

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) contains public and agency comments received during the public review period of the Amazing Facts Ministry project Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR). This document has been prepared by Placer County, as lead agency, in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Guidelines (Section 15132). Chapter 1.0 discusses the background of the Draft EIR and the organization of the Final EIR, and lists the 19 comment letters received.

1.1 BACKGROUND

The Draft EIR contains the following environmental analysis sections:

- Land Use and Agriculture
- Population, Housing, and Employment
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Visual Resources
- Traffic and Circulation
- Air Quality
- Noise
- Geology, Soils, and Seismicity
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Public Services
- Hazardous Materials and Hazards
- Greenhouse Gas and Climate Change

The County used several methods to solicit public input on the Draft EIR. These methods included the distribution of a Notice of Preparation (NOP) on February 5, 2009, and the distribution of the Draft EIR for a 45-day comment period from September 2, 2011, through October 17, 2011. The Draft EIR was distributed to applicable public agencies, responsible agencies, and interested individuals. Copies of the document were made available at the Auburn Library and the public counter of the Community Development Resource Agency, located at 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, California 95603. In addition, the Draft EIR was made available for public review on the Placer County website. A public hearing on the Draft EIR was also held on October 13, 2011, at 10:00 a.m. in the Placer County Planning Commission Hearing Room, located at 3091 County Center Drive. The purpose of the hearing was to receive comments on the Draft EIR for the Project.

By preparing a Project EIR, the County intends to allow the entire Project, if approved by the County, to proceed without additional CEQA compliance, absent the kinds of changed circumstances or project modifications that trigger the preparation of a subsequent EIR, supplemental EIR, or addendum (see CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15162–15164).

1.2 ORGANIZATION OF FINAL EIR

The Final EIR is organized into the following chapters:

1.0 Introduction

Chapter 1.0 provides an introduction and overview of the document, describing the background and organization of the Final EIR. Chapter 1.0 also includes a list of commenters who submitted letters in response to the Draft EIR.

2.0 Revisions to the Draft EIR

Chapter 2.0 is intended to summarize changes made to the Draft EIR text, either in response to comment letters or minor staff edits that do not change the intent or content of the analysis or effectiveness of mitigation measures.

3.0 Responses to Comments

Chapter 3.0 presents all of the comment letters received and responses to each comment. Each comment letter received has been numbered at the top and then bracketed to indicate how the letter has been divided into individual comments. Each comment is given a number with the letter number appearing first, followed by the comment number. For example, the first comment in Letter 1 would have the following format: 1-1.

4.0 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan

The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP) in Chapter 4.0 includes a description of the CEQA requirements for monitoring or reporting programs for projects approved by a public agency. In addition, the MMRP includes all of the mitigation measures identified in the EIR for the proposed Project, along with the party responsible for monitoring implementation of the mitigation measures, the milestones for implementation and monitoring, and a sign-off that the mitigation measures have been implemented. The intent of the MMRP is to prescribe and enforce the proper and successful implementation of the mitigation measures as identified within the EIR for this project.

1.3 LIST OF COMMENTERS

The following individuals and representatives of organizations and agencies submitted written comments on the Draft EIR:

Letter	Individual or Signatory	Affiliation	Date
1	Katy Sanchez	Native American Heritage Commission	9/7/11
2	Gregory S. Baker	United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria	9/26/2011
3	Genevieve Sparks	California Regional Water Quality Control Board Central Valley Region	10/7/2011
4	Donald B. Mooney	Law Offices of Donald Mooney	10/12/2011
5	Tom R. Thompson	Placer County Air Pollution Control District	10/13/2011
6	Ralph Gibson	Placer County Museums Division	10/17/2011
7	Heather Trejo	Placer County Water Agency	10/17/2011
8	Sherri Abbas	City of Rocklin	10/17/2011
9	Andrew Darrow	Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	10/17/2011
10	Scott Morgan	Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit	10/18/2011
11	Scott Robertson	Resident	10/17/2011
12	Robert Sans	Resident	10/3/2011
13	Sandra Harris	Granite Bay Community Association	10/13/2011
14	Jane Negri	Resident	10/13/2011
15	Marilyn Jasper	Sierra Club	10/16/2011
16	Janet Thew	Resident	10/17/2011
17	Kim Zercie, et al. and Residents (Sierra View)	Residents	10/17/2011
18	A. Rogers	Placer County Sheriff's Department	9/14/2011
19	David Keyser	United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria	3/28/12
N/A	Multiple	October 13, 2011, Placer County Planning Commission Meeting	10/13/11

1.4 RECIRCULATION

CEQA requires recirculation of an EIR when significant new information is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the Draft EIR for public review, but before certification (Section 15088.5). New information is not "significant" unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (Section 15088.5).

Because this Final EIR did not result in the identification of any new significant environmental impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact, this Final EIR does not contain "significant new information," and recirculation of the Draft EIR is not required prior to approval.

1.5 CONSIDERATION OF PROJECT MODIFICATIONS SINCE RELEASE OF THE DRAFT EIR

Modification of the Proposed Antenna

Since release of the Draft EIR, the Project applicant has made a minor modification regarding the placement of the antenna. The Project originally proposed the placement of the antenna on a 75-foot pole behind the Resource Center Building (see Draft EIR page 3-12). In order to minimize potential visual impacts, and to maintain the desired broadcasting range, the antenna is proposed to be relocated to the roof of the Phase I Multi-Purpose building. The modified design uses a single antennae structure, maintaining the necessary surface area for broadcasting but allowing the height to stay below that of the building's architectural element. The power density is anticipated to be less than 0.125mW/cm^2, which is less than half of the federal Occupation Safety and Health Administration and Federal Communications Commission limits. **Figures 1-1** and **1-2** illustrate this change to the proposed building design.

Figures 1-1 and **1-2** were compared to the visual analysis and associated visual simulations provided in Chapter 8.0 (Visual Resources) of the Draft EIR (see Draft EIR pages 8-14 through -16). In reviewing the visual simulations provided in the Draft EIR (see Figures 8-3, -4a through d, 8-5a through c), the proposed architectural element (highest feature on the building) cannot be easily seen and is not a visually dominant feature of the Project. Given that the proposed antenna would have a similar visual character as the building's architectural element feature, the addition of the proposed antenna is not expected to become a visually dominant feature of the Project that would result in a new significant environmental impact or a substantial increase in the severity of environmental impacts identified in the Draft EIR and would not require recirculation of the document.

Modification of the Proposed Resource Center Building Elevations

The Project applicant has made modifications to the architectural design (façade treatment) of the proposed Resource Center Building in order to address neighbor concerns. No changes in the massing or size of this building are proposed. **Figure 1-3** illustrates this change to the proposed building design.

Figure 1-3 was compared to the visual analysis and associated visual simulations provided in Chapter 8.0 (Visual Resources) of the Draft EIR (see Draft EIR pages 8-14 through -16). In reviewing the visual simulations provided in the Draft EIR (see Figures 8-3, -4a through d, 8-5a through c), the proposed façade treatment changes to the building would have a similar visual impact as identified in the Draft EIR given that the siting, color, and massing of the Resource Center Building would not change. This change would improve the appearance of the building and would not result in a new significant environmental impact or a substantial increase in the severity of environmental impacts identified in the Draft EIR and would not require recirculation of the document.

Proposed Re-Striping of Sierra College Boulevard

In order to further address Project traffic impacts to Sierra College Boulevard, the Project applicant has proposed (as part of the Project) to re-stripe a portion of Sierra College Boulevard from Nightwatch Drive to El Don Avenue (see **Figure 1-4**). This re-striping would result in a complete four-lane Sierra College Boulevard from City of Roseville city limits to Interstate 80 (I-80). This re-striping would retain the existing bicycle lane on both sides of the roadway. The re-striping was reviewed by KD Anderson & Associates regarding potential changes in traffic impacts identified in the Draft EIR. This analysis is provided in **Appendix A**. As shown in this analysis, the proposed re-striping would provide for improved intersection operations with Project conditions for "Existing Plus Approved Projects Conditions" (see Draft EIR pages 9-40 through -56 for a description of "Existing Plus Approved Projects Conditions") and "Cumulative Conditions" (see Draft EIR pages 18-7 through -18 for "Cumulative Conditions") for Sierra College Boulevard intersections at Southside Ranch Road, Ridge Park Drive (westbound movement), and Nightwatch Drive as noted below:

- Existing Plus Approved Projects Conditions for Saturday Peak Hour
 - o Sierra College Boulevard/Nightwatch Drive (from LOS E to LOS C)
 - o Sierra College Boulevard/Ridge Park Drive (maintains LOS A for overall intersection operations but improves the westbound right- and left-turn movement delay by 4.3 seconds)
 - Sierra College Boulevard/Southside Ranch Road (from LOS D to LOS A)
 - o Sierra College Boulevard/El Don Drive (maintains LOS A conditions).
- Cumulative Plus Project Conditions for Saturday Peak Hour
 - o Sierra College Boulevard/Nightwatch Drive (from LOS F to LOS C/D)
 - O Sierra College Boulevard/Ridge Park Drive (maintains LOS A for overall intersection operations but improves the westbound right- and left-turn movement delay by 4.3 seconds)
 - o Sierra College Boulevard/Southside Ranch Road (from LOS F to LOS A)
 - o Sierra College Boulevard/El Don Drive (from LOS A to LOS A/B).

Specifically, this improvement would eliminate significant and unavoidable impacts identified in the Draft EIR for the following intersections: Sierra College Boulevard/Southside Ranch Road (Impact 9.4 and cumulative plus Project impact) and Sierra College Boulevard/Nightwatch Drive (Impact 9.5).

This page has been intentionally left blank.

Figure 1-1 Multi-Use Building Elevations with Antenna 1 of 2



Figure 1-2 Multi-Use Building Elevations with Antenna 2 of 2





Figure 1-3
Revised Resource Center Building Elevation

PMC*



Source: King Engineering Inc., 2012

Figure 1-4
Proposed Sierra College Boulevard Re-Striping Plan

PMC®

The proposed re-striping would not involve the acquisition of additional right-of-way and would not require any physical improvements that require grading or the disturbance of land. Temporary construction traffic controls would be required to conduct the re-striping, but are not expected to result in substantial traffic operation impacts. Thus, the inclusion of this project feature would not result in a new significant environmental impact or a substantial increase in the severity of environmental impacts identified in the Draft EIR and would not require recirculation of the document.

1.6 UPDATE OF THE GRANITE BAY COMMUNITY PLAN

Since release of the Draft EIR, the Placer County Board of Supervisors adopted an updated Granite Bay Community Plan on February 28, 2012. The update refined the policy provisions of the previously adopted version of the Granite Bay Community Plan. Based on review of the policies of the adopted Granite Bay Community Plan to the consistency analysis provided in Draft EIR Tables 4-7, 8-2, 9-6, 10-6, 11-7, 12-2, 13-2, 14.1-2, 14.2-2, 14.4-4, 14.5-2, 14.7-7, and 15-3, the proposed Project would be generally consistent with the updated Granite Bay Community Plan as identified in these tables. The following policies are applicable to the Project:

General Community Policies

- 1. Land in the Granite Bay community shall, in general, be restricted to residential uses; parks and open space areas for watershed protection, air quality protection, scenic enjoyment and recreation; agricultural pursuits and such public, private, and commercial uses as are necessary to serve the frequent needs of the community and to provide reasonable or accustomed services to local residents.
- 2. The magnitude and intensity of land use within the Granite Bay area should be limited by natural and other planning constraints including:
 - a) Natural terrain, natural open spaces, floodplains, and natural scenic areas; and
 - b) Granite Bay's location as a transition area between urban densities in neighboring communities to the south and west and the predominantly agricultural communities and open spaces to the north and east.
- 3. Care shall be taken in the development and use of lands in the Granite Bay area to protect the community and downstream communities against excessive storm water runoff, flooding, air and water pollution, erosion, fire, landslides and other natural hazards.

Land Use Policies

- 6. Provide transitional land uses or a landscaped buffer wherever necessary to minimize the conflicts inherent to adjoining properties of different zoning intensity, density, or adverse uses.
- 7. Property shall be developed with minimum disturbance to the natural terrain. The natural environment shall be enhanced, retained or restored as much as possible.

- 9. Buildings shall be of a size and scale conducive to the character of the immediate neighborhood.
- 10. Non-residential uses shall generally be of an appropriate size and scale for their setting and shall be designed to incorporate such elements such as plazas, terraces, porches, arcades or canopies to contribute to a pleasant environment as well as provide safety and shelter to pedestrians.
- 11. To preserve the character of the community, land use changes shall be considered only if:
 - a) The change can be designed and implemented to be consistent with the contiguous properties. In determining consistency, all elements of the Community Plan shall be reviewed.
 - b) The change is consistent with or adequately buffered from contiguous properties and will provide for a reasonable transition between land uses.
 - c) The change shall not significantly impact the level of services provided in its vicinity and there is or will be adequate infrastructure to serve the proposed development.
 - d) The development is effectively screened so as to not be perceived by the public as high-density.

Specific Policies for Intensity of Use

- 1. The planning area shall have the intensity of development which is appropriate to its location on the fringe of the urban areas of the cities of Roseville and Rocklin and the County of Sacramento, and should provide a transition between the urban densities in the adjoining communities and non-intensive land uses to the north and west.
- 4. Intensity of use of individual parcels and buildings shall be governed by considerations of health and safety; impact on adjoining properties due to noise, traffic, night lighting, or other disturbing conditions; and protection of natural land characteristics.

Specific Policies for Public and Private Institutions

- 1. Institutional uses shall be limited to those which provide non-commercial services or facilities for local residents and contribute to the general well-being of the community.
- 2. The intensity of use of an institutional site shall be limited to that which is compatible with adjoining uses and in keeping with the particular characteristics of the specific location and the overall rural character of Granite Bay; the institution should not generate excessive noise or traffic.
- 3. Buildings shall be of moderate size and scale and are encouraged to utilize timeless, traditional architectural styles such as Craftsman in their building design and comply with the *Granite Bay Douglas Corridor Design Elements and Landscape Goals* if applicable. Natural materials (i.e., wood, river cobble and fieldstone) and native plants shall be used where practicable.
- 4. Sites shall be landscaped attractively; trees and other plantings should be used to screen adjacent residential areas from noise, light pollution, unsightliness, odor, and other

nuisances; natural materials (i.e., wood, river cobble and fieldstone) and native plants shall be used where practicable. In particular, parking areas shall be screened from view from roads and adjacent residential properties.

Community Design Policies

- 4. Preserve the heavily vegetated areas that exist along circulation corridors to protect the Plan areas rural nature.
- 7. Require development/projects to comply with the Placer County Landscape Guidelines, Placer County Design Guidelines, Rural Design Guidelines and the specific design standards herein, where applicable.
- 8. Where possible, preserve native trees and support the use of native, drought tolerant plant materials in all revegetation/landscaping projects. Landscapes should be designed to help lower on-going maintenance efforts and costs.
- 11. To the maximum extent possible, all structures, including residences, should complement and blend in with the natural setting of the project area, and to this end the following principles shall be adhered to:
 - a. The visual impact of the structure shall be mitigated either through reduction of building bulk, increased setbacks, or screened by incorporating additional landscaping. In general, hillside structures shall be designed to step down the natural hillside in order to achieve a lower building profile.
 - b. Structures may be located in existing tree covered areas to the extent possible and still be consistent with slope, geologic and related conditions, and the need to preserve natural terrain and locally unique or especially wooded areas.
- 12. Encourage use of natural materials (i.e. wood siding and field stone). Exterior colors shall blend with the surrounding natural landscape. The use of "earth tones" or natural finishes which blend with the natural background is encouraged.
- 13. Landscaping shall be used to reduce visual impact of all structures and sound walls. Natural vegetation should dominate where possible. The use of native plant materials is encouraged. Landscaping plans and raw materials provide an informal character and smooth transition between buildings, parking lots, adjacent roadways, and open areas.

Community Design Site Principles

- Provide satisfactory access for automobiles, pedestrians, cyclists and persons with disabilities.
- Encourage the use of architectural elements such as canopies, towers, patios, arcades and cornices which enliven the building exteriors and street frontage and promote visual diversity.

- Every effort shall be made to design projects so that noise-generating uses are buffered from adjoining residential uses.
- All mechanical equipment shall be screened from public view.
- All trash enclosures and storage areas shall be as unobtrusive as possible.
- Trash and loading areas shall be located a sufficient distance from residential lots to avoid creating a nuisance.
- Planting and fencing shall be used to create a buffer between residences and service areas.
- Walkways shall accommodate the passage of persons with a wide range of abilities.
- On-site pedestrian walkways shall have direct and easy connections to the streets and sidewalks of adjacent neighborhoods wherever possible.

Community Design Principles

- All non-residential projects are encouraged to be designed to promote the "Craftsmanstyle village" concept. The use of natural materials (i.e. wood siding, river cobble and field stone) is encouraged. The goal is not strict rural-village or Craftsman design, but the construction or renovation of buildings should incorporate the use of time-honored and timeless elements.
- Establish a high quality of design with a variety of appropriate architectural details. Brick as an accent and concrete shingle roofing is encouraged.
- Appropriate massing and architectural design treatment (wall/roof articulation, doors, fenestration, masonry detailing, character lighting) shall be provided to avoid uninteresting expanses of roof and wall facades.

Community Design Lighting Principles

- Lighting shall be designed to minimize projection into adjacent properties and onto adjacent roads and not provide a source of glare.
- The height of light standards in parking areas shall not exceed eighteen (18) feet.

Natural Resource Policies

- 1. The natural resources and features of a site proposed for development shall be one of the planning factors determining the scope and magnitude of development.
- 2. Particular attention shall be given to protection of the natural regiment in the planning, environmental review, and completion of all subdivisions, land development or land alteration projects.

- 3. Removal of vegetation shall be minimized and where removal is necessary, replanting for erosion control, maximizing reoxygenation, and retaining the aesthetic qualities of the community.
- 4. Project landscaping shall emphasize the use of native rather than exotic plants. In areas of high fire risk, however, it may be preferable to introduce carefully chosen exotics with high fire resistance characteristics.
- 5. Continue to identify and preserve any rare, significant or endangered environmental features and conditions.
- 8. All stream influence areas, including floodplains and riparian vegetation areas shall be retained in their natural condition, while allowing for limited stream crossings for public roads, trails, and utilities.
- 9. Site-specific surveys shall be required prior to development to delineate wetlands and vernal pools in the Granite Bay Community Plan area. All development proposals involving wetlands shall be coordinated with the California Department of Fish and Game, Corps of Engineers, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. A "no-net-loss" policy requiring preservation of all wetland sites or preservation of priority wetlands and compensation for wetland losses should continue to be implemented by these agencies.
- 10. The standards of the Placer County Grading Ordinance and this Resources section of the Granite Bay Community Plan shall be implemented for all projects in the Granite Bay area.
- 11. New construction shall not be permitted within 100 feet of the centerline of permanent streams and 50' of intermittent streams, or within the 100 year floodplain, whichever is greater.
- 12. In implementing Best Management Practices, the County shall promote consideration of the concepts of low impact development, and sustainable technology, and current standards of the County to address the quantity and quality of storm water run-off released to any watercourse.
- 13. Protect sensitive habitats such as wetlands, riparian areas, and oak woodlands against any significant disruption or degradation of habitat values. Utilize the following design and use regulations on parcels containing or in close proximity to these resources, excluding existing agricultural operations:
 - Structures shall be placed as far from the habitat as feasible;
 - Delineate development envelopes to specify location of development in minor land divisions and subdivisions;
 - Require easements, deed restrictions, or equivalent measures to protect that portion of a sensitive habitat on a project which is to be undisturbed by a proposed development activity or to protect sensitive habitats on adjacent parcels;

- Limit removal of native vegetation to the minimum amount necessary for structures, landscaping/gardens, driveways, parking lots, and where applicable, septic systems; and,
- Prohibit landscaping with invasive or exotic species and encourage the use of characteristic native species.
- 14. Individual sites and properties can contribute to the health of the environment by incorporating measures such as:
 - Using renewable energy sources such as solar or geothermal energy;
 - Planting additional trees in appropriate locations;
 - Managing storm water runoff using storm water best management practices;
 - Naturalizing landscapes with native, non-invasive species; and,
 - Installing "green roofs" or light-colored roofs.
- 15. The County's Tree Preservation Ordinance shall be implemented.

Air Quality Policies

- 1. Ensure that project air quality impacts are quantified using analysis methods and significance thresholds as recommended by the PCAPCD.
- 2. Ensure that projects which may have potential air quality impacts mitigate any of its anticipated emissions which exceed allowable emissions as established by the PCAPCD.
- 3. Ensure all air quality mitigation measures are feasible, implementable, and effective for individual projects and on a community-wide basis.
- 4. Encourage innovative mitigation measures and approaches to reduce air quality impacts by coordinating with the PCAPCD, project applicants, and other interested parties.
- 5. Work with the PCAPCD to reduce particulate emissions from project construction, grading, excavation, demolition and other sources.

Open Space Policies

- 8. The scale of building, the siting of structures, and the design and materials of construction shall be harmonious with the natural setting.
- 11. Native trees and woodlands shall be protected and enhanced by:
 - a. Ensuring development and site alteration minimize impact to native trees;

- b. Increasing tree canopy coverage and diversity by planting trees appropriate to the location;
- c. Regulating the injury and destruction of trees on public and private property;
- d. Providing public education and stewardship; and,
- e. Enforcing the County's Tree Preservation Ordinance.

Noise Policies

- 2. Ensure compliance with noise standards adopted in the General Plan Noise Element.
- 3. Avoid the interface of noise-producing and noise-sensitive land uses.
- 4. Noise emanating from construction activity that requires a grading or building permit is prohibited on Sundays and federal holidays, and shall only occur:
 - Monday through Friday, 6 AM to 8 PM (during daylight savings)
 - Monday through Friday, 7 AM to 8 PM (during standard time)
 - Saturdays, 8 AM to 6 PM
- 5. Where proposed non-residential land uses are likely to produce noise levels exceeding County performance standards of Table 8.1.2 at existing or planned noise-sensitive uses, an acoustical analysis shall be required as part of the environmental review process so that noise mitigation may be included in the project design. The requirements for the content of an acoustical analysis are contained in the General Plan.
- 7. Where noise mitigation measures are required to achieve the standards of Tables 8.1.2 and 8.1.3, the emphasis of such measures shall be placed upon site planning and project design. The use of noise barriers shall be considered as a means of achieving the noise standards only after all other practical design-related noise mitigation measures have been integrated into the project.
- 8. The County shall employ procedures to ensure that noise mitigation measures required pursuant to an acoustical analysis are implemented in the project review process and, as may be determined necessary, through the building permit process.
- 9. Noise created by new proposed non-transportation noise sources shall be mitigated as not to exceed the noise level standards of Table 8.1.3 as measured immediately within the property line of lands designated for noise-sensitive uses such as residential.

Seismic Safety Policies

1. Maintain strict enforcement of seismic safety standards for new construction contained in the Uniform Building Code.

- 2. Review future developments using all available seismic data and considering recommendations from the Health and Safety Chapter of the Countywide General Plan Policy Document.
- 3. Require soils or geologic reports for construction or extensive grading in identified geologic hazard areas.

Flooding Policies

- 1. Work closely with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District in defining existing and potential flood problem areas.
- 2. Evaluate potential flood hazards in an area prior to the approval of any future development.
- 3. Land development projects should be designed to minimize potential loss of property and threat to human life caused by flooding.
- 4. Retain natural flow conditions within the 100-year floodplain of all streams except where work is required to maintain the stream's natural drainage characteristics as determined by Placer County Flood Control District.
- 5. New construction shall not be permitted within 100 feet of the centerline of permanent streams and 50' of intermittent streams, or within the 100 year floodplain, whichever is greater.