the Initial Study included several mitigation measures which are no longer requirements of the project. Those measures originally numbered 5.3, 5.4, 5.5, 5.6, 5.14, and 5.15 have been deleted. Initial Study Mitigation Measures 5.3 and 5.4 required submittal of a fleet inventory and management plan to the Air Pollution Control District. This requirement has been removed based on the limited amount of construction necessary for this project. Initial Study Mitigation Measures 5.5 and 5.6 established timing restrictions for construction activities, but these measures are no longer used as standard conditions by the Air Pollution Control District. Initial Study Mitigation Measures 5.14 and 5.15 required use of alternative diesel fuels and particulate traps on construction equipment. These measures were removed because the California Air Resources Board now requires the use of ultra low sulfur diesel fuel in all diesel engines, consistent with Mitigation Measure 5.9. These deletions are shown in strikethrough font (~~strikethrough~~) in the Initial Study provided in Appendix A, and the revised mitigation measure numbering is shown in underlined font. *Table 2.3* of **CHAPTER 2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY** lists each of the mitigation measures related to Air Quality, and each of these measures are included in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

Biological Resources

The Biological Assessment conducted for the site determined that potential habitat for 12 wildlife species and 34 plant species occurs on the site, and that the subject parcel could provide suitable habitat for special-status species including two plants (Butte County fritillary and Brandegee's clarkia), and four birds (white-tailed kite, Cooper's hawk, loggerhead shrike, and lark sparrow). However, no special status species were identified onsite or in the immediate vicinity during field surveys conducted in preparation of the Biological Assessment. As a result, this project is expected to have a less than significant impact on endangered, threatened, and rare species.

Grading for the proposed project would result in the removal of ten trees (161 inches in diameter total) that are protected by the Placer County Tree Preservation Ordinance. The impact resulting from the removal of trees is expected to remain less than significant with implementation of provisions for tree replacement required by Mitigation Measure 7.1, as identified in the Initial Study.

North Fork Associates prepared a Wetland Delineation based on the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) protocols for the project site in 2005. ~~The delineation has been submitted to the Corps for verification.~~—A total of 0.26 acres of wetlands were delineated on the project site, including 0.25 acres of non-jurisdictional seasonal wetlands and 0.01 acres of a wetland swale as documented in the Wetland Delineation and Initial Study. The seasonal wetlands that occurred on the subject parcel were determined to be a result of artificial hydrologic conditions created by a leaking underground Placer County Water Agency pipeline that crosses the subject

property. ~~As a result of r~~Repairs were made to the pipeline, ~~it is expected that wetland conditions created by the leaking water will no longer be supported onsite in 2006. In 2008, North Fork Associates biologists conducted a site visit with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers staff. Field observations during this visit indicated that both the seasonal wetland and drainage ditch no longer exhibit characteristics of jurisdictional wetlands.~~ The seasonal wetlands occurring on the project site were determined to be outside the Corps jurisdiction under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act because they are artificially irrigated, isolated wetlands. The drainage ditch did not meet the three-parameter criteria to be classified as a wetland swale, and similarly did not meet the criteria to be classified as a stream. North Fork Associates revised the Wetland Delineation and resubmitted it to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. On July 21, 2008, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers issued a verification letter stating that there are no waters of the U.S., including wetlands, present within the project site. Impacts to these wetlands would not require permitting by the Corps.

~~The 0.01-acre wetland swale identified in the Wetland Delineation is located along the northern property frontage on Ophir Road on the eastern side of the project site. This swale is within the Corps jurisdiction. It is a section of the shallow roadside ditch that runs along the southern side of Ophir Road. Water draining from this swale is routed through a storm drain network that presumably discharges to Auburn Ravine. Construction of the proposed project would impact this swale. As part of the widening of Ophir Road and paving of the entrance driveway to the project site, the swale would be placed in a culvert under the paving. Mitigation Measure 7.3 in the Initial Study identified that a requirement for O~~onsite or offsite replacement for ~~this any impacted wetlands impact is required in Mitigation Measure 7.3 as identified in the Initial Study. However, based on the determination by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers that the site does not support any waters of the U.S., the project would not impact wetlands and would not be required to provide any replacement. Thus, Mitigation Measure 7.3 has been removed from the Initial Study and the analysis in the Initial Study has been revised to reflect the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers determination, as shown in Appendix A. New text added to the Initial Study is shown as underlined text, while deletions are shown in strikethrough font (strikethrough). It is expected that with implementation of mitigation measures, impacts to wetlands would remain less than significant.~~ Because all potential impacts to biological resources are expected to remain less than significant through implementation of mitigation measures, no further analysis of these impacts is needed in this EIR. See *Table 2.3* of CHAPTER 2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY of this EIR for the specific mitigation measures related to Biological Resources.

Energy and Mineral Resources

The project site does not support any significant mineral resources as identified in the soil classification studies prepared by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, or in the *Ophir General Plan*. The proposed project would not conflict with adopted energy conservation plans nor use energy/non-renewable resources in a wasteful or inefficient manner. The proposed construction would be required to comply with provisions in Title 24 of the Uniform Building Code that address energy efficiency. No further analysis is needed in this EIR.

The leak in the pipeline was repaired in 2006. In 2008, North Fork Associates conducted a site visit with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers staff. Field observations during this visit indicated that both the seasonal wetland and drainage ditch no longer exhibit characteristics of jurisdictional wetlands. North Fork Associates revised the Wetland Delineation and resubmitted it to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. On July 21, 2008, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers issued a verification letter stating that there are no waters of the U.S., including wetlands, present within the project site.

2.3 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Project objectives of the proposed Livingston's Concrete Batch Plant facility are as follows:

1. Provide a batch plant facility with a daily production capacity of 300 cubic yards per day.
2. Establish the facility in a location that allows Livingston's to serve projects in the general Auburn area using as little vehicle fuel and creating as little vehicle pollution as possible.
3. Operate in a location that allows Livingston's to serve projects in the general Auburn area while resulting in the least amount of impacts on local transportation systems.
4. Operate in a location that allows Livingston's to serve projects in the general Auburn area within the narrow timeframe (90 minutes) allowed for delivery of their product in its optimum form.
5. Operate in a location that allows Livingston's to serve projects in the general Auburn area with the lowest costs to builders, contractors, and the community as possible.

2.4 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

Livingston's Concrete Service, Inc. proposes the construction and operation of a concrete batch plant on an approximately five-acre parcel located near the community of Ophir, in Placer County. The proposed development includes a concrete batch plant (including a 57-foot tall batch plant tower), a 1,440 square-foot office building, a 1,800 square-foot warehouse building, a 15,000 gallon water storage tank, wash areas for concrete trucks, and parking for concrete trucks and employee vehicles. The project may also include a 900 square-foot single story apartment to be used as a caretaker's residence, as discussed in **CHAPTER 3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION**. Facility lighting would be necessary to provide for security and to illuminate the site during early morning operations. The proposed site plan is shown in **CHAPTER 3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION Figure 3-4**.

Operations on the project site would include delivery and storage of materials, concrete mixing, transfer of mixed concrete to trucks, and reclamation of excess material from trucks returning from delivery runs. All concrete mixing would occur onsite. The Ophir plant is expected to produce approximately 300 cubic yards of concrete per day. Hours and days of operation for the plant would be from 5:30 am to 3:30 pm Monday through Saturday.

Administrative Code, §15000, et seq.) and Placer County’s Environmental Review Ordinance. The Draft EIR is an informational document prepared to provide public disclosure of potential impacts of the project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and evaluate alternatives to the proposed project. The Draft EIR is not intended to serve as a recommendation of either approval or denial of the project.

The Livingston’s Concrete Batch Plant EIR provides an assessment of environmental impacts associated with construction and operation of the proposed project and presents the means and methods of reducing impact significance where possible.

Required Permits and Approvals

Table 2.1 lists the entitlements and approvals required from Placer County and from other Responsible Agencies for the proposed project. Following the table is a discussion of each of the entitlements and approvals required from Placer County and the approvals and permits required from other agencies.

Table 2.1
Required Approvals/Permits for Livingston Concrete Batch Plant

Required Permit	Responsible Agency
Variance (to 45-foot maximum height allowed in Heavy Commercial Zone District)	Placer County
Use Permit	Placer County
Improvement Plan Approval	Placer County
Grading Permit	Placer County
Building Permit	Placer County
Onsite sewage disposal system construction	Placer County
Sand filter system operating permit	Placer County
Authority to Construct and Permit to Operate	Air Pollution Control District – Placer County
Section 404 Nationwide Permit	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps)
Section 401 Certification and Report of Waste Discharge/ Waste Discharge Requirements	Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
Section 402 National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Compliance	Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board

Placer County Required Permits and Approvals

Variance To construct a 57-foot tall concrete batch plant tower, the proposed project would require County approval of a variance to the maximum building height of 45 feet set by zoning standards.

Use Permit The proposed project would require County approval of a use permit to allow for the manufacture of concrete products on the project site.

Improvement Plan Approval The proposed project would require County approval of the Improvement Plans for the project site. These plans would be required to include site improvements, frontage improvements along Ophir Road as well as mitigation for increases in peak stormwater flow rates for 10- and 100-year storm events.

Grading Permit In the absence of approved Improvement Plans, the proposed project would require a grading permit issued by the County prior to grading the project site.

Building Permit A building permit would be required from the County to construct structures on the project site.

Onsite sewage disposal Based on the site evaluation, the project site has been approved for a sand filtration septic system. Construction and installation of this system is subject to issuance of a permit from the Environmental Health Division. In addition, operation of a sand filter system requires that Placer County issue an operating permit, which is subject to annual renewal.

Authority to Construct and Permit to Operate Construction and operation of the proposed batch plant would also be subject to approval from the Placer County Air Pollution Control District through these permits.

Other Agencies Using the EIR and Consultation Requirements

Section 404 Permit — ~~The Corps regulates the placement of fill or dredged material that affects waters of the United States, which include streams and wetlands. The Corps regulates these activities under authority granted through Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The Plan Area includes ±0.01 acres of wetland resources under the jurisdiction of the Corps that may be impacted. Any discharge of dredged or fill materials to wetlands would require permitting pursuant to Sections 401 and 404 of the federal Clean Water Act.~~

Water Quality Certification (Section 401) — ~~Construction of the proposed project has the potential to affect wetlands or other waters of the U.S. Therefore, the Central Valley RWQCB would need to provide water quality certification of the project per Section 401 of the Clean Water Act. Section 401 water quality certification entails review of the Corps permit conditions of approval and may also include additional water quality protection measures deemed necessary by the Central Valley RWQCB.~~

Report of Waste Discharge/Waste Discharge Requirements — ~~Operation of the proposed project has the potential to affect surface water quality. The applicant will be required to submit a Report of Waste Discharge (RWD) to the Central Valley RWQCB to apply for Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) for the proposed project. The WDRs will define minimum requirements for the drainage collection and treatment system to ensure that it would prevent the project from violating water quality standards.~~

Section 402 National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Construction of the proposed project would result in clearing, excavation, and grading activities on the five-acre project site. Compliance with the existing statewide permit for stormwater discharge, administered by the Central Valley RWQCB is required for any project that results in clearing, excavation, and grading activities on more than one acre of land. Permit compliance requires

the preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that contains measures, also called Best Management Practices (BMPs), to ensure that the quality of stormwater runoff is not adversely affected by construction activities.

2.8 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impacts and mitigation measures were identified in the Initial Study (circulated with the NOP) and in this EIR. *Table 2.2* lists all of the impacts associated with the proposed project, as evaluated in this EIR. The table identifies the level of significance of each impact and presents the mitigation measures necessary to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. *Table 2.3* lists each of the mitigation measures identified in the Initial Study to address the impacts evaluated in that document. All of the impacts evaluated in the Initial Study were found to be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of the identified mitigation measures. [If the proposed project is approved, the project would be required to implement all mitigation measures included in *Table 2.2* and *Table 2.3*.](#)

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
		<p><i>Mitigation Measure 6.2d:</i> The onsite septic system shall be abandoned when public sewer service is extended to area. The proposed septic system is intended to be used temporarily. Once the public sewer service is available, the onsite septic system shall be abandoned in accordance with County requirements that are in effect at the time of abandonment and in accordance with the procedures specified in the Placer County <i>On-site Sewage Manual</i>.</p>	
		<p><i>Mitigation Measure 6.2e:</i> The proposed Livingston's Concrete Batch Plant shall retain no more than 13 full-time equivalent employees (inclusive of a caretaker if a caretaker's apartment is constructed).</p>	
<p>Impact 6.3: Operational Impacts To Groundwater</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p><i>Mitigation Measure 6.3a:</i> <u>The Conditional Use Permit for the Livingston's Concrete Batch Plant will limit the operations to 300 cubic yards of concrete production each day so that the maximum demand of water usage for concrete production does not exceed 7,500 gallons per day. Livingston's Concrete Services, Inc. may pump no more than 10,000 gallons per day. This includes approximately 2,000 gallons per day for property maintenance (site cleanup, truck cleaning), 180 gallons per day for staff consumption (assuming 12 employees onsite), and 300 gallons per day for the caretaker residence should it be constructed.</u> The Livingston's Concrete Batch Plant shall connect to public water supply when it is available. To facilitate this future connection, the onsite water supply/delivery system shall be designed and constructed with stub-outs toward the future point of connection. The project applicant shall coordinate with PCWA on this design for future connection. Public water is considered available for connection if the water supply is within 1,000 feet of any boundary of the property, as measured in a straight line, and the connection can be legally and physically achieved.</p> <p><i>Mitigation Measure 6.3b:</i> Livingston's Concrete Service, Inc. shall abandon the existing onsite well when PCWA water is available, in accordance with State of California Well Standards Bulletin 74-90, as revised.</p> <p><i>Mitigation Measure 6.3c:</i> Livingston's Concrete Service, Inc. shall provide for treatment of the onsite well to remove bacteriological contaminants. Following treatment, Livingston's Concrete Services shall provide for completion of a bacteriological test. The well water must meet potable water standards prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the proposed project.</p>	<p>LTS</p>

Impact Significance

- NI: No Impact
- LTS: Less than Significant
- PS: Potentially Significant
- SU: Significant and Unavoidable

Mitigation Measure(s)
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES
<p>MM 7.1 - The applicant shall replace trees onsite at a ratio of 2:1, or shall pay into the Tree Preservation Fund \$100.00 for each diameter inch removed (\$16,100.00). The applicant shall comply with provisions of the Placer County Tree Preservation Ordinance for protection of all trees to remain onsite.</p>
<p>MM 7.2 - The wetland delineation shall be submitted to the Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) for verification. The applicant shall provide the County with the verification letter from the Corps prior to any development activity onsite, including preliminary clearing or grading.</p>
<p>MM 7.3 - The project applicant shall obtain the appropriate permits from the Corps and the Regional Water Quality Control Board for impacts to waters of the United States, and shall carry out onsite replacement or off site banking to mitigate wetlands lost as a result of project development consistent with the Corps' and County's "no net loss" of wetlands policies. At a minimum the permit must cover impacts to the 0.01 acre wetland swale. If the Corps determines that the 0.25 acres of seasonal wetlands do fall within the scope of Corps jurisdiction, the permit must also cover impacts to the seasonal wetlands. Mitigation may be completed either through onsite replacement or off site banking. If off site mitigation is chosen, the project applicant shall provide written evidence that compensatory habitat has been established through the purchase of mitigation credits at a County qualified wetlands mitigation bank. The amount of money required to purchase these credits shall be equal to the amount necessary to replace wetland or habitat acreage and value, including compensation for temporal loss. Evidence of payment, which describes the amount and type of habitat purchased at the bank site, must be provided to the County prior to the approval of Improvement Plans or issuance of Grading Permits.</p>
HAZARDS
<p>MM 9.1 - In order to reduce the risk of accidental release of hazardous substances, the applicant shall comply with the state and local regulations for operating a business that uses and stores hazardous materials. The applicant shall complete a set of forms provided by the Placer County Department of Environmental Health Services, which is the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) for the Cal-EPA. This packet includes a Business Owner/Operator Form, a Business Activities Form, a Hazardous Materials Inventory and Chemical Description, and a Hazardous Materials Release Response Plan. As part of this packet, the applicant must submit a site plan depicting where the hazardous materials are stored on the site.</p> <p>In order to own and operate an AST onsite, the AST shall be registered with the CUPA, and a spill prevention control and countermeasure (SPCC) plan must be prepared and filed.</p> <p>The applicant/facility operator shall submit to annual inspections by the CUPA inspectors, and shall correct any violations that are found at the direction of the CUPA.</p>
CULTURAL RESOURCES
<p>MM 14.1 - If any archaeological artifacts, exotic rock (non-native), or unusual amounts of shell or bone are uncovered during any onsite construction activities, all work must stop immediately in the area and a SOPA-certified (Society of Professional Archaeologists) archaeologist retained to evaluate the deposit. The Placer County Planning Department and Department of Museums must also be contacted for review of the archaeological find(s).</p> <p>If the discovery includes human remains, the Placer County Coroner and Native American Heritage Commission must also be contacted. Work in the area may only proceed after authorization is granted by the Placer County Planning Department. A note to this effect shall be provided on the Improvement Plans for the project.</p> <p>Following a review of the new find and consultation with appropriate experts, if necessary, the authority to proceed may be accompanied by the addition of development requirements which provide protection of the site and/or additional mitigation measures necessary to address the unique or sensitive nature of the site.</p>

toward the north via overland flow where it is captured in a roadside ditch that runs from east to west along the southern side of Ophir Road. The roadside ditch delivers stormwater through a culvert that runs under Ophir road to a storm drain inlet on the western side of Geraldson Road. Water entering the storm drain inlet presumably discharges to Auburn Ravine, which is the first major surface water located downgradient of the storm drain inlet.

Waters of the U.S.

A Wetland Delineation prepared by North Fork Associates in 2005 mapped a total of 0.26 acres of wetlands on the project site, of which 0.01 acre was determined to be under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The remaining 0.25 acres of seasonal wetland delineated on the subject parcel was determined to be the result of artificial hydrologic conditions created by a leaking underground pipeline crossing the subject property, and therefore is not subject to regulation as waters of the U.S. [In 2008, North Fork Associates biologists conducted a site visit with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers staff. Field observations during this visit indicated that neither the seasonal wetland nor the drainage ditch exhibit characteristics of jurisdictional wetlands. As stated above, the seasonal wetland was artificially created and isolated. The wetland swale was found not to meet the three-parameter criteria to be classified as a wetland swale, and similarly did not meet the criteria to be classified as a stream. North Fork Associates revised the Wetland Delineation and resubmitted it to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. On July 21, 2008, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers issued a verification letter stating that there are no waters of the U.S., including wetlands, present within the project site.](#)

3.2 GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING DESIGNATIONS

Project Site Designations

The proposed project site is currently vacant. The site is designated as Commercial in the *Ophir General Plan*. This designation allows a variety of urban commercial uses including, but not limited to, general and heavy commercial uses, highway service areas, and neighborhood-serving commercial centers. This designation is applied to other properties along Ophir Road in the project vicinity, which is near the major transportation corridors of I-80 and SR 49.

The project property is within a C-3 (Heavy Commercial) zone district. Combining designations applied to the zoning on the project site include UP (Use Permit required), and Dc (Design Scenic Corridor). Zoning designations are defined in **CHAPTER 4 LAND USE**.

Designations and Land Uses of Adjacent Parcels

The I-80 right-of-way abuts the project site on the south. The southern project site boundary is ± 70 feet north of the edge of existing I-80 pavement.

The parcel abutting the project site on the east is currently undeveloped and carries a Commercial land use designation. The parcel abutting the project site on the west carries an Industrial (I) land use designation and is currently occupied by a propane distribution company. The parcel northwest of the project site on the corner of Ophir Road and Geraldson Road also carries an Industrial land use designation and is occupied by a landscaping products supplier. The property north of the project site (across Ophir Road) carries a Commercial land use designation. The western portion of the property is vacant while a single residence is situated in the eastern portion of this property, ± 300 feet north of the project site.

3.5 ENTITLEMENTS AND REQUIRED APPROVALS

Table 3.1 lists the entitlements and approvals required from Placer County and from other responsible agencies for the proposed project. CHAPTER 2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY includes the same table, as well as an explanation of each of the entitlements and approvals required from Placer County and each of the approvals and permits required from other agencies.

Table 3.1
Required Approvals/Permits for Livingston's Concrete Batch Plant

Required Permit	Responsible Agency
Variance (to 45-foot maximum height allowed in Heavy Commercial Zone District)	Placer County
Use Permit	Placer County
Improvement Plan Approval	Placer County
Grading Permit	Placer County
Building Permit	Placer County
Onsite sewage disposal system construction	Placer County
Sand filter system operating permit	Placer County
Authority to Construct and Permit to Operate	Air Pollution Control District - Placer County
Section 404 Nationwide Permit	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Section 401 Certification and Report of Waste Discharge/Waste Discharge Requirements	Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
Section 402 National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Compliance	Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board

IMPACT 6.3:	Operational Impacts To Groundwater
SIGNIFICANCE:	Potentially Significant
MITIGATION:	
Proposed:	Mitigation Measures 6.3a and 6.3b
Significance After Proposed Mitigation:	Potentially Significant
Recommended:	Mitigation Measure 6.3c
RESIDUAL SIGNIFICANCE:	Less than Significant

Groundwater Quality

Operation and maintenance of the facility could potentially impact groundwater quality through inadvertent spills or discharge that could then infiltrate and percolate down to groundwater. Soils within the project site have low permeability, which limits the amount of water percolation through the soil. Additionally, Mmost of the operational portion of the site would be paved, thereby preventing infiltration into the subsurface. Potential contaminants that could collect on the paved surfaces would be picked up by stormwater and/or washwater and conveyed to the onsite settling pond, treatment pond, and detention basin (see discussion of Impact 6.5). As indicated in a letter from Livingston's Concrete dated September 13, 2005, hexavalent chromium (Cr⁺⁶) will not be used directly in their process but it may be present in trace amounts in other products used. In obtaining a Report of Waste Discharge from the Central Valley RWQCB, the project applicant would be required to ~~provide demonstrate that~~ the management of process water ~~to would~~ ensure that impacts associated with hexavalent chromium this and other constituents will not occur. Specifically, the proposed process water collection and treatment system would be designed such that no connection to surface drainage would occur. Any water discharged from the detention basin would be sampled and monitored prior to discharge offsite to ensure that no contaminated water is released offsite. Thus any constituents present in the process water would not be discharged to the surface water system in the project area.

As described in Impact 6.6, Tthe project would use a three-pond drainage collection and treatment system. All water (including process water, water from truck washing, and stormwater runoff) from the production area of the site would be collected in a concrete-lined settling pond, which would be plumbed to the batch plant to allow reuse of this water. eoncrete lined pond to manage storm water runoff from the operational areas of the site and recycled washwater. Because the pond would be concrete lined, percolation of storm water and recycled washwater from the basin into the subsurface would not be expected to occur, and no degradation of groundwater below the site is expected. In heavy rain events where the volume of stormwater exceeds the capacity of the settling pond, the overflow water would be directed to the concrete-lined treatment pond. This water would be routed through an oil/grit separator to filter particulates, oils, and greases from the water. The runoff would then flow through a bark media to provide further filtering of solids and reduce the pH of the runoff. After passing through the bark media, the water would be discharged to the unlined detention basin, which would also be plumbed to the batch plant to allow use of detained water in the plant operations. This would reduce the amount of water held in the detention basin and discharged offsite. Based on the low permeability of the soils onsite, it is expected that minimal percolation of the treated water in the detention basin to groundwater supplies would occur. In addition, water would be treated before reaching the detention basin, which would minimize the amount

of contaminants present in this water. As noted above, water would be sampled and monitored prior to discharge offsite to ensure that no contaminated water is released offsite.

With use of the proposed three-pond drainage collection and treatment system, and compliance with any conditions issued by the RWQCB as part of a Report of Waste Discharge, potential impacts to groundwater quality due to the proposed project are considered less than significant.

Groundwater Quantity

Groundwater recharge into the regional system occurs throughout the area. Soils within the project site are not conducive to onsite recharge of the aquifer. Substantial recharge typically occurs in this area at major drainageways, none of which occur onsite or would be affected by the proposed project. Thus, the paving associated with the project is not anticipated to decrease regional groundwater recharge.

The project proposes to use groundwater from an onsite well until such time as treated water is available in the project area. The well is located in the southwest corner of the site, and water would be pumped to the water tank through a two-inch water line. As described in Chapter 3 Project Description, the proposed project would use approximately 7,000 to 10,000 gallons per day during the summer months, until a supply is provided by PCWA. It is unknown when PCWA will extend public water supply to the project site. The maximum water demand includes 7,500 gallons per day for concrete production, (based on a maximum of 300 cubic yards of concrete per day), 2,000 gallons per day for property maintenance (site cleanup, truck cleaning), 180 gallons per day for staff consumption (assuming 12 employees onsite), and 300 gallons per day for the caretaker residence should it be constructed. Usage amounts for landscaping and fire protection are not included. The 72-hour constant head and recovery pump test (Diamond Well Drilling, 2007) indicated a yield of 25 gpm, which is equal to 36,000 gallons per day. The State of California standards recommend assigning a capacity of 25% of the pumping rate for wells drilled into hard rock formations, such as the existing well onsite. Based on this standard, the well would be assigned a capacity of 9,000 gallons per day. The estimated use of between 7,000 and 10,000 gallons per day would represent a use of 19% to 28% of the established well yield. The Placer County EHS has determined that this estimated daily volume of well water usage is within an acceptable range of the State recommendation of 25% of the established yield.

Other water sources for the project's operations include recycled washwater in the EM40 Enviromatic reclaim system and captured stormwater. The project would rely on these alternate sources of water before using groundwater. The Well Completion Report for the onsite well indicates that the fracture system transmitting the groundwater resource is located at depths of 235 to 237 feet. Based on these depths relative to the depths of other wells in the vicinity, the likelihood of this system connecting to existing wells in the vicinity of the project, including all wells within a ¼ mile radius of the project site, is considered extremely remote. Additionally, a neighboring well was observed throughout the 72-hour constant head and recovery pump test. This well showed less than one foot of drop of the depth to water level during the test, indicating that there is minimal connection between the onsite well and this offsite well. Based on the Well Completion Reports and the 72-hour test results, it is expected that the project would have no potential to affect other nearby wells by pumping from the onsite well.

The onsite well would be abandoned when water supply from PCWA is available. At that time, the project would connect to the public water supply in accordance with PCWA’s requirements (*Mitigation Measure 6.3a*). As required by Mitigation Measure 6.3b, well abandonment would be performed in accordance with DHS requirements.

~~Because most of the operational portion of the site would be paved and the detention basin would be concrete lined, potential impacts to groundwater quality due to the proposed project are considered less than significant.~~ With implementation of Mitigation Measures requiring that the well be abandoned once PCWA water is available to the site, the well would only be used temporarily until PCWA water is available and the amount of water pumped would be within an acceptable range of the State recommendation for well capacity, the project’s potential to impact to other nearby water supply wells is considered less than significant.

The bacteriological test included in the 72-hour constant head and recovery pump test indicated that the water in the existing onsite well tested positive for coliform bacteria. To ensure that no impacts occur as a result of using contaminated water, *Mitigation Measure 6.3c* requires that the project applicant provide for treatment of the water and completion of a bacteriological test demonstrating that the well water meets potable water standards.

IMPACT 6.4:	Operational Impacts To Hydrology
SIGNIFICANCE:	Potentially Significant
MITIGATION:	
Proposed:	Mitigation Measures 6.4a and 6.4b
Significance After Proposed Mitigation:	Less than Significant
Recommended:	None
RESIDUAL SIGNIFICANCE:	Less than Significant

The proposed project would increase the amount of impervious surface present on the site. The proposed project consists of the construction and operation of a concrete batch plant on approximately 4.9 acres. The project would include a 1,440-square-foot office building, a 1,800-square-foot warehouse building, a batch plant, and parking and wash areas for the concrete trucks. The project may also include a 900-square-foot single story apartment to provide a caretaker residence. The majority of the project site, approximately 73 percent, would be paved. Portions of the site that would not be paved include the septic area in the southeast portion of the site (approximately 0.4 acres) and the landscaped areas along the eastern and northern property lines (approximately 0.9 acres).

Development of the site would result in an increase in impervious surfaces due to the construction of buildings, parking lots and interior drive aisles. Therefore, peak flow rates of stormwater runoff would increase during storm events. Currently, stormwater runoff leaves the site and is discharged via overland flow into an existing drainage ditch along Ophir Road. Stormwater runoff from approximately 1.83 acres of the site flows towards the northeast and stormwater from approximately 3.07 acres flows towards the northwest. The proposed project would grade and pave most of the site, such that stormwater runoff from approximately 1.33 acres would flow towards the northeast and from approximately 3.57 acres would flow towards the northwest (refer to *Figure 3-4* in **CHAPTER 3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION**).

Stormwater runoff from the eastern portion of the site, which includes the access driveway, parking lot, warehouse and apartment building and septic leach field, would be discharged directly offsite. Although the amount of impervious area would be increased, the proposed grading of the site would reduce the runoff area (from 1.83 acres to 1.33 acres). The net result would be a decrease in peak flow discharged offsite as shown in *Table 6.3*. Based on a preliminary analysis by Ourada Engineering (2006), the estimated un-mitigated peak flow for the 100-year event for post-development conditions would be less than 90 percent of the peak flow for existing conditions. Since this would satisfy the requirements of the Placer County's SWMM, there would be no need to detain the post-project flows from the eastern portion of the site prior to discharge offsite.

Drainage from the paved surfaces of the operation area (approximately 3.07 acres) would be managed in a three-pond drainage collection and treatment system, as described in Impact 6.3 above. Water would primarily be collected in a concrete-lined settling pond basin proposed for the northwestern corner near the center of the paved production area. This basin would be designed to contain up to 30,000 gallons of as much stormwater and re-claimed washwater as possible and reuse it in the batch plant operations, as is done at other existing Livingston's Concrete Batch Plant sites in the greater Sacramento area. When runoff water from the production area exceeds 30,000 gallons, the overflow water would be directed to a concrete-lined treatment pond northwest of the production area. Water in this pond would be treated by passing through an oil/grit separator and a bark media. Treated water leaving the treatment pond would be directed to an unlined detention basin.~~The basin would be designed to retain the runoff from a 10-year storm event and detain runoff from a 100-year storm event.~~ Preliminary calculations indicate that the onsite detention pond would provide approximately 6,000 cubic feet (±44,800 gallons) of storage (Ourada, 2006). It would be approximately four feet deep with an approximate surface area of 1,200 square feet. ~~During the year, The detention basin would be plumbed to the batch plant to allow for reuse of water would be managed to make use of~~ the recycled water and stormwater. Water supply for the plant operations, which would be supplemented during the dry summer months; -- initially the supplementing water would come from the groundwater well, and later from -- At the time that PCWA public water when it is available at the project site, this would be the source of the supplementing water. During the rainy season, typically November through March, the plant generally would supplement the recycled water with stormwater rather than groundwater or PCWA water.

Based on preliminary estimates by Ourada Engineering, the estimated peak flows for pre-project, unmitigated post-project and mitigated post-project conditions are summarized in *Table 6.4*. The preliminary estimates indicate that post-project flows (i.e., the regulated outflow from the proposed stormwater detention system) would be less than pre-project flows for all storm events. During detailed design, the facilities would be sized to achieve the required reduction in flows in accordance with the SWMM. To support the design of the three-pond drainage collection and treatment system~~detention facilities~~, and as required by *Mitigation Measure 6.4a*, a project drainage report, including drainage calculations, would be prepared for review and approval by Placer County ESD.

These preliminary estimates show that there would be no increase in peak discharge to downstream storm drain systems (e.g., the roadside ditch along Ophir Road) due to the proposed project. To support the design of the proposed conveyance systems, a project

and the Central Valley RWQCB would ensure that impacts associated with [hexavalent chromium](#) ~~this~~ and other constituents will not occur. In addition, as indicated in the Hazardous Materials Business Plan for the project (Livingston's Concrete Services, 2005), large quantities of hazardous materials would not be stored at this site.

Potential source areas that could contribute to stormwater contamination are as follows:

- Parking area: Stormwater runoff from areas where employees park their vehicles during the day and where concrete trucks are parked overnight could potentially be contaminated by leaking fluids from the parked vehicles. Potential contaminants could include petroleum hydrocarbons.
- Warehouse: Maintenance and fueling activities would be performed on ready-mix concrete trucks in the warehouse. Materials that would be stored in this area include 55 gallons of motor oil and 55 gallons of coolant; these materials would be stored within the warehouse under appropriate cover. Stormwater runoff from the perimeter of the warehouse area could be potentially contaminated by fluids leaking from the vehicles or spills and leaks at the fueling station. Potential contaminants could include petroleum hydrocarbon and antifreeze.
- Truck unloading area: Trucks would unload aggregate in the unloading area. Stormwater runoff from this area could be potentially contaminated by fluids leaking from the trucks or by materials spilled onto the ground. Potential contaminants could include petroleum hydrocarbons and particulates.
- Truck washout area: Trucks would be washed in the truck washout area. This would include washing the interior of the truck drums and the exterior surfaces of the trucks. Stormwater runoff from this area could be potentially contaminated by fluids leaking from the trucks or by materials washed onto the ground. Potential contaminants could include petroleum hydrocarbons, particulates, and washwater with high pH.
- Ready-Mix Manufacturing area: The manufactured cement would be loaded into the ready-mix truck at the loading area. Stormwater runoff from this area could be potentially contaminated by fluids leaking from the trucks or by materials washed onto the ground. Potential contaminants could include petroleum hydrocarbons and particulates, as well as batch plant water with high pH.
- Material Storage area: Material used in the concrete mix, such as aggregate, would be stored in four concrete bays located in the southeastern portion of the site. Stormwater runoff from this area could be potentially contaminated by particulates.

Stormwater runoff from approximately 1.33 acres of the site (Area 3 on *Figure 6-4*), which includes the access driveway, employee parking area, warehouse and apartment building, and the septic field would be discharged directly offsite to the existing roadside ditch along Ophir Road. As discussed in Impact 6.4, post-development discharge to the northeast would be less than pre-development conditions, due to a smaller area of contribution (from 1.83 acres to 1.33 acres). In order to prevent offsite discharge of particulates and oil/grease, the County requires that the applicant collect and convey stormwater runoff from the paved portion of this area to an oil/grit separator prior to discharge. Because of the operations at the site, the roof of

the warehouse and apartment building could collect particulates that could then be picked up by precipitation falling on the roof. This requires that runoff from the building roof ~~should~~ also be directed to the oil/grit separator. Stormwater runoff from the non-paved areas would flow offsite as overland sheet flow.

The conceptual storm water management plan for the operational portion of the site is shown in Figure 6-4. The project proposes a three-pond drainage collection and treatment system and proposes to recycle any waste or leftover concrete. Approximately 99% of all returned concrete as well as concrete leftover from batch plant operations would be recycled at the reclaim station in an EM40 Enviromatic Recycling System by Stephens Manufacturing Company. The recycled aggregates, cement fines, and water would be reused in concrete production at the facility. The EM40 Enviromatic Recycling System includes a 7,000-gallon water tank. This water would be reused in the plant operations.

~~The proposed project would collect all stormwater runoff from the operational portion of the site (approximately 3.6 acres or approximately 73 percent) and convey it to an onsite detention basin. This portion of the site would be paved and sloped so that runoff would flow to the basin. Runoff from the driveways would be collected and conveyed via ditches to the basin. Similar to its other concrete sites, the applicant proposes to recycle approximately 50 to 70 percent of the stormwater collected from the site and use it in the batch plant operations (Ourada Engineering, 2006).~~

Approximately 99% of all returned concrete as well as concrete leftover from batch plant operations would be recycled at the reclaim station in an EM40 Enviromatic Recycling System by Stephens Manufacturing Company. ~~Waste (leftover) concrete would be recycled through this equipment.~~ The recycled aggregates, cement fines, and water would be reused in concrete production at the facility. The EM40 Enviromatic Recycling System includes a 7,000-gallon water tank. This water would be managed through reused in the plant operations. ~~while process water and water from truck cleaning operations discharged to the surface of the project site would be collected in a 30 foot by 40 foot boat ramp style basin, which would have a holding capacity of approximately 30,000 gallons.~~

Non-reclaimable material would be washed into washout holding tanks that would allow solids to drop out. Environment Canada reports that generally one hour of settling in a properly designed basin can provide 80 to 90 percent reduction in settleable solids and that this type of treatment system is common practice in the ready-mix concrete industry (Envirochem, 1993). The recovered water would then be used for rinsing of trucks or reused in the production of concrete. ~~This water would be directed to the basin in the northwest portion of the site.~~

Process water and water from truck cleaning operations discharged to the surface of the project site would be collected in the settling pond, which is proposed as a 30-foot by 40-foot boat ramp style basin with a holding capacity of approximately 30,000 gallons. This pond would also accommodate stormwater runoff from the production area of the project site, which is shown as AREA 2 in Figure 6-4. The settling pond would be plumbed to the batch plant to allow reuse of this water in plant operations.

In a very heavy rain event, runoff may leave the settling pond and production area. This runoff would combine with runoff from AREA 1 shown in Figure 6-4 and would flow into the treatment pond located in the northwest corner of that area. The treatment pond would be concrete-lined. As described above, stormwater from the industrial portions of the site and washwater could have high levels of petroleum hydrocarbons and particulates with relatively high pH values. An oil/grit separator would be installed to collect oils, greases, and particulates. Water would then flow through a bark media to filter out a portion of the suspended solids and reduce the pH prior to discharge into the basin. The basin would allow suspended solids that were not intercepted by the oil/grit separator or bark media to settle. ~~This water would be sampled and monitored prior to discharge offsite.~~ The oil/grit separator would be maintained and solids removed and disposed as needed. The bark media would be replaced periodically as needed to ensure that it is still effective in lowering the pH. The applicant has used this method effectively at its other concrete facilities (Ourada, 2006). Data provided by the applicant for another ready-mix concrete facility shows that the discharge that had passed through the bark media had pH values ranging on the order of 5.8 to 9.6. Prior to installation of the bark media, discharges typically had pH values on the order of 10 to 12 (Hersh, 2006).

Water leaving the treatment pond would flow to the unlined detention basin located in the northwest corner of the project site. This facility is labeled "storm detention basin" in Figure 6-4, and would have 6,000 cubic feet (±44,800 gallons) of storage. The basin would also be plumbed to the batch plant to allow use of the captured stormwater. Similar to its other concrete sites, the applicant proposes to recycle approximately 50 to 70 percent of the stormwater collected from the site and use it in the batch plant operations (Ourada Engineering, 2006). Before water is discharged offsite, it would be detained in the stormwater basin to allow solids to settle out. The water in the detention basin would be sampled and monitored prior to discharge offsite to ensure that no contaminated water is released offsite.

As noted in the NOP comment letter from the Central Valley RWQCB, the project would be required to provide a containment system for all concrete washwater to prevent discharges of this water onto the ground surface. The proposed onsite drainage and collection system complies with this requirement by directing all process wastewater to the onsite settling basin and the Enviromatic Recycling System, and by providing for reuse of process wastewater.

As an industrial facility, the proposed project would be required to comply with the requirements of the NPDES General Permit for Discharge of Storm Water Associated with Industrial Activities (General Industrial Permit). Prior to operation, the project applicant would submit a Notice of Intent (NOI) to the RWQCB to comply with the General Industrial Permit (*Mitigation Measure 6.6a*). In addition, because the facility is located within Placer County, the proposed project must also comply with requirements of the NPDES Phase II Rule permit for MS4s.

A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for operations would be prepared in accordance with the General Industrial permit and NPDES II permit requirements (*Mitigation Measure 6.6b*). The General Industrial Permit SWPPP checklist developed by the RWQCB provides guidance on the items to be included in the document. The items in the checklist are

derived from the current General Industrial Permit requirements and would be reviewed for applicability to the proposed project. Typical contents include:

- Pollution Prevention Team
- Existing Facility Plans
- Facility Site Map
- List of Significant Materials
- Description of Potential Pollution Sources
- Assessment of Potential Pollutant Sources
- Storm Water BMPs
- Annual Comprehensive Site Compliance Evaluation

For compliance with the NPDES Phase II Rule Permit, the SWPPP must also include elements that will reduce the discharge of pollutants to the “maximum extent practicable” (MEP) to protect water quality.

Similar to BMPs used at its other concrete batch plant operations, the proposed project would include the following BMPs to address water quality impacts:

- Practice good housekeeping to control containment dispersal.
- Pave, curb, and slope operational areas of the site, to contain possible sand and gravel spills and facilitate cleanup.
- Divert stormwater around the facility to minimize the volume of water that may cause erosion onsite and/or come into contact with potential pollutants. This could be accomplished via perimeter ditches, berms, or curbs.
- Provide drip pans in warehouse area to collect leaking fluids.
- Do not include any floor drains or plumbing in the warehouse.
- Place aggregates in raised bins to avoid contact with stormwater.
- Install energy dissipating discharge aprons at discharge points to reduce flow velocities and minimize erosion potential. These structures would be made of concrete and include rip-rap.
- Provide pH treatment, e.g., filter stormwater runoff and washwater through redwood bark media to reduce pH.
- Detain stormwater and washwater in a basin to allow particulates and pollutants to settle.
- Maximize water reuse in plant operations.
- Sampling and monitoring to measure BMP performance.

The detention system temporarily detains runoff and releases flows at low rates. This detention allows sediments and particulates to settle in the basin. The [three-pond drainage collection and](#)

from the Placer County Department of Health and Human Services, Environmental Health Division as required by Section 8.24.080.B.2 of the Placer County Code and page 41, Chapter 24 of the *On-site Sewage Manual*.

Mitigation Measure 6.2b: The project applicant shall obtain a permit for the use of an onsite septic system. The project must submit an application for a Septic Construction Permit, along with the septic system design, prior to construction. The application must include plot plans and final designs, as described in the Placer County *On-site Sewage Manual*, and all applicable fees. The applicant shall work with the Placer County Department of Health and Human Services, Environmental Health Division to ensure that all proposed and recommended mitigation measures are incorporated into the septic system design as specific design details and subsequently as permit conditions. The project is expected to use an “Intermittent Sand Filter Septic System” which requires a renewable operating permit and system monitoring and maintenance in conformance with the permit requirements.

Recommended Mitigation

Mitigation Measure 6.2c: To facilitate future connection to the County sewer collection and treatment system, the onsite collection system shall be designed and constructed with sewer stub-outs toward the future point of connection, so that cut over to the permanent system and subsurface excavation and construction will be minimized.

Mitigation Measure 6.2d: The onsite septic system shall be abandoned when public sewer service is extended to area. The proposed septic system is intended to be used temporarily. Once the public sewer service is available, the onsite septic system should be abandoned in accordance with County requirements that are in effect at the time of abandonment and in accordance with the procedures specified in the Placer County *On-site Sewage Manual*.

Mitigation Measure 6.2e: The proposed Livingston’s Concrete Batch Plant shall retain no more than 13 full-time equivalent employees (inclusive of a caretaker if a caretaker’s apartment is constructed).

Operational Impacts to Groundwater

Proposed Mitigation

Mitigation Measure 6.3a: The Conditional Use Permit for the Livingston’s Concrete [Batch](#) Plant will limit the operations to 300 cubic yards of concrete production each day so that the maximum demand of water usage for concrete production does not exceed 7,500 gallons per day. [Livingston’s Concrete Services, Inc. may pump no more than 10,000 gallons per day. This includes approximately 2,000 gallons per day for property maintenance \(site cleanup, truck cleaning\), 180 gallons per day for staff consumption \(assuming 12 employees onsite\), and 300 gallons per day for the caretaker residence should it be constructed.](#) The Livingston’s Concrete Batch Plant shall connect to public water supply when it is available. To facilitate this future connection, the onsite water supply/delivery system shall be designed and constructed with stub-outs toward the future point of connection. The project applicant shall coordinate

p.m. Saturday. In addition, all construction equipment must be fitted with factory installed muffling devices and be maintained in good working order. With implementation of *Mitigation Measure 7.3a* requiring the project to comply with operational hours of construction and equipment muffler requirements, noise associated with construction of the project is expected to be reduced to less than significant levels.

IMPACT 7.4:	Batch Plant And Related Operational Noise Exceeding Established Noise Standards
SIGNIFICANCE:	Less than Significant
MITIGATION:	No Mitigation is Necessary
Proposed:	None
Significance After Proposed Mitigation:	Less than Significant
Recommended:	None
RESIDUAL SIGNIFICANCE:	Less than Significant

The acoustic analysis provides an assessment of the potential for project related operational activities to exceed Placer County noise thresholds. The analysis included quantification of existing and projected noise levels associated with operation of the plant.

Noise measurements and accepted noise modeling techniques were used to predict noise levels generated by the proposed batch plant facility operations. Operational information used in the acoustical analysis was obtained from Livingston’s Concrete staff. The proposed site plan for the batch plant facility is shown on *Figure 3-4* in **CHAPTER 3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION**.

The acoustic analysis also used file data for similar batch plant facilities to quantify the proposed project’s noise emissions. That noise level data indicate that a complete cycle of the batch plant would generate an averagea maximum noise level of approximately 75 dB and an average noise level of approximately 70 dB at a distance of 100 feet from the effective noise center of the plant. Noises generated onsite would include ready-mix truck passages, engine spool-up and feeding of the plant hoppers by front-loaders, mixing of concrete and departure of ready-mix trucks.

In order to account for peak production periods, the acoustic analysis assumed a production rate of 120 cubic yards per hour. The project is expected to produce a maximum of 300 cubic yards daily. At a rate of 120 cubic yards per hour, the plant would only need to operate for 2.2 hours to produce the maximum amount. As a practical matter, all of the concrete would not be mixed consecutively, so the total duration during which the plant would be operating would be longer than 2.2 hours and the average production rate would be much less than 120 cubic yards per hour. The anticipated operating hours are from 5:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. Monday through Saturday. If the plant equipment is in operation for a total duration conservatively estimated to be 6 hours out of a day (including one hour prior to 7:00 a.m.), the computed noise level for plant operations would be approximately 68 dB L_{dn} at a distance of 100 feet from the noise center of the plant. Plant operations that occur before 7 a.m. would be subject to the nighttime standards.

The property line of the nearest identified noise sensitive area (Receiver #1 described on page 7-6 above) is approximately 300 feet from the noise-center of the plant. At this distance, the plant noise emissions are predicted to be approximately 60 dB L_{eq} and 65 dB L_{max} during a typical plant cycle producing 120 cubic yards per hour. This level is based on a decrease of 6 dB per doubling of distance from the plant, and does not include shielding of plant noise by intervening structures or additional attenuation of sound by the ground and atmosphere. These levels are in compliance with the 60 dB L_{eq} Placer County General Plan Noise Element standard and the Placer County Code 70 dB L_{max} daytime and 65 dB L_{max} nighttime performance standards. However, these levels exceed the 55 L_{eq} daytime and 45 L_{eq} nighttime standards of the Placer County Code, Section 9.36.060.

As shown in Table 7.6 below, at the other sensitive receivers, Livingston’s Concrete facility noise levels would be the same or lower than the noise levels at Receiver #1, and similar findings can be made. Specifically, the project would meet the Placer County General Plan Noise Element standard and the Placer County Code 70 dB L_{max} daytime and 65 dB L_{max} nighttime performance standards but would exceed the L_{eq} standards of the Placer County Code at some sensitive receptors: The daytime L_{eq} standard would be exceeded by 5 dB at the property lines of Receivers #1, 3, and 4; the nighttime L_{eq} standard would be exceeded by between 5 and 15 dB at all receivers. These violations could represent potentially significant noise impacts of the proposed project.

Table 7.6
Predicted Livingston’s Concrete Batch Plant Noise Emissions at Nearest Residences

Receiver	Description	Distance (ft)	Project Generated Noise Levels		
			Leq, dB	Ldn, dB	Lmax, dB
1	Nearest Res. to North.				
	▪ Property Line	300	60	58	65
	▪ Residence	600	54	52	59
2	Uninhabited Res. To North.	N/A			
3	Mobile Home Park to Northeast	800 1200	60 48	58 46	65 53
4	Residences on Opposite Side of I-80				
	▪ Property Line	300	60	58	65
	▪ Residences	700	53	51	58
5	Residences near Geraldson Road	1,000	50	48	55

Notes:

Receiver locations are described on page 7-6.

L_{dn} values for the project assume three full hours of Livingston’s Concrete Batch Plant operation daily, with one of the hours occurring before 7 am.

Source: Bollard, 2007

Based on the data shown in Table 7.2 above, the existing noise conditions in the project vicinity already exceed the L_{eq} standards of the Placer County Code. The daytime L_{eq} noise levels range from 53 to 65 dB, while the nighttime L_{eq} noise levels range from 49 to 61 dB. Additionally, average noise levels generated by traffic on I-80 were measured to be approximately 60 dB L_{eq} at Receiver #1, with computed L_{dn} values of 63 to 66 dB. The noise emissions from the proposed Livingston’s Concrete facility are expected to be below existing traffic noise levels at the nearest

approval, easements shall be created and offered for dedication to the County for maintenance and access to these facilities in anticipation of possible County maintenance.

MM 3.5 The applicant shall submit with the project Improvement Plans, a drainage report in conformance with the requirements of Section 5 of the LDM and the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal, to the ESD for review and approval. The report shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and shall, at a minimum, include: A written text addressing existing conditions, the effects of the improvements, all appropriate calculations, a watershed map, increases in downstream flows, proposed on- and off-site improvements and drainage easements to accommodate flows from this project. The report shall address storm drainage during construction and thereafter and shall propose "Best Management Practice" (BMP) measures to reduce erosion, water quality degradation, etc. Said BMP measures for this project shall include: Minimizing drainage concentration from impervious surfaces, construction management techniques, erosion protection at culvert outfall locations and sand/oil separators (or other suitable proprietary treatment units, as approved by the ESD).

MM 3.6 All onsite parking and circulation areas shall be improved with a minimum asphaltic concrete or portland cement concrete capable of supporting anticipated vehicle loadings.

Water

MM 4.1 Drainage facilities shall be designed in accordance with the requirements of the County Storm Water Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal, and to the satisfaction of ESD. These facilities shall be constructed with project improvements and easements provided as required by ESD. Maintenance of these facilities shall be provided by the property owner(s).

Air Quality

MM 5.1 The applicant shall submit to the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (District) and receive approval of a Construction Emission & Dust Control Plan prior to groundbreaking.

MM 5.2 Construction equipment exhaust emissions shall not exceed District Rule 202 Visible Emission limitations.

MM 5.3 Diesel-powered equipment shall not be allowed to idle ~~ing time shall not exceed 10~~ more than five minutes consecutively.

MM 5.4 Use low sulfur California diesel fuel for stationary construction equipment.

MM 5.5 Utilize existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or clean fuel generators rather than diesel power generators.

MM 5.6 Use electric or low emission natural gas onsite stationary equipment.

MM 5.7 No open burning of removed vegetation during infrastructure improvements. Vegetative material should be chipped or delivered to waste to energy facilities.

- MM 5.8** The applicant shall implement sufficient dust control measures so as not to violate California Health and Safety Code section 41700 emission limits, and visible emission standards of 20% opacity.
- MM 5.9** All diesel fuel used in the on and off-road construction equipment shall at a minimum use California diesel fuel. The applicant will use a lower sulfur diesel fuel if economically available.
- MM 5.10** The applicant shall obtain an Authority to Construct / Permit to Operate from the District for all stationary source equipment, including the concrete operation and the use of any engines and/or generators.
- MM 5.11** Water to suppress fugitive dust emissions shall be applied onsite and at access roads as necessary during grading and construction activities by onsite trucks or other means to prevent violation of District Rule 228-Fugitive Dust. Controls must be adequate to control dust onsite and to prevent offsite dust migration.
- MM 5.12** The project is located within an area known to potentially contain naturally occurring asbestos (NOA), the applicant shall comply with requirements, conditions, and restrictions of the California Air Resources Board's Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measure (ATCM) for Construction, Grading, Quarrying, And Surface Mining Operations. If any NOA has been found onsite, an implementation plan to comply with the ATCM shall be developed and approved by the District (as required by the ATCM) prior to starting any construction or grading activity.

Biological Resources

- MM 7.1** The applicant shall replace trees onsite at a ratio of 2:1, or shall pay into the Tree Preservation Fund \$100.00 for each diameter inch removed. The applicant shall comply with provisions of the Placer County Tree Preservation Ordinance for protection of all trees to remain onsite.
- MM 7.2** The wetland delineation shall be submitted to the Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) for verification. The applicant shall provide the County with the verification letter from the Corps prior to any development activity onsite, including preliminary clearing or grading.
- ~~**MM 7.3** The project applicant shall obtain the appropriate permits from the Corps and the Regional Water Quality Control Board for impacts to waters of the United States, and shall carry out onsite replacement or off site banking to mitigate wetlands lost as a result of project development consistent with the Corps' and County's "no net loss" of wetlands policies. At a minimum the permit must cover impacts to the 0.01 acre wetland swale. If the Corps determines that the 0.25 acres of seasonal wetlands do fall within the scope of Corps jurisdiction, the permit must also cover impacts to the seasonal wetlands. Mitigation may be completed either through onsite replacement or off site banking. If off site mitigation is chosen, the project applicant shall provide written evidence that compensatory habitat has been established through the purchase of mitigation credits at a County qualified wetlands mitigation bank. The amount of money required to purchase these credits shall be equal to the amount necessary to~~

~~replace wetland or habitat acreage and value, including compensation for temporal loss. Evidence of payment, which describes the amount and type of habitat purchased at the bank site, must be provided to the County prior to the approval of Improvement Plans or issuance of Grading Permits.~~

Hazards

MM 9.1 In order to reduce the risk of accidental release of hazardous substances, the applicant shall comply with the state and local regulations for operating a business that uses and stores hazardous materials. The applicant shall complete a set of forms provided by the Placer County Department of Environmental Health Services, which is the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) for the Cal-EPA. This packet includes a Business Owner/Operator Form, a Business Activities Form, a Hazardous Materials Inventory and Chemical Description, and a Hazardous Materials Release Response Plan. As part of this packet, the applicant must submit a site plan depicting where the hazardous materials are stored on the site.

In order to own and operate an AST onsite, the AST shall be registered with the CUPA, and a spill prevention control and countermeasure (SPCC) plan must be prepared and filed.

The applicant/facility operator shall submit to annual inspections by the CUPA inspectors, and shall correct any violations that are found at the direction of the CUPA.

Cultural Resources

MM 14.1 If any archaeological artifacts, exotic rock (non-native), or unusual amounts of shell or bone are uncovered during any onsite construction activities, all work must stop immediately in the area and a SOPA-certified (Society of Professional Archaeologists) archaeologist retained to evaluate the deposit. The Placer County Planning Department and Department of Museums must also be contacted for review of the archaeological find(s).

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

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

Mitigation Measures from the Draft EIR

Impact 4.4: Consistency With Placer County Plans And Policies

Mitigation Measure 4.4a: At such time as public water supply is extended to the area of the proposed project and becomes available for connection, the owner/operator of the

Mitigation Measure 6.2e: The proposed Livingston's Concrete Batch Plant shall retain no more than 13 full-time equivalent employees (inclusive of a caretaker if a caretaker's apartment is constructed).

Impact 6.3: Operational Impacts To Groundwater

Mitigation Measure 6.3a: The Conditional Use Permit for the Livingston's Concrete Batch Plant will limit the operations to 300 cubic yards of concrete production each day so that the maximum demand of water usage for concrete production does not exceed 7,500 gallons per day. Livingston's Concrete Services, Inc. may pump no more than 10,000 gallons per day. This includes approximately 2,000 gallons per day for property maintenance (site cleanup, truck cleaning), 180 gallons per day for staff consumption (assuming 12 employees onsite), and 300 gallons per day for the caretaker residence should it be constructed. The Livingston's Concrete Batch Plant shall connect to public water supply when it is available. To facilitate this future connection, the onsite water supply/delivery system shall be designed and constructed with stub-outs toward the future point of connection. The project applicant shall coordinate with PCWA on this design for future connection. Public water is considered available for connection if the water supply is within 1,000 feet of any boundary of the property, as measured in a straight line, and the connection can be legally and physically achieved.

Mitigation Measure 6.3b: Livingston's Concrete Service, Inc. shall abandon the existing onsite well when PCWA water is available, in accordance with State of California Well Standards Bulletin 74-90, as revised.

Mitigation Measure 6.3c: Livingston's Concrete Service, Inc. shall provide for treatment of the onsite well to remove bacteriological contaminants. Following treatment, Livingston's Concrete Services shall provide for completion of a bacteriological test. The well water must meet potable water standards prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the proposed project.

Impact 6.4: Operational Impacts To Hydrology

Mitigation Measure 6.4a: The project applicant shall prepare and submit with the project Improvement Plans, a drainage report 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, to the Engineering and Surveying Department for review and approval. The report shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and shall, at a minimum, include: A written text addressing existing conditions, the effects of the improvements, all appropriate calculations, a watershed map, increases in downstream flows, proposed onsite and offsite improvements and drainage easements to accommodate flows from this project. The report shall identify water quality protection features and methods to be used both during construction and for long-term post-construction water quality protection. Best Management Practice (BMP) measures shall be provided to reduce erosion, water quality degradation, and prevent the discharge of pollutants to stormwater to the maximum extent practicable. No retention/detention facility

hazards would result from the project.

7. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal result in impacts to:

- | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats (including, but no limited to plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Locally occurring natural communities (e.g., oak woodlands, mixed conifer, annual grasslands, etc.)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Significant ecological resources including: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1) Wetland areas including vernal pools; | | | | |
| 2) Stream environment zones; | | | | |
| 3) Critical deer winter ranges (winter and summer), migratory routes and fawning habitat; | | | | |
| 4) Large areas of non-fragmented natural habitat, including but not limited to Blue Oak Woodlands, Valley Foothill Riparian, vernal pool habitat; | | | | |
| 5) Identifiable wildlife movement zones, including but not limited to, non-fragmented stream environment zones, avian and mammalian routes, and known concentration areas of waterfowl within the Pacific Flyway; | | | | |
| 6) Important spawning areas for anadromous fish? | | | | |

Planning Department

Item 7a - Discussion: The proposed project will result in the development of five acres of currently undeveloped land. The Biological Assessment conducted for the site determined that potential habitat for 12 wildlife species and 34 plant species occurs on the site, and that the subject parcel could provide suitable habitat for special-status species including two plants (Butte County fritillary and Brandegees clarkia), and four birds (white-tailed kite, Cooper's hawk, loggerhead shrike, and lark sparrow). However, no special status species were identified onsite or in the immediate vicinity during field surveys conducted in preparation of the Biological Assessment. As none of the plant or animal species identified onsite are federal or state listed endangered, threatened, or rare, this project is expected to have a less-than-significant impact on endangered, threatened, and rare species.

Item 7b - Discussion: Grading for the proposed project will result in the removal of ten trees (161" diameter total) that are protected by the Placer County Tree Preservation Ordinance. The impact resulting from the removal of trees is expected to remain less than significant with implementation of mitigation measure 7.1.

Item 7b – Mitigation Measure:

MM 7.1 - The applicant shall replace trees onsite at a ratio of 2:1, or shall pay into the Tree Preservation Fund \$100.00 for each diameter inch removed (\$16,100.00). The applicant shall comply with provisions of the Placer County Tree Preservation Ordinance for protection of all trees to remain onsite.

Item 7c.1 - Discussion: North Fork Associates prepared a Wetland Delineation based on the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers protocols for the project site in 2005. A total of 0.26 acres of wetlands were delineated on the project site, including 0.25 acres of seasonal wetlands and 0.01 acres of a wetland swale. However, it was determined that the seasonal wetland occurring on the subject parcel are a result of artificial hydrologic conditions created by a leaking underground Placer County Water Agency pipeline which crosses the subject property. At the time the Initial Study was first circulated, As a result of recent repairs had recently been made to the pipeline, it is and it was expected that wetland conditions created by the leaking water will would no longer be supported onsite. This determination is supported by aerial photos indicating that no wetland conditions were present on the site prior to the artificial water source created by

the leaking pipe. In addition, the seasonal wetlands appear to have no apparent hydrologic connection to a navigable water of the U.S. or a tributary of a navigable water of the U.S., such as Auburn Ravine. As such the seasonal wetlands would be considered “isolated wetlands” as defined by the Corps and case law.

Based on the data gathered during field surveys, the Wetland Delineation determined that the seasonal wetlands occurring on the project site are artificially irrigated, isolated wetlands outside the scope of Corps jurisdiction under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, and impacts to these wetlands would not require permitting by the Corps. Although this interpretation is consistent with recent case law pertaining to isolated waters and with recent memoranda issued by the Corps and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency regarding the scope of Clean Water Act jurisdiction, it is preliminary and subject to verification by the Corps. As described below, the Corps has concurred that the seasonal wetlands are not within the Corps’ jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act.

The 0.01 acre wetland swale identified in the 2005 Wetland Delineation is located on the eastern side of the northern property boundary. It is a section of the shallow roadside ditch that runs along the southern side of Ophir Road. In 2008, North Fork Associates biologists conducted a site visit with Corps staff. Field observations made during this visit indicated that this ditch is not a swale or stream and is not a waters of the U.S. or wetland. The drainage ditch did not meet the three-parameter criteria to be classified as a wetland swale, and similarly did not meet the criteria to be classified as a stream. North Fork Associates revised the Wetland Delineation and resubmitted it to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. On July 21, 2008, the Corps issued a verification letter stating that there are no waters of the U.S., including wetlands, present within the project site.

Water draining from ~~this swale~~ the roadside ditch is routed through a culvert and drainage ditch network to a storm drain inlet on the western side of Geraldson Road. Water entering the storm drain inlet presumably discharges to Auburn Ravine, which is the first major stream located downgradient of the storm drain inlet. As discussed in Section 4 above, the potential impacts of the project to water quality are evaluated in the EIR. Because of the connection to Auburn Ravine, this swale is not considered an isolated wetland. Construction of the proposed project would impact this swale. As part of the widening of Ophir Road and paving of the entrance driveway to the project site, the swale would be placed in a culvert under the paving. Mitigation for this impact is required in Mitigation Measure 7.3.

The Wetland Delineation has been ~~submitted to verified by the Corps for verification of findings contained therein, in compliance with Mitigation Measure 7.2. Based on the determination that there are no waters of the U.S., including wetlands, on the project site, the project is expected to have no impact to wetlands. It is expected that with implementation of mitigation measures, impacts to wetlands will remain less than significant.~~

Item 7c – Mitigation Measures:

MM 7.2 - The wetland delineation shall be submitted to the Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) for verification. The applicant shall provide the County with the verification letter from the Corps prior to any development activity onsite, including preliminary clearing or grading.

~~**MM 7.3** – The project applicant shall obtain the appropriate permits from the Corps and the Regional Water Quality Control Board for impacts to waters of the United States, and shall carry out onsite replacement or off site banking to mitigate wetlands lost as a result of project development consistent with the Corps’ and County’s “no net loss” of wetlands policies. At a minimum the permit must cover impacts to the 0.01 acre wetland swale. If the Corps determines that the 0.25 acres of seasonal wetlands do fall within the scope of Corps jurisdiction, the permit must also cover impacts to the seasonal wetlands. Mitigation may be completed either through onsite replacement or off site banking. If off site mitigation is chosen, the project applicant shall provide written evidence that compensatory habitat has been established through the purchase of mitigation credits at a County qualified wetlands mitigation bank. The amount of money required to purchase these credits shall be equal to the amount necessary to replace wetland or habitat acreage and value, including compensation for temporal loss. Evidence of payment, which describes the amount and type of habitat purchased at the bank site, must be provided to the County prior to the approval of Improvement Plans or issuance of Grading Permits.~~

8. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal: