

### **3.0 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

---

## 3.0 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

### PROJECT UNDER REVIEW

The proposed project is an approximately 1,157.5-acre mixed-use development that would include a University campus and an adjoining Community, which is defined in the Regional University Specific Plan. The University portion of the Plan Area would consist of 600 acres, and would accommodate approximately 6,000 students with 800 professors and staff. The University would include institutional facilities, 1,155 residential units for students and faculty, a retirement village, athletic facilities, and open space. A portion of the campus is planned for a potential private high school that would accommodate 1,200 students. The adjoining Community would include 3,232 residential units of varying densities, commercial uses, schools, open space, parks, schools, and recreation areas.

The proposed project is located in western Placer County, immediately west of the incorporated limits of the City of Roseville. The eastern boundary of the project site is located adjacent to and immediately west of a future Watt Avenue extension, proposed as part of the project; the western boundary of the project site is defined by Brewer Road. The northern and southern boundaries are both irregular, with the northwest corner of the project site approximately 2.7 miles north of Base Line Road. Lands to the south, west, and north of the project site are agricultural, used primarily for rice farming and grazing, or are fallow. Land to the east of the project site is within the West Roseville Specific Plan, in the City of Roseville, and is currently being developed. Development is also planned for land southeast of the project site.

### SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

#### Effects Found to be Less Than Significant

As shown in Table 3-1, a number of project impacts identified in the EIR were found to be less than significant, requiring no mitigation. These impacts can be found in Section 6.3 (Air Quality), Section 6.4 (Biological Resources), Section 6.6 (Geology, Soils, and Seismicity), Section 6.7 (Hazards), Section 6.8 (Hydrology and Water Quality), Section 6.9 (Noise), Section 6.10 (Public Services), Section 6.11 (Public Utilities) and Section 6.12 (Transportation and Circulation). In the course of drafting the EIR for this project, it was determined that numerous other identified impacts could be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of the proposed mitigation measures described herein.

Issues focused out of this EIR that were identified as being less than significant in the Initial Study include:

- Potential impacts on scenic vistas;
- Potential impacts on historic structures;
- Potential impacts due to the use of septic systems;
- Potential impacts due to exposure of people or structures to a significant risk from seiche, tsunami, or mudflow;
- Loss of availability of mineral resources;

- Impacts associated with the displacement of substantial numbers of people; and
- Potential to interfere with air traffic.

For a complete discussion of technical issues focused out of this EIR, please see the Initial Study in Appendix A.

### **Environmental Impacts and Mitigation**

Under CEQA, a significant effect on the environment is defined as a substantial or potentially substantial adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project, including air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance (CEQA Guidelines Section 15382). Implementation of the proposed project would result in significant impacts to some of these resources, which are analyzed in Sections 6.1 through 6.12 of this document and summarized in Table 3-1 (provided at the end of this Chapter).

This EIR discusses mitigation measures that could be implemented by the County and/or the project applicant to reduce potential adverse impacts to a level that is considered less than significant. Such mitigation measures are noted in this document and are found in the following sections: Section 6.1 (Aesthetics), Section 6.4 (Biological Resources), Section 6.5 (Cultural Resources), Section 6.7 (Hazards), Section 6.8 (Hydrology and Water Quality), Section 6.11 (Public Utilities), and Section 6.12 (Transportation and Circulation). However, even with the application of feasible mitigation measures, some impacts could not be reduced to less-than-significant levels. The following are the significant and unavoidable impacts that were identified for both project-level and cumulative impacts:

### **Project-Specific Significant and Unavoidable Impacts**

- 6.1-1 Development of the proposed project could be incompatible with the agricultural character of the natural landscape in the project site and its surrounding areas.
- 6.1-2 Development of the proposed project could introduce new sources of light and glare to the specific plan and surrounding areas, which could contribute to the discomfort glare or disability glare experienced by adjacent residences and other uses.
- 6.2-1 The proposed project could convert Important Farmland (Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Local Importance) as defined in the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program to non-agricultural use.
- 6.2-2 The proposed project could create potential conflicts with County goals, policies, and standards that may lead to physical impacts on the environment.
- 6.2-3 The proposed project could conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or with a Williamson Act contract.
- 6.3-1 The proposed project could generate PM<sub>10</sub> through land-clearing and other earth-moving activities during construction.
- 6.3-2 The proposed project could generate emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, and CO during construction.

- 6.3-3 The proposed project could generate PM<sub>2.5</sub> through the use of heavy-duty equipment during construction.
- 6.3-4 The proposed project's long-term operational emissions could exceed PCAPCD thresholds of significance for PM<sub>10</sub>, ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, and CO.
- 6.4-1 Development of the proposed project, including off-site infrastructure, could result in the conversion of the project site to another use, which could affect the availability of habitat and biological function.
- 6.4-2 The proposed project could result in the filling or adverse modification of jurisdictional wetlands, non-jurisdictional wetlands, and other "waters of the U.S."
- 6.4-3 Development of the proposed project could result in the loss of special-status vernal pool crustacean and amphibian species and degradation and/or loss of their habitat.
- 6.4-8 The proposed project could result in the loss of foraging habitat for Swainson's hawk, white tailed kite, burrowing owl, and other raptors.
- 6.4-12 Development of the proposed project could result in habitat fragmentation and wildlife population isolation.
- 6.5-1 The proposed project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource or an historical resource as defined in section 21083.2 of CEQA and section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines.
- 6.9-5 Noise from the University athletic facilities, including a stadium, that could be developed as part of the proposed project could affect sensitive receptors.
- 6.12-1 The proposed project could contribute to traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of the regional roadway network under existing plus project conditions.
- 6.12-2 The proposed project could increase daily traffic volumes using City of Roseville roadway segments, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under existing plus project conditions.
- 6.12-3 The proposed project could increase daily traffic volumes using Sacramento County roadway segments, exacerbating unacceptable LOS conditions under existing plus project conditions.
- 6.12-4 The proposed project could increase daily traffic volumes using Caltrans roadway segments, exacerbating unacceptable LOS conditions under existing plus project conditions.
- 6.12-6 The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using City of Roseville intersections, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under existing plus project conditions.
- 6.12-7 The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Sutter County intersections, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under existing plus project conditions.

- 6.12-8 The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Sacramento County intersections, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under existing plus project conditions.
- 6.12-9 The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Caltrans intersections resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under existing plus project conditions.
- 6.12-10 The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Caltrans ramp junctions resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under existing plus project conditions.
- 6.12-11 The proposed project could generate substantial vehicle traffic flows before and after special events at the stadium that may exceed the typical weekday peak hour operational capacity of the local and regional roadways.
- 6.12-12 The proposed project could generate vehicle parking demand that may exceed available supply during special events at the stadium.

### **Cumulative Significant and Unavoidable Impacts**

- 6.1-3 The proposed project, in combination with other cumulative development in west Placer County, could be incompatible with the agricultural character of the natural landscape in the project site and its surrounding areas.
- 6.1-4 The proposed project, in combination with other cumulative development in west Placer County, could contribute to sky glow and diminished views of the night sky experienced by residents of west Placer County.
- 6.2-4 The proposed project, in conjunction with other development in Placer County, could convert Important Farmland (Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Local Importance) as defined in the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, to non-agricultural uses.
- 6.2-5 The proposed project, in conjunction with other development in Placer County, could create potential conflicts with County goals, policies, and standards that may lead to physical impacts on the environment.
- 6.2-6 The proposed project, in conjunction with other development in west Placer County, could conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or with a Williamson Act contract.
- 6.3-9 Construction of the proposed project, in combination with other construction and agricultural activities in the vicinity of the Plan Area, could add to cumulative levels of PM<sub>10</sub> during construction.
- 6.3-10 Construction of the proposed project, in combination with other sources of criteria pollutants in the region, could temporarily add to criteria pollutant levels in the air basin.
- 6.3-11 The proposed project could contribute to cumulative levels of PM<sub>2.5</sub>.
- 6.3-12 The proposed project's long-term operational emissions could add to the cumulative levels of criteria pollutant levels in the air basin.

- 6.4-14 Construction of the proposed project, in combination with other development in the county, could contribute to the loss of native plant communities, wildlife habitat values, special-status species and their potential habitat, and wetland resources in the region.
- 6.5-4 The proposed project, in combination with other development in the Sacramento region, could adversely affect unique archaeological resources or historical resources as defined in section 21083.2 of CEQA and section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines.
- 6.8-10 The proposed project, in combination with the buildout of Placer County and the City of Roseville General Plans, could result in degradation of water quality from stormwater runoff.
- 6.8-11 The proposed project, in combination with the buildout of Placer County and the City of Roseville General Plans, could result in the construction of residences and other structures within the pre-construction 100-year FEMA floodplain.
- 6.11-7 The proposed project, in combination with other development, could require the construction of new or expansion of the existing landfill and MRF, which could result in significant adverse environmental effects.
- 6.12-13 The proposed project could increase daily traffic volumes using City of Roseville roadway segments, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions.
- 6.12-14 The proposed project could increase daily traffic volumes using Sacramento County roadway segments, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions.
- 6.12-15 The proposed project could increase daily traffic volumes using Caltrans roadway segments, exacerbating unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions.
- 6.12-16 The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Placer County intersections, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions.
- 6.12-17 The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using City of Roseville intersections, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions.
- 6.12-18 The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Sutter County intersections, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions.
- 6.12-19 The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Sacramento County intersections, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions.

- 6.12-20 The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Caltrans intersections, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions.
- 6.12-21 The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Caltrans ramp junctions, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions.
- 6.12-22 The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Roseville CIP intersections, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under 2020 conditions plus the RUSP with an extension of Watt Avenue to the project site.
- 6.12-23 The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Roseville CIP intersections, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under 2020 conditions plus the RUSP with an extension of Watt Avenue to Blue Oaks Boulevard.
- 6.12-24 The proposed project could increase demand for public transit service beyond that currently planned and may result in unmet transit needs.
- 6.12-26 Mitigation measures implemented to reduce transportation impacts could adversely affect traffic in other jurisdictions.
- 6.12-27 Mitigation measures implemented to reduce transportation impacts could adversely affect the natural environment.
- 6.13-1 Development of the RUSP could potentially result in a cumulatively considerable incremental contribution to the significant cumulative impact of global climate change.

## ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The EIR analyzes the following alternatives to the proposed project:

**No Project/No Development Alternative:** This alternative assumes that the proposed project would not occur and there would be no development of the site. This alternative assumes any existing agricultural operations that have historically occurred on the site would remain.

**Reduced Units/Same Development Footprint:** This alternative assumes the same 1,157.5-acre development footprint as the proposed project, with a 4,500 student campus and a 25 percent reduction in the number of residential units. The commercial component would remain the same as described for the proposed project and the residential component within the mixed-use portion would remain at 75 units. With the above assumptions, the number of units within the community portion of the site would be reduced to approximately 2,367 and the campus would be reduced to 867. Therefore, the total number of units under this alternative would be 3,309.

**Reduced Units/Reduced Development Footprint:** This alternative provides for a reduced footprint of development by applying a 400-foot agricultural buffer along the northern, southern, and western boundaries of the project site. The development footprint for this alternative would be 665.7 acres compared to 912.2 acres for the proposed project (both of which exclude open space and agricultural buffers). A conceptual land use plan for this alternative was developed to provide the same intensity (same overall dwelling units per acre) of development as the proposed project;

however, because the area to be development would be reduced, the overall unit count would also be reduced. This alternative would include 3,364 residential units. As with the Reduced Units/Same Development Footprint Alternative, the commercial component would be the same as that described for the proposed project. It is assumed that the University would continue to be a 6,000 student campus, but the density of development would have to be increased to be accommodated within the reduced development area.

**Same Units/Reduced Development Footprint:** This alternative assumes the incorporation of the 400 foot agricultural buffer as that described under the Reduced Units/Reduced Development Footprint Alternative, which would result in the same development area of 821 acres. However, this alternative would include the same amount of development as the proposed project. Because the development area would be reduced under this alternative, the density of development would have to be increased. The overall density of residential development in the community portion of the project area would increase from an average of 10 dwelling units per acre to 16.5 dwelling units per acre. The commercial component would remain the same as the proposed project, and the University is assumed to accommodate 6,000 students.

**SACOG Units/Same Development Footprint:** This alternative is intended to be consistent with SACOG's Blueprint assumptions, which includes higher density, compact mixed-use development. The development area (footprint) under this alternative would remain the same as for the proposed project. Overall residential development in the Community under this alternative is assumed to be 18.4 du/ac (approximately 1.8 times that of the proposed project). In order to accommodate the increased population associated with the increased development intensity, this alternative would also include additional area set aside for parks use and an additional school site. Based on the density and the above assumptions, this alternative would include approximately 5,414 residential units in the community portion of the project area. The assumptions for the amount of commercial, the number of units within the mixed-use area, and the campus development would be the same as that for the proposed project.

The relative effects of the alternatives are identified in Chapter 7, Alternatives. Table 7-1 from Chapter 7, which provides a comparison of the alternatives, is also included in this chapter, following Table 3-1.

### **Potential Areas of Concern**

The areas of potential concern identified through the environmental evaluation process include the use of groundwater for potable supply, suburban sprawl, effects on the regional transportation system, and impacts on wildlife, open space, and agriculture. Comments on the NOP/IS are included as Appendix B.

### **SUMMARY TABLE**

Table 3-1 (Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures), has been organized to correspond with the environmental issues discussed in Chapter 6. The summary table is arranged in four columns:

1. Environmental impacts ("Impact")
2. Level of significance without mitigation ("Significance")
3. Mitigation measures ("Mitigation Measure")

4. The level of significance after implementation of mitigation measures (“Residual Significance”)

If an impact is determined to be significant or potentially significant, mitigation measures are identified, where appropriate and feasible. More than one mitigation measure may be required to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. This EIR assumes that all applicable plans, policies, and regulations would be implemented, including, but not necessarily limited to, County General Plan Policies, laws, and requirements or recommendations of the County of Placer. Applicable plans, policies, and regulations are identified and described in the Regulatory Setting of each issue area and within the relevant impact analysis. A description of the organization of the environmental analysis, as well as key foundational assumptions regarding the approach to the analysis, is provided in Chapter 6.0 (Introduction to the Environmental Analysis).

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>6.1-1</b> Development of the proposed project could be incompatible with the agricultural character of the natural landscape in the project site and its surrounding areas.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p><b>6.1 Aesthetics</b> 6.1-1 Implement Mitigation Measure 6.2-1, which requires that one acre of agricultural land be preserved within Placer County for each acre of agricultural land impacted by the Community and University development within the Specific Plan area.</p>	<p>SU</p>
<p><b>6.1-2</b> Development of the proposed project could introduce new sources of light and glare to the specific plan and surrounding areas, which could contribute to the discomfort glare or disability glare experienced by adjacent residences and other uses.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>6.1-2 a) In conjunction with tentative small lot map or design review process for commercial or park submittals within the Community, the applicant shall include a lighting plan for review and approval by the Planning Department. The lighting plan shall incorporate the following light control standards and provisions for minimizing, shielding and screening of night lighting, angles of light sources, and control of light spill and glare:                      1. All outdoor fixtures shall use shielded fixtures with a maximum cutoff angle of 90 degrees.                      2. Residential development shall use shielded fixtures with a maximum cutoff angle of 90 degrees for security lighting.                      3. Energy efficient lamp technologies shall be incorporated wherever possible such as metal halide, induction lamps, high-pressure sodium, and linear and compact florescent sources. Mercury vapor shall be avoided. Incandescent lights shall be avoided unless they are integrated with a control mechanism that limits their operation time.                       b) The project applicant for the University Campus shall submit for review and approval by the Planning Department a lighting plan as part of the Campus Master Plan that includes athletic facilities and stadium, if proposed. The lighting plan shall incorporate the following light control standards and provisions for minimizing, shielding and screening of night lighting, angles of light sources, and control of light spill and glare:                      1. All outdoor fixtures shall use shielded fixtures with a maximum cutoff angle of 90 degrees.</p>	<p>SU</p>

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Energy efficient lamp technologies shall be incorporated wherever possible such as metal halide, induction lamps, high-pressure sodium, and linear and compact florescent sources. Mercury vapor shall be avoided. Incandescent lights shall be avoided unless they are integrated with a control mechanism that limits their operation time.</li> <li>3. Stadium and athletic field lighting systems shall protect surrounding uses from spillover light and glare by incorporating the following guidelines and specifications into all proposed lighting plans and construction documents:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Stadium and athletic field lighting shall be sized, oriented, and hooded to minimize spill light beyond the campus property line and glare visible at nearby residences or residential-zoned land.</li> <li>B. The proposed stadium and athletic fields within the Plan Area shall include field lighting fixtures and lamps that are metal halide, or a combination of metal halide and high-pressure sodium, which provide more natural color rendition. Low watt fluorescent or incandescent bulbs shall also be installed in any associated service building and for security lighting</li> <li>C. On-field lighting shall be matched to the specific type of field requirements (e.g., lighting levels needed for type of sport, division, and telecast requirements).</li> <li>D. Exterior project lighting shall be directed downward and sufficiently shielded to avoid substantial light trespass on adjacent uses.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		E. The applicant shall provide a lighting plan that shall be subject to review and approval by the County. The plan shall include a photometric diagram, prepared by a certified lighting professional, showing predicted maintained lighting levels produced by the proposed lighting fixture facilities. The lighting plan shall demonstrate how the plan has been formulated to minimize new light and glare to area residents and motorists. F. The lighting plan shall include provisions to limit glare from direct and indirect sources (e.g. reflective surfaces illuminated by direct sources) at residences.	
6.1-3 The proposed project, in combination with other cumulative development in west Placer County, could be incompatible with the agricultural character of the natural landscape in the project site and its surrounding areas.	S	6.1-3 Implement Mitigation Measure 6.1-1.	SU
6.1-4 The proposed project, in combination with other cumulative development in west Placer County, could contribute to sky glow and diminished views of the night sky experienced by residents of west Placer County.	S	6.1-4 Implement Mitigation Measures 6.1-2.	SU

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>6.2 Agricultural Resources</b>			
<p><b>6.2-1 The proposed project could convert Important Farmland (Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Local Importance) as defined in the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program to non-agricultural uses.</b></p>	S	<p>6.2-1 In order to mitigate for the loss of farmland resources converted to non-agricultural uses on the project site and on areas designated for off-site improvements, one acre of agricultural land within Placer County shall be preserved for each acre of agricultural land impacted by the Community and University development within the project area. A total of 1,024 acres has been identified to be compensated at this one-to-one ratio. That portion of the University site consisting of 183.5 acres proposed as open space and not currently in agricultural production and 53 acres of land temporarily impacted do not require mitigation. If the 20-acre offsite detention/retention basin can be used for agricultural purposes while maintaining its functional use as a detention/retention basin as determined by the County, no mitigation shall be required for this area. Mitigation lands shall be protected by agricultural conservation easements containing restrictive encumbrances in a form deemed acceptable to and approved by the County.</p> <p>Lands proposed for mitigation shall satisfy at least one of the following criteria, as determined by the Planning Director in consultation with the County Agricultural Commissioner: (1) be in agricultural production, or have the potential to support agriculture, (2) be undeveloped and have a Natural Resources Conservation Service soils classification of the same or greater value than lands being affected within the Regional University Specific Plan property at issue, or (3) be undeveloped and have the same or higher value California Department of Conservation Important Farmland Mapping categorization than lands being affected with the Specific Plan property. "In-kind" mitigation (i.e., rice land for rice land) is not required for the agricultural land impacted by the development within the Project Area when so approved by County.</p>	SU

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Mitigation land shall be acquired in increments of no less than 80 total contiguous acres in size. This 80-acre minimum size standard can be met by the acquisition of one or more parcels that cumulatively add up to 80 acres or more. The mitigation land shall be within or adjacent to lands designated as Agriculture or Open Space within the Placer County General Plan, unless the Planning Director, in consultation with the County Agricultural Commissioner, determines the proposed land meets the purpose and intent of this mitigation measure.</p> <p>Mitigation lands shall be acquired in the appropriate minimum size prior to approval by the County of any permit or entitlement that could result in ground disturbance (e.g., prior to issuance of grading permit or improvement plans), including the construction of off-site or on-site project infrastructure.</p>	
<p>6.2-2 The proposed project could create potential conflicts with County goals, policies, and standards that may lead to physical impacts on the environment.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>None available.</p>	<p>SU</p>
<p>6.2-3 The proposed project could conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or with a Williamson Act contract.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>None available.</p>	<p>SU</p>
<p>6.2-4 The proposed project, in conjunction with other development in Placer County, could convert Important Farmland (Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Local Importance) as defined in the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, to non-agricultural uses.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>6.2-4 Implement Mitigation Measure 6.2-1.</p>	<p>SU</p>

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**TABLE 3-1**

**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
6.2-5 The proposed project, in conjunction with other development in Placer County, could create potential conflicts with County goals, policies, and standards that may lead to physical impacts on the environment.	S	None available.	SU
6.2-6 The proposed project, in conjunction with other development in west Placer County, could conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or with a Williamson Act contract.	S	None available.	SU
<b>6.3 Air Quality</b>			
6.3-1 The proposed project could generate PM <sub>10</sub> through land-clearing and other earth-moving activities during construction.	S	6.3-1 a) Water exposed surfaces, as required, to control fugitive dust; b) Apply soil stabilizers to inactive areas; c) Suspend grading operations when wind is sufficient to generate visible dust emissions crossing the boundary line of a project site, despite the application of dust mitigation measures; d) Pave, use gravel cover, apply water three times daily, or spray a dust control agent on all unpaved haul roads; e) In compliance with Rule 228, Fugitive Dust, all visible roadway dust tracked-out upon public paved roadways as a result of active operations shall be removed at the conclusion of each work day when active operations cease, or every twenty-four (24) hours for continuous operations. Wet sweeping or a HEPA filter equipped vacuum device shall be used for roadway dust removal; f) Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand and other loose materials or ensure that all trucks hauling such materials maintain at least two feet of freeboard space; g) Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff onto public roadways;	SU

LS = Less than Significant  
PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1073 423 1745 505">h) Unpaved areas subject to vehicle traffic must be stabilized by being kept wet, treated with a chemical dust suppressant, or covered;</li> <li data-bbox="1073 505 1745 764">i) Prior to groundbreaking, the applicant shall submit a Construction Emission/Dust Control Plan to PCAPCD for its review and approval. This plan must address the minimum Administrative Requirements found in section 400 of District Rule 228, Fugitive Dust. The applicant shall keep a hard or electronic copy of Rule 228, Fugitive Dust, on-site for reference. In addition, the applicant shall have a pre-construction meeting for grading activities on 20 or more acres to discuss the Construction Emission/Dust Control Plan. The applicant shall invite PCAPCD to this meeting;</li> <li data-bbox="1073 764 1745 1073">j) The applicant shall suspend all grading operations when fugitive dust exceeds District Rule 228, Fugitive Dust limitations. An applicant representative who is CARB-certified to perform Visible Emissions Evaluations (VEE), shall routinely evaluate compliance with Rule 228, Fugitive Dust. This requirement for a VEE applies to all projects grading 20 or more acres in size, regardless of how many acres are to be disturbed daily. Fugitive dust shall not exceed 40 percent opacity and shall not go beyond the Specific Plan boundary line at any time. If lime or other drying agents are utilized to dry out wet grading areas, they shall be controlled so as not to exceed District Rule 228, Fugitive Dust limitations; and</li> <li data-bbox="1073 1073 1745 1229">k) The speed of any vehicle or equipment traveling on unpaved areas must be no more than 15 miles per hour unless the road surface and surrounding area is sufficiently stabilized to prevent vehicles and equipment traveling more than 15 miles per hour from emitting dust exceeding Ringlemann 2 or visible emissions from crossing the project boundary line.</li> </ul>	

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>6.3-2 The proposed project could generate emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, and CO during construction.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>6.3-2 Contractors shall be required to reduce NO<sub>x</sub>, ROG, and CO emissions by complying with the construction vehicle air pollutant control strategies developed by the PCAPCD. Contractors shall include in the construction contracts the following requirements or measures shown to be equally effective:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Construction equipment operators shall shut off equipment when not in use to avoid unnecessary idling. Generally, vehicle idling should be kept below 5 minutes.</li> <li>b) Contractor's construction equipment shall be properly maintained and in good working condition.</li> <li>c) Construction equipment exhaust shall not exceed PCAPCD Rule 202 Visible Emissions limitations. Operators of vehicles and equipment found to exceed opacity limits are to be immediately notified and the equipment must be repaired within 72 hours. An applicant representative, CARB-certified to perform Visible Emissions Evaluations (VEE), shall routinely evaluate project related off-road and heavy-duty on-road equipment emissions for compliance with this requirement for projects grading more than 20 acres in size regardless of how many acres are to be disturbed daily.</li> <li>d) The prime contractor shall submit to the District a comprehensive inventory (i.e., make, model, year, emission rating) of all heavy-duty off-road equipment (50 horsepower or greater) that will be used an aggregate of 40 or more hours for the construction project. The project representative shall provide the District with the anticipated construction timeline including start date and name and phone number of the project manager and on-site foreman. The project shall provide a plan for approval by the District demonstrating that the heavy-duty (50 horsepower or greater) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased, and subcontractor vehicles, will achieve a project wide fleet average of 20 percent NO<sub>x</sub> reduction and 45 percent</li> </ul>	<p>SU</p>

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>particulate reduction compared to the most recent CARB fleet average. The District should be contacted for average fleet emission data. Acceptable options for reducing emissions may include use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as they become available. Contractors can access the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District's web site to determine if their off-road fleet meets the requirements listed in this measure.</p> <p>e) Construction contractors shall be required to use low-VOC architectural coatings and asphalt in compliance with District Rules and Regulations. Contractors shall also be required to fuel stationary construction equipment with low-sulfur fuels, and use existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or clean fuel generators in place of temporary diesel power generators whenever feasible.</p>	
<p><b>6.3-3</b> The proposed project could generate PM<sub>2.5</sub> through the use of heavy-duty equipment during construction.</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>6.3-3 Implement Mitigation Measure 6.3-2.</p>	<p>SU</p>
<p><b>6.3-4</b> The proposed project's long-term operational emissions could exceed PCAPCD thresholds of significance for PM<sub>10</sub>, ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, and CO.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>6.3-4 a) The following guidelines shall be used by the County during review of future project specific submittals for development within the Specific Plan area in order to reduce generation of air pollutants with the intent that specified measures be required where feasible and appropriate. PCAPCD may replace or supplement air pollution measures for individual projects as new technology and feasible measures become available over the course of Plan Area buildout.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include in all new parking lots tree plantings designed to result in 50 percent shading of parking lot surface areas within 15 years. Incorporated by reference are the City of Sacramento Parking Lot Tree Shading Design and Maintenance Guidelines dated June 17, 2003.</li> </ul>	<p>SU</p>

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prohibit wood-burning fireplaces, woodstoves, or similar wood-burning devices for the entire Specific Plan area. Only natural gas/propane-fired fireplace appliances are allowed.</li> <li>• All new residences shall have low NOx hot water heaters in compliance with PCAPCD Rule 246.</li> <li>• HVAC units for residential units shall have the PremAir (or other manufacturer) ozone catalyst installed if available and economically feasible at the time building permits are issued. Installation of an ozone catalyst on the HVAC units is considered feasible if the additional cost is less than 10 percent of the base HVAC unit cost.</li> <li>• Install two 110/208 volt power outlets for every two loading docks.</li> <li>• Implement the following, or equivalent measures, as determined by the County in consultation with the APCD:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Establish building guidelines that require the use of high-albedo (low-absorptive) coatings/Energy Star roofing products on all roofs and other building surfaces, if available and economically feasible at the time building permits are issued.</li> <li>▪ Establish paving guidelines that, if feasible, require businesses to pave all privately-owned parking areas with a substance with reflective attributes (albedo = 0.30 or better) similar to cement concrete. The use of a paving substance with reflective attributes similar to concrete is considered feasible if the additional cost is less than 20% of the cost of applying a standard asphalt product.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>b) In order to incorporate passive solar building design and landscaping conducive to passive solar energy use, the Regional University Specific Plan Design Guidelines shall include the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encourage the orientation of buildings to be in a south to southwest direction where feasible.</li> <li>• Encourage the planting of deciduous trees on western and southern sides of structures.</li> <li>• In all residences, include high-efficiency heating and other appliances, such as water heaters, cooking equipment, refrigerators, furnaces, and boiler units.</li> <li>• In all residential units, include energy-efficient window glazings, wall insulation, and efficient ventilation.</li> <li>• Landscaping plans shall prohibit the use of liquidambar and eucalyptus trees that produce smog-forming compounds (high emission factors for isoprenes).</li> </ul> <p>c) In order to promote bicycle usage, a pedestrian/bikeway (P/B) Master Plan shall be developed for the entire Plan Area. This master plan shall be consistent with the guidelines established in the Placer County Regional Bikeway Plan and the Regional University Specific Plan Design Guidelines. The P/B Master Plan shall include the following measure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-residential development shall provide an additional 20 percent of bicycle lockers and/or racks over what is currently required in the applicable local code.</li> </ul>	

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>d) The project applicant shall implement an offsite mitigation program, coordinated through the PCAPCD, to offset the project's long-term ozone precursor emissions. The project offsite mitigation program must be approved by PCAPCD. The project's offsite mitigation program provides monetary incentives to sources of air pollutant emissions within the project's air basin that are not required by law to reduce their emissions. The emission reductions are real, quantifiable, and implement provisions of the 1994 State Implementation Plan. The offsite mitigation program reduces emissions within the air basin that would not otherwise be eliminated.</p> <p>In lieu of the applicant implementing their own offsite mitigation program, the applicant can choose to participate in the PCAPCD Offsite Mitigation Program by paying an equivalent amount of money into the District program. The PCAPCD, on behalf of Placer County, will determine air quality mitigation fees using calculation methodology established in practice and routinely applied to other, similar, contemporaneous land use development projects. The Offsite Mitigation Program, coordinated by PCAPCD, is designed to offset the project's long-term ozone precursor emissions. The actual amount of emission reductions needed through the Offsite Mitigation Program, and, thus, the project's air quality mitigation fees, would be calculated when the project's average daily emissions have been determined. Fees are to be paid at the time of final map recording for each phase of the project.</p>	
<p>6.3-5 CO concentrations could exceed the CAAQS at any intersections as a result of the proposed project.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>6.3-6 The proposed project could expose receptors to unhealthy levels of TAC.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>NA</p>

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
6.3-7 The proposed project could expose sensitive receptors to objectionable odors.	LS	None required	NA
6.3-8 Future residents, employees, and students in the Plan Area could be exposed to pesticide spray drift from adjacent agricultural operations.	LS	None required	NA
6.3-9 Construction of the proposed project, in combination with other construction and agricultural activities in the vicinity of the Plan Area, could add to cumulative levels of PM <sub>10</sub> during construction.	S	6.3-9 Implement Mitigation Measure 6.3-1.	SU
6.3-10 Construction of the proposed project, in combination with other sources of criteria pollutants in the region, could temporarily add to criteria pollutant levels in the air basin.	S	6.3-10 Implement Mitigation Measure 6.3-2.	SU
6.3-11 The proposed project could contribute to cumulative levels of PM <sub>2.5</sub> .	S	6.3-11 Implement Mitigation Measure 6.3-4.	SU
6.3-12 The proposed project's long-term operational emissions could add to the cumulative levels of criteria pollutant levels in the air basin.	S	6.3-12 Implement Mitigation Measure 6.3-4.	SU
6.3-13 CO emissions from operation of the proposed project could contribute to significant cumulative CO levels.	LS	None required.	NA
<b>6.4 Biological Resources</b>			
6.4-1 Development of the proposed project, including off-site infrastructure, could result in the conversion of the project site to another use, which could affect the availability of habitat and biological function.	S	6.4-1 a) <u>Habitat Mitigation:</u> Applicants for development entitlements within the Regional University Specific Plan area shall comply with the mitigation standards set forth in this Mitigation Measure 6.4-1 and shall also obtain applicable permits from the State and Federal resource agencies as may be required by law. Preservation of mitigation land shall occur, in order of preference, by acquisition in fee, through permanent conservation easements, or by purchase of mitigation credits, as deemed acceptable to and approved by Placer County.	SU

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation															
		<p>b) <u>No Net Loss of Wetlands</u>: Applicants for development entitlements or approvals associated with the Regional University Specific Plan are required to comply with Placer County's policy of "no-net-loss of wetlands" in connection with proposed development activity that will impact this resource. To satisfy this County "no-net-loss of wetlands" standard, the applicant shall satisfy a preservation component and an enhancement, restoration, and creation component. Table 6.4-3 that follows sets forth the County's mitigation ratios to be achieved to provide for preservation and for restoration, creation, and enhancement to offset wetlands impacts.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="982 740 1749 930"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">TABLE 6.4-3</th> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="3">COUNTY MITIGATION RATIOS FOR IMPACTS ON WETLANDS</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>Preservation</th> <th>Creation/Restoration<sup>1</sup></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Vernal Pool Wetlands</td> <td>2:1</td> <td>1:1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Non-Vernal Pool Wetlands</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>1:1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Notes: 1. Final mitigation ratio will be derived through implementation of Mitigation Measure 6.4-2</p> <p>Since all potential jurisdictional waters of the U.S. will not be avoided in the proposed Specific Plan, the wetland delineation shall be finalized and mapped, and then submitted to the Corps for verification through the Section 404 permit process. Completion of the delineation will be used to identify the precise final acreage of various wetland types impacted within properties surveyed.</p>	TABLE 6.4-3			COUNTY MITIGATION RATIOS FOR IMPACTS ON WETLANDS				Preservation	Creation/Restoration <sup>1</sup>	Vernal Pool Wetlands	2:1	1:1	Non-Vernal Pool Wetlands	N/A	1:1	
TABLE 6.4-3																		
COUNTY MITIGATION RATIOS FOR IMPACTS ON WETLANDS																		
	Preservation	Creation/Restoration <sup>1</sup>																
Vernal Pool Wetlands	2:1	1:1																
Non-Vernal Pool Wetlands	N/A	1:1																

LS = Less than Significant  
PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>The project applicant shall preserve and replace, re-create, or restore wetland habitat lost, as determined by the County, to comply with the above no-net-loss standards. Assuming that the project will result in the direct loss of approximately 18 acres of non-vernal pool complex habitat-type wetlands, the preservation and replacement, re-creation or restoration of similar wetlands is required. The total required acreage shall be determined by the County prior to issuance of any permit or entitlement that could result in ground disturbance, such as a grading permit or improvement plans, based upon the verified wetland delineation.</p> <p>Additionally, the applicant shall comply with Placer County General Plan Policy 6.A.1, which requires sensitive habitat buffers as follows: a minimum of 100 feet from the centerline of perennial streams, a minimum of 50 feet from the centerline of intermittent streams, and a minimum of 50 feet from the edge of sensitive habitats to be protected including riparian zones, wetlands, old growth woodlands, and the habitat of rare, threatened or endangered species. If development is proposed within these buffers, prior to approval of the project by the County the project applicant shall be required to ensure that no wetlands, sensitive habitats or threatened or endangered species are present in these areas, or would be affected by project activities.</p>	

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>c) <u>(Non-Vernal Pool) Wetland Impacts:</u> Impacts on “waters of the United States” (not including vernal pools) and other non-jurisdictional wetlands identified in the Placer County General Plan shall be mitigated to provide “no-net-loss” through avoidance, minimization and/or compensatory mitigation techniques. Both the wetland and upland components of all wetland mitigation lands may be creditable towards agricultural land mitigation requirements of Mitigation Measure 6.2-1 and uplands shall count as wetland buffers when appropriate. To minimize indirect effects to the preserve site, the County may impose measures such as controlling and redirecting runoff from adjoining properties or the construction or removal of fences.</p> <p>d) <u>Vernal Pool Impacts:</u> Impacts on vernal pool (fairly shrimp and tadpole shrimp) habitat shall be mitigated through preservation and restoration of acreage based on each acre directly impacted. Required ratios are set forth in Table 6.4-3. Both the wetland and the upland components of all wetland mitigation lands may be creditable towards agricultural land mitigation requirements of Mitigation Measure 6.2-1 and uplands shall count as wetland buffers when appropriate. To minimize indirect effects to a preserve site, the County may impose measures such as controlling and redirecting runoff from adjoining properties or the construction or removal of fences.</p> <p>Additional acreage may be required to address impacts on non-vernal pool type wetlands that function as habitat for state or federally-listed species, and indirect impacts on similar avoided habitat. The total required acreage shall be the greater of 1) the amount determined by the County to compensate for the loss of habitat function and value including temporal loss, or 2) the amount determined by the federal agencies working</p>	
		with project applicants. As an alternative, once the Placer	

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>County Conservation Plan (PCCP) is adopted, project applicants may participate in the PCCP which is intended to provide for adequate mitigation of vernal pool habitat.</p> <p>Buffers of such off-site mitigation lands shall be consistent with requirements of the PCCP as ultimately adopted by the County to the extent that the PCCP is adopted prior to the acquisition of preserve sites and to the extent feasible.</p> <p>e) <u>Swainson's Hawk Foraging Impacts:</u> Swainson's hawk foraging habitat shall be mitigated according to California Department of Fish and Game Guidelines: one acre for each acre lost within one mile of a nest, 0.75 acre for each acre lost within one to five miles of a nest, and 0.5 acre lost within five to ten miles of a nest, unless otherwise addressed through the PCCP. Mitigation for impacts on Swainson's hawk habitat may occur within the land required for agricultural mitigation provided that the lands acquired provide suitable foraging habitat for Swainson's hawks. (For example, according to DFG, rice is not a compatible foraging type.) Additionally, the Applicant shall be required to obtain a CESA take permit for any active Swainson's hawk nest that may be removed as part of any proposed construction under the Specific Plan. Additional mitigation measures for the loss of active nest trees shall include planting of suitable nest trees (e.g., valley oak, California black walnut, California sycamore, or Fremont's cottonwood) at a 15:1 ratio (tree per tree) on suitable foraging habitat areas within west Placer County.</p>	

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>f) <u>Out-of-County Habitat Mitigation:</u> Use of out-of-County lands for habitat mitigation shall only be allowed when such lands are of equal or of higher resource value than those in the Specific Plan area. Use of any such lands may be allowed by the County after an evaluation of the resource value of the lands proposed for such use.</p> <p>g) <u>“Out-of-Kind” Habitat Mitigation:</u> “Out-of-kind” habitat mitigation shall only be allowed as mitigation for loss of a particular habitat type after approval by the County. “Out-of-kind” mitigation may be appropriate where the mitigation lands include areas with a mosaic of riparian habitat, creek corridors, floodplains and upland areas, where an assemblage of vernal pool complexes in fallow or grazed lands is in close proximity to such riparian habitat, or where the County deems that the “out-of-kind” mitigation lands contain other unique or desirable characteristics that provide a comparable level of habitat mitigation.</p> <p>h) <u>Funding for Mitigation Land Acquisition (Fee Title or Conservation Easement) and Monitoring and Maintenance:</u> Funding for land acquisition, adaptive management and monitoring and maintenance may be financed, if acceptable to the County, through a Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD) or other funding mechanism similar to the funding mechanism used to fund Specific Plan infrastructure construction. The specific funding plan, including a method for preserve acquisitions and for in-perpetuity preserve management must be approved by Placer County prior to the first preserve acquisition and prior to any ground disturbance associated with the project.</p>	

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>i) <u>Excess Habitat</u>: Excess habitat within mitigation lands acquired for the mitigation of impacts associated with an approved development project within the Specific Plan area may be used to mitigate for subsequent approved development projects within the Specific Plan area. Transfer of excess habitat shall be accomplished through a private cost sharing agreement. The project applicant shall provide Placer County with copies of such agreements for review and for tracking purpose (e.g., debits and credits).</p> <p>j) <u>Mitigation and Management Plans</u>: Implementation of the “no-net-loss of wetlands” standard of this Mitigation Measure 6.4-1 shall occur through the implementation of Mitigation and Management Plans for mitigation sites. Such Plans shall accompany each proposed development project, or group of projects, within the Specific Plan area. The applicant shall demonstrate to the County compliance with an approved Mitigation and Management Plan prior to recordation of a final small lot map. For non-residential uses that do not require a tentative subdivision map, as well as development of any off-site infrastructure project associated with the Regional University Specific Plan, a condition of approval shall be placed that requires the approval of a Mitigation and Management Plan prior to issuance of improvement plans, grading permits, or a building permit, whichever comes first.</p>	

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Each Mitigation and Management Plan shall identify the specific mitigation lands that will be necessary to fully mitigate impacts on habitat and special-status species. The plan shall demonstrate capacity to control said property by fee title, permanent conservation easement, or mitigation credits to the satisfaction of the County and State and federal agencies to the extent required by applicable state or federal permits. Recordation or purchase of said property shall take place after approval of the plan by the County. The Plan shall also identify the necessary funding mechanism for the long-term maintenance and management of the mitigation lands along with provisions for adaptive management. Purchase of required habitat credits shall be identified in the Mitigation and Management Plan when such credits are proposed for all or part of a mitigation requirement.</p> <p>k) Dedication of Mitigation Lands for Regional University Specific Plan Projects: The mitigation lands necessary to mitigate for the impacts of developing a project within the Regional University Specific Plan area, as well as developing any off-site infrastructure project associated with the Regional University Specific Plan, shall be dedicated to the County (or other County approved entity) prior to recordation of a final small lot map, or as a condition of issuance of a project-level discretionary approval for non-residential land uses that do not require a tentative subdivision map.</p> <p>l) Placer County Conservation Plan: At the time of the release of this Draft EIR, Placer County was preparing a Natural Community Conservation Plan, a Habitat Conservation Plan Programmatic Section 404/401 Compliance and a Master Streambed Alteration Agreement to comply with the State and Federal Endangered Species Acts and the Federal Clean</p>	

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Water Act. Collectively, this planning effort is known as the Placer County Conservation Plan (PCCP). If the approved PCCP is in place before the Regional University Specific Plan (RUSP) EIR is certified and the RUSP is approved, biological resource mitigation measures shall be implemented in such a manner as to be consistent with the PCCP. If the RUSP EIR is certified and the RUSP is approved before the PCCP is approved, biological mitigation for the Regional University project as set forth in this Measure 6.4-1 shall not be subject to the requirements of the PCCP, except at the applicant's discretion. In lieu of the above described measures, the Specific Plan or subsequent phases of the Specific Plan may, at the applicant's discretion, fulfill mitigation requirements by compliance with the terms of the adopted PCCP. Such compliance, as determined by Placer County, shall constitute sufficient mitigation that will obviate the need to comply with this Mitigation Measure.</p> <p>m) Joint Mitigation: Provided that the mitigation land satisfies the criteria set forth in both Mitigation Measure 6.2-1 and this Mitigation Measure, land acquired to meet the habitat mitigation requirements of this Mitigation Measure, and/or any additional habitat mitigation that is required by any governmental agency for any development project undertaken pursuant to the Regional University Specific Plan, may occur within and also be counted towards the required agricultural land mitigation obligation set forth in Mitigation Measure 6.2-1.</p>	
<p>6.4-2 The proposed project could result in the filling or adverse modification of jurisdictional wetlands, non-jurisdictional wetlands, and other "waters of the U.S."</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>6.4-2 a) Implement Mitigation Measures 6.4-1 b) as they pertain to wetland resources.</p>	<p>SU</p>

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>The mitigation acreage required by these measures may be partially or entirely included within Mitigation Measure 6.4-1, to the extent that the mitigation area includes wetlands similar in type and equal or greater in habitat value to those pools lost to development. Once it is adopted, the PCCP will provide an alternate means of mitigating the impacts on wetlands by contributing to the preservation and restoration of wetlands in western Placer County.</p> <p>Additional steps shall be taken for properties that require more detailed resource identification prior to development. These steps shall include: wetland delineations, habitat mapping, and where appropriate, protocol level presence/absence surveys for special-status species within the Specific Plan area.</p>	
<p><b>6.4-3 Development of the proposed project could result in the loss of special-status vernal pool crustacean and amphibian species and degradation and/or loss of their habitat.</b></p>	<p>S</p>	<p>6.4-3 The project applicant shall preserve, replace, re-create, or restore vernal pool crustacean habitat lost, at a ratio determined by the County in consultation with USACE, to comply with established no-net-loss standards. Potential compensation ratios for loss of vernal pool crustacean habitat could be 3:1 for direct impacts (i.e., direct loss of a pool, or a portion of a pool) and 2:1 for indirect impacts (i.e., ground disturbance within 250 feet of a pool). This may be accomplished through implementation of Mitigation Measure 6.4-1 as it pertains to vernal pools. Additional steps may be required through the State and federal permitting process for properties requiring more detailed resource identification prior to development. Steps the project applicant shall implement, if required, include mapping of habitat types, delineation of wetlands (followed by submission of delineation report to the Corps for verification), special-status species habitat assessments, and possibly protocol-level special-status species surveys.</p>	<p>SU</p>

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>6.4-4 The proposed project could result in the loss and/or degradation of rare plant populations.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>6.4-4 a) Known populations of Boggs Lake hedge-hyssop and dwarf downingia shall be preserved in designated on-site open space preserves. Such preserve areas shall be developed in coordination with the CDFG and the USFWS, and preserved and managed in perpetuity. Additionally, potential habitat occurs in the remainder of the project site for these species as well as Ahart's dwarf rush, big-scale balsamroot, legenera, Henderson's bent grass, pincushion navarretia, Red Bluff dwarf rush, Sacramento Orcutt grass and Sanford's arrowhead. Therefore, focused botanical surveys shall be performed for these species within suitable habitat areas. The project applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct focused surveys within the project site during the appropriate flowering period for these species. If any of these species are found, locations of these occurrences shall be mapped. A detailed mitigation/conservation plan that includes long-term strategies for the conservation of the species shall be developed in coordination with CNPS and/or USFWS. The conservation plan shall provide for preservation and restoration at ratios that would ensure "no-net-loss" of the affected plant habitat. If none of these species are located during surveys, no mitigation would be necessary.</p> <p>The mitigation acreage required by this measure could be partially or entirely included within Mitigation Measure 6.4-1.</p>	<p>LS</p>

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>b) The project applicant shall replace, re-create, or restore special-status plant habitat lost, at a ratio determined by the County. This may be accomplished through implementation of Mitigation Measure 6.4-1 as it pertains to vernal pool habitat. If any other special-status vernal pool plant species are located during the surveys, implementation of Mitigation Measure 6.4-1 for avoidance of vernal pool crustacean habitat will concurrently protect vernal pool plant species occurring in those pools.</p> <p>c) If any other special-status upland plant species are located during the surveys, locations of these occurrences shall be mapped. A detailed mitigation/conservation plan that includes long-term strategies for the conservation of the species shall be developed confirming the presence of these species. The plan shall provide for preservation and restoration at ratios that would ensure “no-net-loss” of the affected plant habitat.</p> <p>The mitigation acreage required by this measure could be partially or entirely included within Mitigation Measure 6.4-1, to the extent that the mitigation area includes upland habitat such as annual grasslands that provide equal or greater habitat value for the affected special-status species plants.</p>	
<p>6.4-5 Construction of the proposed project could result in loss of valley elderberry longhorn beetles and their habitat.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>6.4-6 The proposed project could result in the loss and/or degradation of western pond turtles and their habitat.</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>6.4-6 Prior to project construction, the project applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct pre-construction surveys of suitable marsh habitat within the project site within 30 days prior to project construction to ensure no western pond turtles have established territories. If ground-disturbing activities are delayed or suspended for more than 30 days after the pre-construction survey, the site shall be resurveyed. If western pond turtle are</p>	<p>LS</p>

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		identified during the pre-construction survey, it shall be moved out of the construction zone to a comparably suitable marsh habitat not proposed for construction activities. If this species is not observed during the pre-construction survey, no further mitigation would be required.	
<p>6.4-7 The proposed project could result in the direct loss or disturbance of nesting birds, including burrowing owls and raptors (birds-of-prey).</p>	PS	<p>6.4-7 a) When construction is proposed during the raptor breeding season (February to early September), a focused survey for raptor nests shall be conducted within 30 days prior to the beginning of construction activities by a qualified biologist in order to identify active nests on-site. If active nests are found, no construction activities shall take place within 500 feet of the nest until the young have fledged. Trees containing nests shall be removed during the non-breeding season (late September to March). If no active nests are found during the focused survey, no further mitigation will be required. This measure will ensure that active nests are not moved or substantially disturbed during the breeding season, so that raptor eggs and young are not destroyed or abandoned as a result of construction.</p> <p>b) When construction is proposed during the burrowing owl breeding season (February 1 - August 31), a focused survey for burrows shall be conducted within 30 days prior to the beginning of construction activities by a qualified biologist in order to identify any active burrows. Because burrowing owls can be present year-round, a pre-construction survey shall be conducted regardless of the time of year. If active nests are found, no construction activities shall take place within 160 feet of the burrow during the non-breeding season of September 1 through January 31, or 250 feet of the nest during the breeding season, until the young have fledged. If no active nests are found during the focused survey, no further mitigation will be required.</p>	LS

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Where possible, active burrowing owl burrows shall be avoided by incorporating them into open space areas and protected in perpetuity. If these burrows, along with 6 acres of adjacent foraging habitat per pair, are avoided, no further mitigation would be required.</p> <p>If burrows are removed as a result of implementation and there is suitable habitat on-site, CDFG shall be consulted on current passive relocation methodology before relocation of owls is attempted. Relocation of owls should only be implemented during the non-breeding season. On-site habitat shall be preserved in a conservation easement and managed to promote burrowing owl use of the site.</p> <p>If there is not suitable habitat on-site, off-site passive relocation shall be required. Off-site habitat must provide suitable burrowing owl habitat. Land shall be purchased and/or placed in a conservation easement in perpetuity and managed to maintain suitable habitat. Off-site mitigation shall use one of the following ratios:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Replacement of occupied habitat with occupied habitat: 1.5 times 6.6 (for a total of 9.9 acres) acres per pair or single bird.</li> <li>2. Replacement of occupied habitat with habitat contiguous to currently occupied habitat: 2 times 6.5 (for a total of 13 acres) acres per pair or single bird.</li> <li>3. Replacement of occupied habitat with suitable unoccupied habitat: 3 times 6.5 (for a total of 19.5 acres) acres per pair or single bird.</li> </ol> <p>The replacement of burrowing owl habitat required by this measure could be partially or entirely included within Mitigation Measure 6.4-1, to the extent that the mitigation area includes areas appropriate for burrowing owl.</p>	

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
6.4-8 The proposed project could result in the loss of foraging habitat for Swainson's hawk, white tailed kite, burrowing owl, and other raptors.	S	6.4-8 The project applicant shall replace, re-create, or restore Swainson's hawk nesting and foraging habitat lost, at a ratio of up to 1:1 for each acre lost, as determined appropriate by the County. This may be accomplished through implementation of Mitigation Measure 6.4-1 as it pertains to Swainson's hawk foraging habitat and nesting trees.	SU
6.4-9 The proposed project could result in loss of nesting habitat for non-raptor special-status bird species.	S	6.4-9 Prior to construction, a focused survey for non-raptor special-status bird species and nesting colonies shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within 30 days prior to the beginning of construction activities in order to identify active nests within the construction area. If active nests are found, no construction activities shall take place within five hundred feet of the nest and/or nesting colony until the young have fledged. The biologist shall consult with CDFG, particularly with respect to vegetation removal as a result of project construction. If no active nests and/or nesting colonies are found during the focused survey, no further mitigation will be required.	LS
6.4-10 The proposed project could result in the modification of on-site drainages, disrupting the associated habitat.	PS	6.4-10 Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a Streambed Alteration Agreement shall be obtained from CDFG, pursuant to Section 1600 et seq. of the California Fish and Game Code, for each stream crossing and any other activities affecting the bed, bank, or associated riparian vegetation of the stream. If required, the project applicant shall coordinate with CDFG in developing appropriate mitigation, and shall abide by the conditions of any executed agreements. Streambed Alteration Agreement measures to protect the channel bank of a stream from erosion and related effects of construction shall be included in all related construction contracts. Impacts to riparian vegetation or removed trees adjacent to creeks would be addressed through the issued Streambed Alteration Agreement.	LS
6.4-11 Development of the proposed project could result in the loss of bat roosting habitat.	PS	6.4-11 Prior to removal of existing structures on these properties, the project applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct a pre-construction survey for roosting bats in the buildings to be removed. If no roosting bats are found, then no further mitigation would be required. If a bat roost is found, CDFG or the USFWS shall be contacted on measures to avoid impacts to roosting bats.	LS

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
6.4-12 Development of the proposed project could result in habitat fragmentation and wildlife population isolation.	S	6.4-12 Implement Mitigation Measure 6.4-1.	SU
6.4-13 Construction of the proposed project, in combination with other development in the county, could contribute to the loss of native plant communities, wildlife habitat values, special-status species and their potential habitat, and wetland resources in the region.	S	6.4-13 Implement Mitigation Measures 6.4-1 through 6.4-11.	SU
<b>6.5 Cultural Resources</b>			
6.5-1 The proposed project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource or an historical resource as defined in Section 21083.2 of CEQA and Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines.	PS	<p>6.5-1 In the event that any prehistoric or historic subsurface archaeological features or deposits, including locally darkened soil ("midden"), that could conceal cultural deposits, animal bone, obsidian and/or mortar are discovered during construction-related earth-moving activities, all ground-disturbing activity within 100 feet of the resources shall be halted and the County shall be notified. The County shall consult with a qualified archeologist to assess the significance of the find. If the find is determined to be significant by the qualified archaeologist (i.e., because the find is determined to constitute either an historical resource or a unique archaeological resource), then representatives of the County and the qualified archaeologist shall meet to determine the appropriate course of action, with the County making the final decision. All significant cultural materials recovered shall be subject to scientific analysis, professional museum curation, and a report shall be prepared by the qualified archaeologist according to current professional standards.</p> <p>If the archaeologist determines that some or all of the affected property qualifies as a Native American Cultural Place, including a Native American sanctified cemetery, place of worship, religious or ceremonial site, or sacred shrine (Public Resources Code §5097.9) or a Native American historic, cultural, or sacred site, that is listed</p>	PSU

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>or may be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources pursuant to Public Resources Code §5024.1, including any historic or prehistoric ruins, any burial ground, any archaeological or historic site (Public Resources Code §5097.993), the archaeologist shall recommend to the County potentially feasible mitigation measures that would preserve the integrity of the site or minimize impacts to it, including any or a combination of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Avoidance, preservation, and/or enhancement of all or a portion of the Native American Cultural Place as open space or habitat, with a conservation easement dedicated to the most interested and appropriate tribal organization (e.g., the United Auburn Indian Tribe), if such an organization is willing to accept and maintain such an easement, or alternatively, a cultural resource organization that holds conservation easements;</li> <li>b) An agreement with any such tribal or cultural resource organization to maintain the confidentiality of the location of the site so as to minimize the danger of vandalism to the site or other damage to its integrity; or</li> <li>c) Other measures, short of full or partial avoidance or preservation, intended to minimize impacts to the Native American Cultural Place consistent with land use assumptions and the proposed design and footprint of the development project for which the requested grading permit has been approved.</li> </ul>	

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		After receiving such recommendations, the County Planning Director shall assess the feasibility of the recommendations and impose the most protective mitigation feasible in light of land use assumptions and the proposed design and footprint of the development project. In reaching his or her conclusions with respect to these recommendations, the Planning Director shall consult with both the project applicant and the most interested and appropriate tribal organization.	
<p><b>6.5-2 The proposed project could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.</b></p>	PS	<p>6.5-2 If human remains are discovered at any project construction sites during any phase of construction, all ground-disturbing activity within 50 feet of the remains shall be halted immediately, and the Placer County Planning Department and the County coroner shall be notified immediately. If the remains are determined by the county coroner to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) shall be notified within 24 hours, and the guidelines of the NAHC shall be adhered to in the treatment and disposition of the remains. The project sponsor shall also retain a professional archaeologist with Native American burial experience to conduct a field investigation of the specific site and consult with the Most Likely Descendant, if any, identified by the NAHC. As necessary, the archaeologist may provide professional assistance to the Most Likely Descendant, including the excavation and removal of the human remains. The County shall be responsible for approval of recommended mitigation as it deems appropriate, taking account of the provisions of state law, as set forth in CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(e) and Public Resources Code section 5097.98. The project sponsor shall implement approved mitigation, to be verified by the County, before the resumption of ground-disturbing activities within 50-feet of where the remains were discovered.</p>	LS
<p><b>6.5-3 The proposed project could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource.</b></p>	PS	<p>6.5-3 Should paleontological resources be identified at a particular site, the project manager shall cease operation until a qualified professional can provide an evaluation. Mitigation shall be conducted as follows:</p>	LS

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identify and evaluate paleontological resources by intense field survey where impacts are considered high;</li> <li>2. Assess effects on identified sites;</li> <li>3. Consult with the institutional/academic paleontologists conducting research investigations within the geological formations that are slated to be impacted;</li> <li>4. Obtain comments from the researchers;</li> <li>5. Comply with researchers' recommendations to address any significant adverse effects where determined by the County to be feasible.</li> </ol> <p>In considering any suggested mitigation proposed by the consulting paleontologist, County Planning Department Staff shall determine whether avoidance is necessary and feasible in light of factors such as the nature of the find, project design, costs, Specific Plan policies and land use assumptions, and other considerations. If avoidance is unnecessary or infeasible, other appropriate measures (e.g., data recovery) shall be instituted. Work may proceed on other parts of the project site while mitigation for paleontological resources is carried out.</p>	
<p><b>6.5-4 The proposed project, in combination with other development in the Sacramento region, could adversely affect unique archaeological resources or historical resources as defined in Section 21083.2 of CEQA and Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines.</b></p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>6.5-4 Implement Mitigation Measure 6.5-1.</p>	<p>SU</p>
<p><b>6.5-5 The proposed project, in combination with other development in the Sacramento region, could adversely affect human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.</b></p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>6.5-5 Implement Mitigation Measure 6.5-2.</p>	<p>LS</p>

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
6.5-6 The proposed project, in combination with other development in Placer County, could adversely affect unique paleontological resources.	PS	6.5-6 Implement Mitigation Measure 6.5-3.	LS
<b>6.6 Geology</b>			
6.6-1 The proposed project could expose people or structures to fault rupture.	NI	None required.	NA
6.6-2 The proposed project could expose people or structures to strong seismic groundshaking.	LS	None required.	NA
6.6-3 The proposed project could expose people or structures to landslides.	NI	None required.	NA
6.6-4 Construction activities resulting in ground disturbance have the potential to result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil as well as topographic alterations.	PS	6.6-4 a) The applicant shall prepare and submit Improvement Plans, specifications, and cost estimates (per the requirements of Section II of the Land Development Manual [LDM] that are in effect at the time of submittal) to the ESD for review and approval of each new development project. The plans shall show all conditions for the project as well as pertinent topographical features both on- and off-site. All existing and proposed utilities and easements, on-site and adjacent to the project, which may be affected by planned construction, shall be shown on the plans. All landscaping and irrigation facilities within the public right-of-way (or public easements), or landscaping within sight distance areas at intersections, shall be included in the Improvement Plans. The applicant shall pay plan check and inspection fees. (Prior to plan approval, all applicable recording and reproduction costs shall be paid). The cost of the above-noted landscape and irrigation facilities shall be included in the estimates used to determine these fees. It is the applicant's responsibility to obtain all required agency signatures on the plans and to secure department approvals. If the Design/Site Review process and/or DRC review is required as a condition of approval for the project, said review process shall be completed prior to submittal of	LS

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Improvement Plans. Record drawings shall be prepared and signed by a California Registered Civil Engineer at the applicant's expense and shall be submitted to the ESD prior to acceptance by the County of site improvements.</p> <p>b) All proposed grading, drainage improvements, vegetation and tree removal shall be shown on the Improvement Plans and all work shall conform to provisions of the County Grading Ordinance (Ref. Article 15.48, Placer County Code) that are in effect at the time of submittal. No grading, clearing, or tree disturbance shall occur until the Improvement Plans are approved and all temporary construction fencing has been installed and inspected by a member of the DRC. All cut/fill slopes shall be at 2:1 (horizontal:vertical) unless a soils report supports a steeper slope and the ESD concurs with said recommendation.</p> <p>The applicant shall revegetate all disturbed areas. Revegetation undertaken from April 1 to October 1 shall include regular watering to ensure adequate growth. A winterization plan shall be provided with project Improvement Plans. It is the applicant's responsibility to assure proper installation and maintenance of erosion control/winterization during project construction. Where soil stockpiling or borrow areas are to remain for more than one construction season, proper erosion control measures shall be applied as specified in the Improvement Plans/Grading Plans. The applicant shall also provide for erosion control, implementing similar erosion control measures, where roadside drainage is off of the pavement, to the satisfaction of the ESD.</p>	

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>The applicant shall submit to the ESD a letter of credit or cash deposit in the amount of 110% of an approved engineer's estimate for winterization and permanent erosion control work prior to Improvement Plan approval to guarantee protection against erosion and improper grading practices. Upon the County's acceptance of improvements, and satisfactory completion of a one-year maintenance period, unused portions of said deposit shall be refunded to the project applicant or authorized agent.</p> <p>If, at any time during construction, a field review by County personnel indicates a significant deviation of from the proposed grading shown on the Improvement Plans, specifically with regard to slope heights, slope ratios, erosion control, winterization, tree disturbance, and/or pad elevations and configurations, the plans shall be reviewed by the DRC/ESD for a determination of substantial conformance to the project approvals prior to any further work proceeding. Failure of the DRC/ESD to make a determination of substantial conformance may serve as grounds for the revocation/modification of the project approval by the appropriate hearing body.</p> <p>c) Stockpiling and/or vehicle staging areas shall be identified on the Improvement Plans and located as far as practical from existing dwellings and protected resources in the area.</p>	

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		d) Developers of projects within the Plan Area, including off-site improvements, with ground disturbance exceeding one-acre that are subject to construction stormwater quality permit requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program shall obtain such permit from the State Regional Water Quality Control Board, and shall provide to the ESD evidence of a State-issued WDID number or filing of a Notice of Intent and fees prior to start of construction.	
<b>6.6-5 Construction of the proposed project on expansive soils could result in potential impacts to foundations, structures, roadways, and other near surface improvements.</b>	PS	6.6-5 a) The developer of any new project within the Plan Area, including off-site improvements, shall submit to the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD), for review and approval, a geotechnical engineering report produced by a California Registered Civil Engineer or Geotechnical Engineer. The report shall address and make recommendations on the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Road, pavement, and parking area design;</li> <li>2) Structural foundations, including retaining wall design (if applicable);</li> <li>3) Grading practices;</li> <li>4) Erosion/winterization;</li> <li>5) Special problems discovered on-site, (i.e., groundwater, expansive/unstable soils); and</li> <li>6) Slope stability.</li> </ol>	LS

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Once approved by the ESD, the project developer shall provide two copies of the final report to the ESD and one copy to the Building Department for their use. If the soils report indicates the presence of critically expansive or other soils problems which, if not corrected, could lead to structural defects, a certification of completion of the requirements of the soils report will be required for subdivisions and other entitlements, prior to issuance of Building Permits. This certification may be completed on a Lot by Lot basis or on a Tract basis, or other defined project basis. This shall be noted in the CC&amp;Rs and on the Informational Sheet filed with the Final Map(s). It is the responsibility of the developer to provide for engineering inspection and certification that earthwork has been performed in conformity with recommendations contained in the report.</p> <p>b) For non-pad graded lots, prior to Improvement Plan approval, the applicant shall submit to the ESD for review and approval, a soil investigation of each lot in the subdivision produced by a California Registered Civil or Geotechnical Engineer (Section 17953-17955 California Health and Safety Code). For pad graded lots, prior to Final Acceptance of project improvements or consideration of early Building Permits and after the completion of the pad grading for all lots, the applicant shall submit to the ESD for review and approval, a soil investigation of each lot produced by a California Registered Civil or Geotechnical Engineer (Section 17953-17955 California Health and Safety Code).</p>	
<p><b>6.6-6 New development on the project site could be exposed to unstable soil conditions.</b></p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>6.6-6 Implement Mitigation Measures 6.6-5 a) and b).</p>	<p>LS</p>

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**TABLE 3-1**

**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
6.6-7 The proposed project could result in the loss of, or loss of access to, mineral resources identified in a Mineral Resource Zone by the California Geological Survey.	NI	None required.	NA
6.6-8 Cumulative development in Placer County, including the proposed project, could expose people and structures to hazards associated with seismic groundshaking.	LS	None required.	NA
6.6-9 Cumulative development in Placer County, including the proposed project, could result in erosion and topsoil loss.	LS	None required.	NA
6.6-10 Cumulative development in Placer County, including the proposed project, could be constructed on expansive soils or soils that could become unstable.	LS	None required.	NA
<b>6.7 Hazards</b>			
6.7-1 Construction of the proposed project could involve the use, storage, and transportation of hazardous materials, which could be a safety hazard for people living and working within the Plan Area.	PS	6.7-1 a) Comply with all federal, State, and local laws and regulations pertaining to the use, storage, and transportation of hazardous materials during project construction. b) All reserve fuel supplies and hazardous materials must be stored within the confines of a designated construction area. c) Equipment refueling and maintenance must take place only within the staging area. d) Construction vehicles shall be inspected daily for leaks.	LS
6.7-2 Operation of the University campus and commercial land uses in the Plan Area could involve the use, storage, and transportation of hazardous materials, which could be a safety hazard for people living and working within the Plan Area.	PS	6.7-2 The proposed project shall comply with all federal, State, and local laws and regulations pertaining to the use, storage, and transportation of hazardous materials within the University, residential, and commercial land uses.	LS

LS = Less than Significant  
PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>6.7-3 In the future, the project site could be included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 or could pose a risk from other hazardous releases and, therefore, may pose a significant hazard to the public or the environment.</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>6.7-3 a) The applicant shall ensure the recommendations for removing all debris and stained soils identified in the existing Phase 1 ESAs prepared for the project site and off-site improvement areas [Wallace-Kuhl Associates, Consolidated Environmental Site Assessment Regional University Specific Plan, November 28, 2006] and any supplements or amendments thereto, are implemented prior to site preparation.</p> <p>b) If, during site preparation, visual or olfactory evidence of contamination is observed when soils are disturbed during construction, the applicant shall ensure the location is investigated and remediated to meet State and County regulations and any required remediation shall be completed prior to resuming construction.</p> <p>c) The applicant shall ensure Grading Notes include standard County provisions for the management of previously unidentified hazardous materials contamination or debris that may be encountered during construction.</p> <p>d) Prior to submittal of a small lot tentative subdivision map or plans for residential or other sensitive development, properties not previously evaluated with a current Phase I Environmental Site Assessment may be required to complete a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, as determined by Environmental Health Services. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment shall be conducted by a qualified professional. If past commercial agricultural uses are disclosed that could have resulted in persistent contamination, such as rice fields, soil sampling shall be conducted within former commercial agriculture areas. In these instances, prior to setting conditions for subdivision development, soil investigation shall be conducted according to guidelines developed by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)</p>	<p>LS</p>

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>and contained in the DTSC August 2002 "Interim Guidance for Sampling Agricultural Fields for School Sites", or equivalent protocol. Sampling and site investigation shall be conducted by a California registered environmental professional, performed with oversight from Placer County Environmental Health Services, and with applicable permits.</p> <p>As a result of soil investigation, a limited and confined area of contamination may be identified and found to be suitable for simple removal. If this is the case, remediation will be required to meet State and County regulations and be completed prior to recordation of the final small lot subdivision map or equivalent final Placer County approval for residential projects.</p> <p>As a result of soil investigation, unconfined and/or widespread residual concentrations of agricultural chemicals may be identified at levels where they individually or in combination meet or exceed US EPA, CalEPA Preliminary Remediation Goals, or equivalent screening levels, thereby indicating the need for risk assessment. Any indicated risk assessment shall be completed prior to improvement plans or equivalent approval. Risk assessments shall include a DTSC Preliminary Endangerment Assessment or no further action determination, or equivalent.</p> <p>Any remedial action indicated by a risk assessment shall be completed and certified prior to recordation of the small lot tentative subdivision final map or equivalent final Placer County approval. Remediation shall include a DTSC Remedial Action Workplan, or equivalent, and can include a range of activities, including restrictions on use, soil excavation and disposal off-site, or encapsulation in appropriate areas away from sensitive receptors in the Specific Plan area.</p>	

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**TABLE 3-1**

**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
6.7-4 Recycled water from the PGWWTP could be used to irrigate publicly accessible areas such as landscaped parks and roadway medians.	LS	None required.	NA
6.7-5 The project could include development where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas, which could present a safety hazard.	PS	6.7-5 a) The proposed project shall comply with all federal, State, and local laws and regulations pertaining to wildland fires. b) Prior to construction, the County shall review project plans for conformance with the UBC and UFC to reduce risk of fires originating within the County. c) During construction activities, the applicant shall consult with the Placer County Fire Department in order to implement fire prevention measures at sites adjacent to natural areas. d) Construct a fire station as required by Mitigation Measure 6.10-7(a). e) A minimum 10-foot firebreak, which shall be maintained until such time that adjacent properties are developed, shall be required in all areas with wood fences that are adjacent to wild areas.	LS
6.7-6 The proposed project could be located near a private airstrip and could create a safety hazard for people residing or working within the Plan Area.	NI	None required	NA
6.7-7 The development of the Plan Area could physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.	LS	None required.	NA
6.7-8 The proposed project could include stormwater basins and open channels that could provide breeding opportunities for mosquitoes.	PS	6.7-8 a) During construction, all grading shall be performed in a manner to prevent the occurrence of standing water or other areas suitable for breeding of mosquitoes and other vectors. b) The Placer Mosquito Abatement District shall be granted access to perform vector control in all common areas including drainage, open space corridor and park areas in perpetuity. Such access shall be a condition of approval of all tentative maps approved within the Plan Area.	LS

LS = Less than Significant  
PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		c) Prior to grading, the applicant shall prepare a Preserve Management Plan which shall include information on compatible mosquito and vector control methods that are appropriate for the various habitat types within the natural open space areas.	
6.7-9 Cumulative development, including the proposed project, could expose people and the environment to hazards and hazardous materials through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions.	LS	None required.	NA
6.7-10 Cumulative development, including the proposed project, could expose people to hazards associated with soil or groundwater contamination.	LS	None required.	NA
6.7-11 The proposed project, in combination with other development in south Placer County, could increase the use of recycled water for irrigation in publicly accessible areas.	LS	None required.	NA
6.7-12 Cumulative development, including the proposed project, could result in a cumulative increase in the number of people and structures that could be exposed to wildland fire hazards.	LS	None required.	NA
6.7-13 Cumulative development, including the proposed project, could result in a cumulative increase in the number of people and structures that could be exposed to aircraft hazards.	LS	None required.	NA

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>6.7-14 Cumulative development, including the proposed project, could temporarily affect local roadway emergency access routes during construction activities, but there could be no long-term or permanent changes in emergency routes or access.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>6.7-15 The proposed project, in combination with other development in south Placer County, could result in an increase in the extent of new or improved stormwater basins that could temporarily store water. The basins could provide breeding opportunities for mosquitoes. Cumulative development could also increase the number of people who could be exposed to mosquito hazards.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p><b>6.8 Hydrology and Water Quality</b></p>			
<p>6.8-1 The proposed project could increase peak runoff rates and volumes which could exceed the capacity of local drainages and result in on- and off-site flooding hazards.</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>6.8-1 a) Prior to recordation of the first Large Lot, Final Map, or any improvement plan approval, a Final Project Drainage Master Plan shall be prepared and submitted to the Placer County Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD) for review and approval. Similarly, drainage plans for any off-site improvement areas shall be prepared and submitted for review. The Final Drainage Master Plan and other drainage plans (Drainage Plans) shall ensure that peak flows from developed areas do not exceed pre-development conditions and shall be in conformance with the requirements of Section 5 of the Land Development Manual and the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal. The drainage facilities shall be designed for future, fully developed, unmitigated flows from upstream development. Regional detention and retention basins, regional water quality basins, as well as regional drainage channel improvements, shall be incorporated with appropriate design information along with appropriate phasing information. The Drainage Plans shall include specific operation and</p>	<p>LS</p>

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>maintenance responsibilities, inspection schedules, and reporting requirements. The Drainage Plans shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and shall include all drainage elements outlined in the Preliminary Drainage Master Plan used for analysis in this EIR or other elements determined by Placer County ESD to be equally effective.</p> <p>b) New development applications (including backbone infrastructure) within the Plan Area shall be accompanied by site-specific project drainage reports consistent with the approved Final Project Drainage Master Plan. The project drainage reports shall be reviewed and approved by the ESD during the Subsequent Conformity Review Process and prior to improvement plan approval for new development. The drainage report shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and shall be in conformance with the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual and Placer County Code. The project applicant shall be financially responsible for all stormwater drainage facility maintenance requirements. The project drainage report shall include, at a minimum, written text addressing existing conditions, the effects of project improvements, all appropriate calculations, a watershed map, potential increases in downstream flows and volumes, proposed on-site improvements, and drainage easements, if necessary, to accommodate flows from the site. The drainage report shall demonstrate compliance with all mitigation measures included in this EIR.</p>	

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>c) Drainage facilities, for purposes of collecting runoff, shall be designed in accordance with the requirements of the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal, to the satisfaction of the ESD. These facilities shall be constructed with proposed project improvements, and easements provided as required by the ESD. Maintenance of these facilities shall be provided by a Master Homeowners Association, Community Services District, or other responsible entity to be determined by Placer County prior to any development approval.</p> <p>d) New development applications within the Plan Area shall describe the location, size, and ownership of any stormwater conveyance facility in the Final Project Drainage Master Plan and shown on improvement plans. The developer shall submit a letter to the ESD from the entity controlling the canal describing any restrictions, requirements, easements, etc. relative to project construction. Said letter shall be provided to the ESD prior to the approval of improvement plans.</p> <p>e) A County Service Area (CSA), Community Facilities District (CFD), or other entity for operation and maintenance of the stormwater facilities shall be formed for the Plan Area prior to recordation of the first Large Lot Final Map. This entity would have the ability to participate in design, inspect and accept facilities, and determine appropriate funding levels necessary to operate and maintain these facilities. A drainage facility operation and maintenance special tax or special assessment, with a provision for increases, indexed to the Consumer Price Index (CPI), shall be approved by the landowners (voters) of the Plan Area prior to recordation of the first Large Lot Final Map in the Plan Area. An indexing formula for operations and maintenance of drainage facilities shall also be in place prior to recordation of the first Large Lot Final Map.</p>	

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		f) New development shall not alter the post-development mitigated drainage shed boundaries identified in the Final Drainage Master Plan in any way that would increase the peak flow runoff or runoff volumes.  g) New development shall reduce post-development storm water run-off peak flows and volumes to pre-development levels through the installation of retention/detention facilities. Retention/detention facilities shall be designed in accordance with the requirements of the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal, and to the satisfaction of the ESD. Retention/detention facilities shall be designed to be consistent with the approved Master Drainage Plan. Construction of regional retention/detention facilities shall occur prior to or concurrent with the initial development of the Specific Plan. No retention/detention facility construction shall be permitted within any identified wetlands area, floodplain, or right-of-way, except as authorized by project approvals.	
<b>6.8-2 The proposed project could increase the amount (volume) of stormwater which could exceed the capacity of Curry Creek, exacerbating on- or off-site flooding.</b>	PS	6.8-2 a) Implement Mitigation Measures 6.8-1(a) through (d).  b) As an option to on-site mitigation for volumetric increases resulting from the proposed project, the proposed project could mitigate for volumetric impacts through purchase of volumetric storage capacity at a facility approved by PCFCWCD and ESD. The Reason's Farms Facility is an approved facility that is planned to be constructed within the Pleasant Grove Creek watershed. If the proposed project were to use this facility for volumetric mitigation, construction of the Reason's Farms Facility must be complete and the facility in operation before any phase of the proposed project is constructed.	LS

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>6.8-3</b> The proposed off-site infrastructure improvement areas could increase impervious surfaces which could affect stormwater runoff rates and volumes.</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>6.8-3 a) Prior to approval of plans for off-site infrastructure areas or the recordation of the first Large Lot or Final Map, the applicant shall prepare an addendum to the Preliminary Drainage Master Plan or include in the Final Project Drainage Master Plan modeling of runoff rates and volumes from off-site infrastructure areas. The modeling shall be used to adequately reduce post-project stormwater runoff flows and volumes.</p> <p>b) Implement Mitigation Measures 6.8-1(a) through (g).</p>	<p>LS</p>
<p><b>6.8-4</b> The proposed project could increase the amount (volume) of treated wastewater discharged into Pleasant Grove Creek which could exceed the capacity of the creek, exacerbating on- or off-site flooding during the 100-year storm event.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p><b>6.8-5</b> The proposed project could construct residences and other structures within the pre-construction 100-year FEMA flood, potentially exposing people and structures to flooding.</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>6.8-5 a) Implement Mitigation Measures 6.8-1(a) through (g).</p> <p>b) No grading activities of any kind may take place within the post project 100-year floodplain as identified in the Final Drainage Master Plan except as necessary to construct and maintain drainage improvements. The post-project 100-year floodplain shall be designated as a development setback line on improvement plans and final subdivision maps, unless greater setbacks are required by other mitigation measures or conditions of approval.</p>	<p>LS</p>

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>c) The Final Drainage Master Plan shall show the limits of the future unmitigated fully-developed 100-year floodplain (after development) for the North and South channel tributaries to Curry Creek on the Improvement Plans and Informational Sheet(s) filed with the appropriate Final Map(s) and designate same as a building setback line unless greater setbacks are required by other conditions contained herein. Channel construction and/or improvements with new development shall provide sufficient freeboard for the 100-year modeled storm event and shall be identified with floodplain delineations. Subsequent site specific developments shall identify the 100-year floodplain in the site specific drainage report and Improvement Plans.</p> <p>d) The Final Drainage Master Plan shall demonstrate that the proposed project would not increase the 100-year floodplain water surface elevation upstream or downstream of the project area.</p> <p>e) New development applications within the Plan Area shall identify the limits of existing and proposed floodplains in the Final Drainage Master Plan. Channel/swale construction and/or improvements with new development shall be designed in accordance with the PCFCWCD Storm Water Management Manual and provide sufficient freeboard for the 100-year event and shall be identified with floodplain delineations.</p>	

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		f) New development shall show finished house pad elevations two feet above the 100-year floodplain water surface elevation (or finished floor at three feet above same elevation) for lots near 100-year floodplain identified in the proposed channels for the North and South tributaries to Curry Creek on the Improvement Plans and Informational Sheet filed with the appropriate Final Map. Pad elevations shall be certified by the project engineer on "As-Built" plans submitted to the ESD following project construction. Benchmark elevation and location shall be shown on the Improvement Plans and Informational Sheet(s) to the satisfaction of DRC.	
<b>6.8-6 Construction activities for the proposed project could result in sediment and other construction-related pollutants entering local drainages.</b>	PS	6.8-6 a) Any project within the Plan Area with ground disturbance exceeding one-acre that is subject to the State NPDES General Construction Permit shall obtain such permit from the CVRWQCB and shall provide to the ESD evidence of a state-issued NPDES General Construction Permit number or filing of a Notice of Intent and fees prior to start of construction.  b) During the Subsequent Conformity Review process and prior to Improvement Plan approval, new development shall submit to the ESD, for review and approval, an erosion control plan consistent with the County's Grading Ordinance. The erosion control plan shall indicate that proper control of siltation, sedimentation and other pollutants will be implemented per NPDES General Construction Permit requirements and County ordinance standards. The plan shall propose BMPs to reduce erosion and water quality degradation during construction to the maximum extent practicable.	LS

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>6.8-7 Implementation of the proposed project could result in urban pollutants entering local drainages, which could result in degradation of water quality from stormwater runoff.</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>6.8-7 a) Implement Mitigation Measures 6.8-1(a) through (g).</p> <p>b) The proposed water quality facilities shall be identified and designed in the Final Drainage Master Plan and submitted to Placer County for review and approval. All water quality facilities identified in the Final Drainage Master Plan shall be constructed with the installation of the backbone infrastructure. The Final Drainage Master Plan shall also include the method or methods for funding the long-term maintenance of the proposed water quality facilities.</p> <p>c) New development projects within the Plan Area shall submit a site-specific BMP plan to the County, for review and approval, showing the on-site locations and effectiveness of the BMP facilities proposed for long-term water quality impact reduction during the Subsequent Conformity Review process and prior to Improvement Plan approval. The plan shall include a method or methods for financing the long-term maintenance of the proposed site-specific facilities.</p> <p>d) All BMPs for water quality protection, source control, and treatment control shall be developed in accordance with the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbook for Construction and New Development/Redevelopment (or other similar source approved by the ESD) for the applicable type of development and/or improvement. The BMPs shall be designed to mitigate (minimize, infiltrate, filter, or treat) stormwater runoff. Flow or volume based post-construction BMPs shall be designed at a minimum in accordance with the Placer County Guidance Document for Volume and Flow-Based Sizing of Permanent Post-Construction Best Management Practices for Stormwater Quality Protection. Provisions shall be included for long-term</p>	<p>LS</p>

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>maintenance of BMPs. All BMPs shall reflect the Best Available Technologies (BAT) available at the time of implementation and shall reflect site-specific limitations. The County shall make the final determinations as to the appropriateness of the BMPs proposed for each project.</p> <p>e) Stormwater runoff from the proposed project's on- and off-site impervious surfaces (including roads) shall be collected and routed through specially designed water quality treatment facilities (BMPs) for removal of pollutants of concern (i.e. sediment, oil/grease, etc.), as approved by the ESD. With the Improvement Plans, the applicant shall verify that proposed BMPs are appropriate to treat the pollutants of concern from this project. The applicant shall provide for the establishment of vegetation, where specified, by means of proper irrigation, for effective performance of BMPs. Maintenance of these facilities shall be provided by the project owners/permittees unless, and until, a County Service Area is created and said facilities are accepted by the County for maintenance. Prior to Improvement Plan or Final Map approval, easements shall be created and offered for dedication to the County for maintenance and access to these facilities in anticipation of possible County maintenance. No water quality facility construction shall be permitted within any identified wetlands area, floodplain, or right-of-way, except as authorized by project approvals.</p>	

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		f) This project is located within the area covered by Placer County's municipal stormwater quality permit, pursuant to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Phase II program under the jurisdiction of the Central Valley RWQCB. Project-related stormwater discharges are subject to all applicable requirements of said permit. BMPs shall be designed to mitigate (minimize, infiltrate, filter, or treat) stormwater runoff in accordance with Attachment 4 of Placer County's NPDES Municipal Stormwater Permit (State Water Resources Control Board NPDES General Permit No. CAS000004).	
6.8-8 The proposed project, in combination with the buildout in the Curry Creek watershed, could result in stormwater peak flows that could result in on- or off-site flooding.	S	6.8-8 a) Implement Mitigation Measures 6.8-1(a) through (g). b) Implement Mitigation Measures 6.8-5(b) through (e).	LS
6.8-9 The proposed project, in combination with the buildout of the Placer County and City of Roseville General Plan, could result in stormwater volumes that could result in on- or off-site flooding.	S	6.8-9 a) Implement Mitigation Measures 6.8-1(a) through (g). b) Implement Mitigation Measures 6.8-5(b) through (e).	LS
6.8-10 The proposed project, in combination with the buildout of Placer County and the City of Roseville General Plans, could result in degradation of water quality from stormwater runoff.	S	6.8-10 Implement Mitigation Measures 6.8-7(a) through (f).	SU
6.8-11 The proposed project, in combination with the buildout of Placer County and the City of Roseville General Plans, could result in the construction of residences and other structures within the pre-construction 100-year FEMA flood zone.	S	6.8-11 a) Implement Mitigation Measures 6.8-1(a) through (g). b) Implement Mitigation Measures 6.8-5(b) through (e).	SU

LS = Less than Significant  
PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>6.8-12</b> The proposed project, in combination with buildout of Placer County and City of Roseville General Plans within the Pleasant Grove Creek watershed, could result in an incremental increase in the amount (volume) of treated wastewater discharged to Pleasant Grove Creek. This could exceed the capacity of the creek and exacerbate on- or off-site flooding during the 100-year storm event.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p><b>6.8-13</b> The proposed project, in combination with the buildout of Urban Growth Areas that could be served by the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant, could result in degradation of water quality from increased wastewater discharge to Pleasant Grove Creek.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>NA</p>
<b>6.9 Noise</b>			
<p><b>6.9-1</b> Construction of the proposed project could generate noise in the existing noise environment.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>6.9-1 Construction activities shall take place between the hours of 6:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. Monday through Friday (during daylight savings time), between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. Monday through Friday (during standard time), and between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Saturday and all construction equipment shall be fitted with factory installed muffling devices and maintained in good working order.</p>	<p>LS</p>
<p><b>6.9-2</b> Construction activities associated with the proposed project could produce groundborne vibration.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>6.9-2 The construction contractor shall not grade within 50 feet of any existing residence between 7 p.m. and 7 a.m.</p>	<p>LS</p>
<p><b>6.9-3</b> During operation of the proposed project, sensitive receptors could be exposed to ambient noise levels that exceed County standards.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>6.9-3 a) For residences located along Watt Avenue and University Boulevard, a project-specific acoustical analysis shall be prepared in full compliance with Table 9-2 of the Placer County General Plan and submitted concurrently with project design plans for review and approval by Placer County Planning Department. The project design shall incorporate noise reductions measures recommended in the noise analysis, to the maximum extent feasible, to reduce noise</p>	<p>LS</p>

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>levels in the rear yard activity areas of residences; in known outdoor activity areas of other sensitive uses; or at the property line of a sensitive receiving non-residential land use if the outdoor activity areas are unknown. Where it is not possible to reduce noise in outdoor activity areas to 60 dB L<sub>dn</sub>/CNEL or less using a practical application of the best-available noise reduction measures and in adhering to the RUSP Development Standards and Design Guidelines, an exterior noise level of up to 65 dB L<sub>dn</sub>/CNEL may be allowed, provided that available exterior noise level reduction measures have been implemented and interior noise levels are in compliance with Table 9-3 of the Placer County General Plan.</p> <p>b) Prior to construction of noise-sensitive uses in areas within 1,700 feet of the centerline of the selected Placer Parkway alignment (or the closest proposed alignment if one has not been selected), a project-specific acoustical analysis shall be prepared in full compliance with Table 9-2 of the Placer County General Plan and submitted concurrently with project design plans for review and approval by Placer County Planning Department. If it is determined that noise levels exceed Placer County standards, the project design shall incorporate noise reductions measures, to the maximum extent feasible, to reduce noise levels in the rear yard activity areas of residences; in known outdoor activity areas of other sensitive uses; or at the property line of a sensitive receiving non-residential land use if the outdoor activity areas are unknown. Where it is not possible to reduce noise in outdoor activity areas to 60 dB L<sub>dn</sub>/CNEL or less using a practical application of the best-available noise reduction measures and in adhering to the RUSP Development Standards and Design Guidelines, an exterior noise level of up to 65 dB L<sub>dn</sub>/CNEL may be allowed, provided that available exterior noise level</p>	

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		reduction measures have been implemented and interior noise levels are in compliance with Table 9-3 of the Placer County General Plan.	
6.9-4 Aircraft noise could affect new receptors developed as part of the proposed project.	LS	None required.	NA
6.9-5 Noise from the University athletic facilities, including a stadium, that could be developed as part of the proposed project could affect sensitive receptors.	S	6.9-5 Design of the stadium shall incorporate measures to reduce noise effects on nearby sensitive receptors. Possible measures include increasing setbacks between the stadium and off-site residential receptors, orientation of the stadium such that noise is directed away from off-site residential receptors, or construction of intervening non-sensitive uses between the stadium and sensitive receptors to attenuate stadium noise. The effectiveness of the measures shall be demonstrated in a project-specific noise study, which shall be submitted concurrently with the stadium design plans. The study shall be subject to review and approval by Placer County Development Review Committee.	SU
6.9-6 Construction of the proposed project, in combination with other construction in the vicinity of the project site, could expose receptors to noise.	LS	None required.	NA
6.9-7 Construction of the proposed project, in combination with other construction in the vicinity of the project site, could generate groundborne vibration.	LS	None required.	NA
6.9-8 Operations of the proposed project could add to cumulative ambient noise levels.	LS	None required.	NA
6.9-9 The Plan Area could experience a cumulative noise impact from airport noise.	NI	None required.	NA

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>6.10 Public Services</b>			
<p><b>6.10-1</b> The proposed project could increase the demand for police protection services requiring additional personnel.</p>	PS	<p>6.10-1 The staffing ratios contained in Table 6.10-1, or ratios as otherwise approved by the Board of Supervisors, shall be maintained for the Specific Plan area. The applicants shall be required to establish a special benefit assessment district or other funding mechanism to assure adequate funding for the ongoing maintenance and operation of law enforcement services, with funding responsibilities imposed on residential and commercial properties within the Specific Plan area, including the costs for services required to satisfy the staffing standards set forth above and General Plan standards now in existence or as later amended. The funding mechanism shall be subject to the prior review and approval of Placer County.</p>	LS
<p><b>6.10-2</b> The urban response time standards set forth in the Placer County General Plan could be unattainable from the existing Sheriff's service center in Loomis. Development of the proposed project could require new facilities, including a Sheriff's service center, equipment, and patrol vehicles.</p>	PS	<p>6.10-2 a) The project developer(s) shall comply with Placer County Policy 4.H.4, which requires that all future development either fund or develop law enforcement facilities. Compliance with Policy 4.H.4 shall include formation of a County Service Area (CSA), Community Facilities District (CFD for the construction of a 2,500-square-foot equipped Sheriff's service center prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map.</p> <p>b) The project developer(s) shall enter into a Development Agreement with Placer County prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map for facilities, staffing, and the purchase and scheduled replacement of the number of equipped vehicles needed as determined by the Sheriff in the same frequency and manner currently used by the County in its patrol vehicle replacement program. All patrol vehicles shall include the necessary equipment to accomplish the mission of the Placer County Sheriff's Department or as otherwise required by the Sheriff.</p>	LS

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>6.10-3 Public safety could be compromised if the Specific Plan does not adequately consider public safety issues in its design.</b></p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>6.10-3 Law enforcement personnel shall have access to and visibility of schools, parks and open spaces; pedestrian areas shall be well lighted and designed in such a manner as to maximize the safety of pedestrians, and buildings shall be designed and sited to provide a safe environment. Improvement plans submitted for review and approval by the Placer County Planning Department shall be accompanied by a written explanation regarding the manner in which the design of the improvements achieves compliance with these requirements.</p>	<p>LS</p>
<p><b>6.10-4 Construction of a sheriff's service center and related facilities within the Specific Plan area could lead to physical impacts on the environment.</b></p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p><b>6.10-5 Cumulative impacts on law enforcement services could occur due to development of the proposed project.</b></p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p><b>6.10-6 Development of the proposed project could require additional personnel to serve new fire stations.</b></p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>6.10-6 The staffing ratios contained in Table 6.10-2 shall be maintained for the Specific Plan area, concurrent with demand, during all phases of development. The applicants shall be required to establish a special benefit assessment district or other funding mechanism to assure adequate funding for the ongoing maintenance and operation of fire protection and related services, with funding responsibilities imposed on residential and commercial properties within the Specific Plan area, including the costs for services required to satisfy Placer County Fire Department staffing requirements set forth above. The funding mechanism shall be subject to the prior review and approval of Placer County, and shall be approved by the affected landowners prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map. It shall be maintained until such time as the County determines that property tax revenues are adequate to maintain the required staffing.</p>	<p>LS</p>

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>6.10-7 Development of the proposed project could require additional fire protection infrastructure including construction of fire stations and purchase of fire trucks and equipment to serve the proposed project.</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>6.10-7 a) The fire station shall be constructed and equipped at a location approved by the Placer County Fire Department, prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the first dwelling unit. This first station may initially be located in a temporary building or location; however, a permanent station shall be available for occupancy within 18 months of issuance of the certificate of occupancy for the first dwelling unit.</p> <p>b) The fire station shall be sized to serve the Specific Plan area at buildout, and shall be fully funded and equipped (i.e., desks, computers, telephones, radio systems, beds, refrigerators and all other needs).</p> <p>c) Formation of a County Services Area (CSA) or a Community Facilities District (CFD), including a landowner-approved special tax of an adequate amount or other financing mechanism acceptable to the County, shall be required prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map to ensure that a funding mechanism for fire protection infrastructure and equipment is in place to provide adequate fire safety services in the Specific Plan area during all stages of development. The required fire station shall be completed and fully staffed and equipped prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy. The fire station shall be located on a site readily accessible to service areas and the final fire station location shall be subject to approval by the Placer County Fire Department.</p>	<p>LS</p>

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>6.10-8</b> Development of the proposed project could create additional fire hazards in large open space/natural areas and utility corridors by limiting pre-suppression and suppression accessibility. High fuel loading could result in areas of restricted or limited access. Development of residential areas in close proximity to utility infrastructure and open space areas increases the potential for fire related hazards.</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>6.10-8 a) Development and subdivision design shall include adequate setbacks, as determined by the Placer County Fire Department, between open space/corridor areas and structures. Fire pre-suppression and suppression access easements to utility corridors and open space areas shall be required as part of the subdivision map process. Building envelopes or another method shall ensure separation of structures, and shall ensure access, as deemed appropriate by the Placer County Fire Department prior to approval of any tentative subdivision map.</p> <p>b) A County Service Area (CSA), Community Facilities District (CFD), or other entity for sustainable park maintenance shall be formed for the Specific Plan area prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map. Funds for a fuels reduction program for open spaces and corridors shall be included in the financing arrangement by a vote of the landowners prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map. The maintenance entity shall establish and identify ongoing funding for a continuous maintenance program for vegetation (both wildland and landscaped) in any and all open space, vacant areas, and landscape trail, easement and corridor areas within the Specific Plan area prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map.</p> <p>c) The developers shall fund a fire-safe plan for the subdivisions adjacent to wildland (natural, landscape, and corridor) areas. The fire-safe plan shall include a fuels management plan, and recommend building separations and distances from wildland areas, evacuation and access routes, fire safety zones and maintenance schedule prior to approval of tentative subdivision maps.</p>	<p>LS</p>

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**TABLE 3-1**

**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
6.10-9 Construction of fire stations and related facilities within the Specific Plan area could lead to physical impacts on the environment.	LS	None required.	NA
6.10-10 Cumulative impacts on fire services could occur due to development of the proposed project.	LS	None required.	NA
6.10-11 Buildout of the Specific Plan area could substantially increase the public school student population, exceeding current school capacities.	LS	None required.	NA
6.10-12 A change in school district boundaries could adversely affect one or more of the three school districts.	LS	None required.	NA
6.10-13 Construction of schools within the Specific Plan area could lead to physical impacts on the environment.	LS	None required.	NA
6.10-14 The proposed project could contribute to cumulative increases in demand for schools.	LS	None required.	NA
6.10-15 Development of the Specific Plan area could result in an inadequate amount of developed passive and active parkland and related facilities.	PS	6.10-15 Project developers in the Specific Plan area shall comply with the requirements of the General Plan by dedication and improvement of a minimum of 38 acres of active parkland and 38 acres of passive parkland. Project developers shall be responsible for dedicating and fully developing parks and or portions thereof, concurrent with demand in accordance with County levels of service. The County may require oversizing of neighborhood and larger type recreation parks, trails and facilities on a subdivision basis when it is deemed necessary and practical to serve the needs of future residents. In such cases, the County will enter into reimbursement agreements whereby future developments will pay initial developers for oversizing.	LS

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Concurrent with the construction of the community parks, project developers shall construct a park maintenance building and yard and provide maintenance equipment. The design and building materials, location and quantity of equipment shall be subject to the approval of the Department of Facility Services.</p> <p>All plans and specifications shall be approved by the Department of Facility Services and/or the managing agency prior to the recordation of each final small lot subdivision map. A procedure or agreement to govern the acquisition of parklands and completed park improvements acceptable to the County and/or managing agency, and in compliance with applicable General Plan standards and policies, shall be in place prior to recordation of the first final small lot subdivision map.</p> <p>The specific park plans shall be submitted to the County for approval prior to the final decision as to the number and location of facilities.</p>	
<p><b>6.10-16 Additional population in the Specific Plan area may result in increased reliance upon park facilities and services in neighboring jurisdictions.</b></p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p><b>6.10-17 Parks within the Specific Plan area have the potential to be poorly maintained if an adequate funding source is not identified.</b></p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>6.10-17 Project developers shall cause a new County Service Area (CSA), Community Facilities District (CFD), or other Parks Special District to be formed for sustainable park maintenance and recreation programs for the Specific Plan area prior to recordation of the first final small-lot subdivision map. A procedure or agreement to govern park maintenance and local recreation programs shall also be finalized prior to recordation of the first final small-lot subdivision map within the Specific Plan area. This entity would thus have the ability to participate in design, inspection and acceptance of facilities, and determination of appropriate funding levels necessary to maintain these facilities and operate recreational programs. A</p>	<p>LS</p>

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		park maintenance special tax or special assessment with a provision for increases indexed to the CPI shall be approved by the landowners (voters) of the Specific Plan area, to be developed prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map in the Specific Plan area. An indexing formula for maintenance and operation of recreational facilities and programs shall be in place prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map.	
6.10-18 Development of the Specific Plan area will create a demand for community recreation facilities.	S	6.10-18 As a condition of Specific Plan approval, the applicant shall submit a phased schedule for providing community recreation facilities for approval by the County Parks Division. This phasing plan shall comply with County levels of service for parks and recreational facilities. Funding for construction, operation and maintenance of these improvements shall be provided in accordance with Mitigation Measures 6.10-7 and 6.10-8.	LS
6.10-19 Development of the Specific Plan area could result in cumulative impacts on passive and active parkland and related facilities.	LS	None required.	NA
6.10-20 Development of the Specific Plan area could result in inadequate library facilities.	S	6.10-20 a) Formation of a County Service Area (CSA), Community Facilities District (CFD) or other financing mechanism acceptable to the County shall be required prior to recordation of the first final small lot subdivision map to ensure that immediate funding for adequate library infrastructure consistent with County standards is in place. The Specific Plan developers shall enter into a Development Agreement to ensure a fair share contribution to adequate library facilities, and that such facilities are available prior to demonstrated need.	LS

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		b) Completion of one or more branch libraries to provide a minimum of 0.4 square feet per capita and stocking with books and other materials necessary for a functioning library with a minimum of 2.2 volumes per capita and otherwise meeting the standards of the Auburn-Placer County Library Long-Range Plan, including any subsequent amendments, shall occur concurrent with demand.  c) Project developers shall be required to establish a special benefit assessment district or other funding mechanism to ensure adequate funding of the Specific Plan's fair share for the ongoing operation and maintenance of library facilities. Such funding mechanism shall be established prior to recordation of the first final subdivision map to ensure that immediate funding for adequate library operations and maintenance is in place.	
<b>6.10-21 The Specific Plan could contribute to cumulative demand for library services.</b>	LS	None required.	NA
<b>6.11 Public Utilities</b>			
<b>6.11-1 The proposed project could fail to meet the wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.</b>	LS	None required.	NA
<b>6.11-2 The proposed project could require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities.</b>	PS	6.11-2 a) Commitments from the wastewater treatment provider to receive anticipated flows from the Specific Plan area at the PGWWTP shall be secured by Placer County prior to County approval of improvement plans for wastewater collection and transmission infrastructure. The County shall comply with General Plan Policy 4.D.2, which requires written certification from the service provider that either existing services are available or needed improvements will be made prior to occupancy to meet wastewater demands of the Specific Plan area.	LS

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>b) Specific Plan proponents shall participate financially through connection fees and other financial mechanisms in the construction of additional wastewater treatment capacity sufficient to accommodate projected flows and treatment at the PGWWTP. In addition, Specific Plan proponents shall prepare, or shall provide a fair share contribution toward the preparation of any additional CEQA analysis that may be required for plant modifications and/or expansions.</p> <p>c) For each increment of new development within the Specific Plan area, the County shall confirm that all necessary permits (e.g., NPDES) are in place for either the PGWWTP to discharge additional treated effluent in the amounts associated with the new development. This shall include a determination that development timing will not impede other development for which entitlements have been issued. The requirement for such a showing shall be made a condition of any small lot tentative map approval associated with the new development and shall be verified by the County prior to recordation any final map associated with the new development. Where no small lot tentative map and final map are required prior to non-residential development having the potential to increase wastewater flows, the requirement for such verification, to be demonstrated no later than the time of issuance of building permits, shall be made a condition of approval of project-level discretionary approvals analogous to issuance of small-lot tentative maps.</p> <p>d) Approval of the Specific Plan shall be premised on concurrent County approval of a financing plan that will provide for funding the necessary wastewater collection facilities needed to serve the Specific Plan area, and implemented through approval for formation of a County Service Area (CSA) and a corresponding funding mechanism.</p>	

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		e) The Specific Plan proponents shall construct or participate financially in the construction of off-site wastewater conveyance capacity, including lift stations, to accommodate projected wastewater flows that would be generated by development of the Specific Plan.  f) Adequately sized on-site collection facilities, including lift stations, shall be installed for each subdivision in the Specific Plan area concurrent with road construction for individual subdivisions. A "backbone" conveyance system sufficient to serve each subdivision shall be installed prior to issuance of building permits for that subdivision.  g) The Sewer Master Plan shall be revised prior to submission of any wastewater-related improvement plans to include a detailed description of necessary on-site and off-site lift station components. The Master Plan shall include a plan for dealing with power and pump failure, and pump maintenance. The plan shall identify how necessary pumping capacity will be replicated in the event of pump failure or pump maintenance, and shall provide for on-site back-up power sufficient to run pumps and any odor scrubbers, in the event of power failure. Each lift station shall include a wastewater storage component in the form of an enclosed reservoir or tank sufficient to deal with temporary emergency conditions while backup systems are brought on line, in accordance with sizing standards utilized by the County Department of Facility Services.	
<b>6.11-3 The proposed project, in combination with other developments that could contribute wastewater flows to the PGWWTP, could fail to meet the wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.</b>	LS	None required.	NA

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
6.11-4 The proposed project, in combination with other development, could require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities.	S	6.11-4 Implement Mitigation Measure 6.11-2(c).	LS
6.11-5 The proposed project could require the construction of new or the expansion of an existing landfill, which could result in a significant adverse environmental effect.	LS	None required.	NA
6.11-6 The proposed project could require the construction of new or expansion of the existing MRF, resulting in significant adverse environmental effects.	LS	None required.	NA
6.11-7 The proposed project, in combination with other development, could require the construction of new or expansion of the existing landfill and MRF, which could result in significant adverse environmental effects.	S	6.11-7 a) The project applicant shall require that all construction contracts include a provision requiring contractors to provide on-site separation of construction debris to assure a minimum 50% diversion of this material from the landfill.  b) A source separated green waste program shall be implemented within the Plan Area, subject to review and approval by the Western Placer Waste management Authority.  c) The project applicant shall develop and ensure the continuous maintenance of recycling centers within the Plan Area. Recycling centers meeting the standards of the California Integrated Waste Management Board/LEA and County Facility Services Department, including provisions for staffing, continuous maintenance, and resident-friendly hours of operations, shall be a part of the permit conditions for new commercial development. Recycling centers shall accept all types of recyclable waste, shall be fenced and screened from view, and shall be located in commercial areas dispersed throughout the Plan Area.	SU

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
6.11-8 The proposed project could require the construction of new facilities to provide electrical and natural gas service, which could result in significant environmental effects.	LS	None required.	NA
6.11-9 The proposed project could require the construction of new facilities to provide cable and communication service, which could result in significant environmental effects.	LS	None required.	NA
6.11-10 The proposed project, combined with other development, could require the construction of new or expansion of existing facilities in order to provide electrical, natural gas, cable, or communication services.	LS	None required.	NA
<b>6.12 Transportation and Circulation</b>			
6.12-1 The proposed project could contribute to traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of the regional roadway network under existing plus project conditions.	S	6.12-1 Developers of property within the Plan Area (“Specific Plan” or “the Project”) shall be responsible for the project’s fair share of all feasible physical improvements necessary and available to reduce the severity of the project’s significant transportation-related impacts, as identified in this traffic analysis, consistent with the policies and exceptions set forth in the Transportation and Circulation Element of the 1994 Placer County General Plan as amended. The project’s contribution toward such improvements, which the County recognizes will not be sufficient to mitigate all transportation-related impacts to less than significant levels, may take any, or some combination, of the following forms.  1. Construction of roads and related facilities within and adjacent to the boundaries of the Specific Plan Area, which may be subject fee credits and/or reimbursement, coordinated by the County, from other fee-paying development projects with respect to roads or other facilities that would also serve fee-paying development projects other than RUSP.	SU

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Construction of roads and/or road improvements or other transportation facilities outside the boundaries of the Specific Plan Area but within unincorporated Placer County, subject in some instances to future reimbursement, coordinated by the County, from other fee-paying development projects where the roads or improvements at issue would also serve fee-paying development projects other than RUSP.</li> <li>3. The payment of impact fees to Placer County in amounts that constitute the Project's fair share contributions to the construction of transportation facilities to be built or improved within unincorporated Placer County, consistent with the County's Capital Improvement Program ("CIP").</li> <li>4. The payment of impact fees to the South Placer Regional Transportation Authority ("SPRTA") in amounts that constitute the Project's fair share contribution to the construction of transportation facilities funded through fees collected by the SPRTA for Tier 1 and/or Tier 2 projects.</li> <li>5. The payment of other adopted regional impact fees that would provide improvements to roadways, intersections and/or interchanges that are affected by multiple jurisdictions (e.g., Walerga/Fiddymont/Base Line).</li> <li>6. The payment of impact fees to Placer County in amounts that constitute the Project's fair share contributions to the construction of transportation facilities and/or improvements within the City of Roseville, Sacramento County and/or Sutter County needed in whole or in part because of the Project, to be made available to the City of Roseville, Sacramento County, and/or Sutter County, if and when those jurisdictions and Placer County enter into an enforceable agreement consistent with Placer</li> </ol>	

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>7. Developers of property within the Plan Area shall pay impact fees to Placer County in amounts that constitute the Project's fair share contributions to the construction of transportation facilities and/or improvements on federal or State highways or freeways needed in part because of the Project, to be made available to the California Department of Transportation ("Caltrans") if and when Caltrans and Placer County enter into an enforceable agreement consistent with State law and Placer County General Plan policy 3.A.15(c).</p> <p>8. In pursuing a single agreement or multiple agreements with City of Roseville, Sacramento County, Sutter County, and/or Caltrans, Placer County shall negotiate in good faith with these other jurisdictions to enter into fair and reasonable arrangements with the intention of achieving, within a reasonable time period after approval of the RUSP, commitments for the provision of adequate "fair share" mitigation payments from the Project for its out-of-jurisdiction traffic impacts and its impacts on federal and state freeways and highways.</p> <p>9. If transportation improvements required to be constructed as mitigation are constructed prior to RUSP implementation, the project will pay its fair share portion for those improvements.</p>	
<p><b>6.12-2 The proposed project could increase daily traffic volumes using City of Roseville roadway segments resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under existing plus project conditions.</b></p>	<p>S</p>	<p>6.12-2 The project applicant shall pay its fair share of mitigation costs for the following improvements, as defined in Mitigation Measure 6.12-1.</p> <p>Scenario A Widen Base Line Road from three to four lanes between Fiddyment Road and Foothills Boulevard.</p> <p>Scenario B Widen Pleasant Grove Boulevard from four to six lanes between Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard and Foothills Boulevard.</p>	<p>SU</p>

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		Scenario C Widen Foothills Boulevard from four to six lanes between Base Line Road and Roseville Road. Scenario D Widen Cirby Way from four to six lanes between Roseville Road and Riverside Avenue. The roadway projects recommended in Mitigation Measure 6.12-2A through 6.12-2C are already contained in the City of Roseville CIP because they are needed to accommodate previously approved development in the City and surrounding jurisdictions. The roadway project recommended in Mitigation Measure 6.12-2D has been removed from the City of Roseville CIP by recent City Council action and thus cannot be assumed. The need for these roadway projects could be accelerated with implementation of the RUSP	
<b>6.12-3 The proposed project could increase daily traffic volumes using Sacramento County roadway segments exacerbating unacceptable LOS conditions under existing plus project conditions.</b>	S	6.12-3 The project applicant shall pay its fair share of costs for the following mitigation project as defined in Mitigation Measure 6.12-1. Scenario A Widen Watt Avenue from four to six lanes between Elverta Road and Antelope Road.	SU
<b>6.12-4 The proposed project could increase daily traffic volumes using Caltrans roadway segments exacerbating unacceptable LOS conditions under existing plus project conditions.</b>	S	6.12-4 The project applicant shall pay its fair share of costs for the following mitigation projects as defined in Mitigation Measure 6.12-1. Scenario A-C Widen SR 70/99 from four to six lanes between Sankey Road and Elkhorn Boulevard. Scenario D-E Widen SR 65 from four to six lanes between Pleasant Grove Boulevard and I-80. The project's impact is limited to the SR 65 segment between Pleasant Grove Boulevard and I-80 under existing plus project conditions, but extends to all study segments of SR 65 (Sunset Boulevard to I-80) under cumulative plus project conditions.	SU

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		Scenario F Construct HOV lanes (as currently planned by Caltrans) on I-80 from the Sacramento County line to just west of Rocklin Road. The project's impact is limited to the I-80 segment between SR 65 and Rocklin Road under existing plus project conditions, but extends to all study segments of I-80 under cumulative plus project conditions.  Payment of the applicable regional SPRTA impact fees satisfies the project's fair share responsibility for mitigating impacts to mainline SR 65 (segments D-E above).	
<b>6.12-5 The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Placer County intersections resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under existing plus project conditions.</b>	S	6.12-5 The project applicant shall pay its fair share of costs for the following mitigation projects as defined in Mitigation Measure 6.12-1.  Intersection A.1) Widen Base Line Road from two to four lanes between Watt Avenue and Pleasant Grove Road south (County line) and;; 2) Construct an exclusive westbound right-turn lane and an exclusive eastbound left-turn lane.  Intersection B.1) Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-5A.1 and; 2) Widen Base Line Road from two to six lanes between Fiddymment Road and Watt Avenue and;	LS
		3) Modify the traffic signal and construct the following intersection lanes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eastbound - an exclusive eastbound right-turn lane, three through lanes, and dual left-turn lanes</li> </ul>	

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Westbound – a free-right turn lane, three through lanes that extend through the intersection and taper back to two lanes after a minimum of 1,000 feet, and dual left-turn lanes</li> <li>• Northbound – an exclusive left-turn lane, two through lanes, and an exclusive right-turn lane</li> <li>• Southbound – an exclusive right-turn lane, two through lanes, and dual left-turn lanes</li> </ul> <p>Intersection C.1) Widen Watt Avenue from two to four lanes between Base Line Road and the current four-lane section just south of PFE Road and;</p> <p>2) Install a traffic signal and construct an exclusive southbound left-turn lane and an exclusive northbound right-turn lane.</p> <p>Intersection D.1) Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-5B-2 and;</p> <p>2) Modify the traffic signal and widen the intersection to add the following intersection lanes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eastbound – add a second left-turn lane</li> <li>• Northbound – add a second through lane and an exclusive right-turn lane</li> </ul>	

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Southbound – add a second through lane and convert the right-turn lane to a free movement that becomes the third westbound through lane on Base Line Road as identified in Mitigation Measure 6.12-5B.2. The second through lane should extend south of the intersection a minimum of 500 feet before transitioning back to one lane.</li> </ul> <p>Intersection E.1) Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-5A.1 and;</p> <p>2) Install a traffic signal and construct the following intersection lanes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eastbound – add a second through lane</li> <li>• Westbound – add a second through lane and an exclusive left-turn lane</li> <li>• Northbound – construct exclusive left-turn and right-turn lanes</li> </ul> <p>Intersection F.1) Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-5A.1 and;</p> <p>2) Install a traffic signal and construct the following intersection lanes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eastbound and Westbound – add a second through lane and an exclusive left-turn lane</li> <li>• Northbound – construct an exclusive right-turn lane</li> </ul>	
<p><b>6.12-6 The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using City of Roseville intersections resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under existing plus project conditions.</b></p>	<p>S</p>	<p>6.12-6 The project applicant shall pay its fair share of costs for the following mitigation projects as defined in Mitigation Measure 6.12-1.</p> <p>Intersection A) Install a traffic signal.</p> <p>Intersection B) Install a traffic signal and construct a second westbound left-turn lane.</p>	<p>SU</p>

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		Intersection C) Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-5D. Intersection D) Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-2A and modify the traffic signal. Intersection E) Convert the third westbound through lane to a third left-turn lane. Intersection F) Construct a second westbound left-turn lane. Intersection G) Construct a third northbound left-turn lane. Intersection H) Add a third northbound through lane, construct a second northbound left-turn lane, and convert the eastbound right-turn lane with overlap phasing.	
<b>6.12-7 The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Sutter County intersections resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under existing plus project conditions.</b>	S	6.12-7 The project applicant shall pay its fair share of costs for the following mitigation projects as defined in Mitigation Measure 6.12-1. Intersection A.1) Install a traffic signal and construct exclusive left turn lanes for the eastbound and westbound approaches; 2) Widen Riego Road from two to four lanes between Pleasant Grove (south) and SR 70/99 and remove the stop signs on the eastbound and westbound approaches and construct an exclusive westbound left-turn lane and an exclusive eastbound left-turn lane. Intersection B.1) Install a traffic signal and construct exclusive left turn lanes for the eastbound and southbound approaches, 2) Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-7A.2 and remove the stop signs on the eastbound and westbound approaches, and construct an exclusive eastbound left-turn lane.	SU

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>6.12-8</b> The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Sacramento County intersections, resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under existing plus project conditions.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>6.12-8 The project applicant shall pay its fair share of costs for the following mitigation projects as defined in Mitigation Measure 6.12-1.                      Intersection A.1) Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-3A and;                      2) Modify the traffic signal and widen the intersection to accommodate a second southbound left-turn lane.</p>	<p>SU</p>
<p><b>6.12-9</b> The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Caltrans intersections resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under existing plus project conditions.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>6.12-9 The project applicant shall pay its fair share of costs for the following mitigation projects as defined in Mitigation Measure 6.12-1.                      Intersection A) Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-4A.                      Intersection B) Re-stripe the northbound approach ramp to include an exclusive left-turn lane, a shared left-turn/right-turn lane, and an exclusive right-turn lane.</p>	<p>SU</p>
<p><b>6.12-10</b> The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Caltrans ramp junctions resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under existing plus project conditions.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>6.12-10 The project applicant shall pay its fair share of costs for the following mitigation projects as defined in Mitigation Measure 6.12-1.                      Ramp A.1) Extend the acceleration lane 100 feet or the minimum length required by Caltrans to meet required design standards. While the ramp junction analysis shows that an additional 100 feet of acceleration distance is sufficient to mitigate the project's incremental impact, Caltrans may require a longer distance or other improvement to meet applicable design standards. Also, this improvement would occur on a bridge structure that may not be feasible to re-stripe or to expand, or                      2) Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-4D-E.</p>	<p>SU</p>

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		Ramp B.1) Extend the deceleration lane 50 feet or the minimum length required by Caltrans to meet required design standards. While the ramp junction analysis shows that an additional 50 feet of deceleration distance is sufficient to mitigate the project's incremental impact, Caltrans may require a longer distance or other improvement such as a two-lane off-ramp or a continuous auxiliary lane between Pleasant Grove Boulevard and Galleria Boulevard to meet applicable design standards; or  2) Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-4D-E.  Ramp C.1) Extend the acceleration lane 100 feet or the minimum length required by Caltrans to meet required design standards. While the ramp junction analysis shows that an additional 100 feet of acceleration distance is sufficient to mitigate the project's incremental impact, Caltrans may require a longer distance or other improvement such as a continuous auxiliary lane between Pleasant Grove Boulevard and Galleria Boulevard to meet applicable design standards, or;  2) Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-4D-E.	

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		Ramp D.1) Extend the deceleration lane 50 feet or the minimum length required by Caltrans to meet required design standards. (Note: While the ramp junction analysis shows that an additional 50 feet of deceleration distance is sufficient to mitigate the project's incremental impact, Caltrans may require a longer distance or other improvement such as a two-lane off-ramp to meet applicable design standards); or  2) Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-4F. (Note: Constructing the HOV lanes currently planned by Caltrans through the I-80/SR 65 interchange area would reduce the mainline mixed-flow volume at the westbound I-80 off-ramp to northbound SR 65, resulting in improved ramp junction operations).	
<b>6.12-11 The proposed project could generate substantial vehicle traffic flows before and after special events at the stadium that may exceed the typical weekday peak hour operational capacity of the local and regional roadways.</b>	S	6.12-11 The college, university, or special event sponsor shall be required to prepare a traffic control plan for each "type" of special event (i.e., college football games). The traffic control plans shall be subject to County approval prior to any special events taking place. For regularly scheduled events, this mitigation only requires one traffic control plan that can be repeatedly used. Unique special events will require their own independent traffic control plans subject to County review and approval prior to the event  The traffic control plans shall contain the following elements. 1) Identification of locations requiring traffic control officers and turn lane prohibitions. 2) Specifications for traffic control officer qualifications.	SU

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		3) Identification of special traffic lane treatments including the use of traffic cones to delineate two lanes in each direction on University Boulevard between 8 <sup>th</sup> Street and 16 <sup>th</sup> Street. Special treatments may also be required on 16 <sup>th</sup> Street. 4) Identification of specific bicycle and pedestrian routes to the stadium, especially pedestrian routes from designated parking areas. 5) Identification of advanced signing for circulation and parking. The college, university, or special event sponsor shall be responsible for implementing all elements of the traffic control plan required by Placer County unless the County decides otherwise. In addition, the following items shall be provided for each event. 1) Maps and information showing circulation and parking options shall be included with all ticket sales and available through a web site. 2) Shuttle or transit service to the event, which is coordinated with Placer County Transit and/or City of Roseville Transit.	
<b>6.12-12 The proposed project could generate vehicle parking demand that may exceed available supply during special events at the stadium.</b>	S	6.12-12 The project applicant or developer shall prepare, and submit to Placer County for approval, a University Master Plan that includes a detailed parking plan for special event conditions. The parking plan shall identify sufficient parking to accommodate projected demand for varying types of events and levels of attendance up to and including a sold-out event. The college, university, or special event sponsor shall be responsible for implementing all elements of the parking plan required by Placer County unless the County decides otherwise.	SU

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>6.12-13</b> The proposed project could increase daily traffic volumes using City of Roseville roadway segments resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>6.12-13 The project applicant shall pay its fair share of mitigation costs as defined in Mitigation Measure 6.12-1.  Segment A-H) Implement Mitigation Measures 6.12-3 and 6.12-4. In addition, construct Placer Parkway as a four-lane freeway between SR 65 and SR 70/99, connect Watt Avenue as four lanes to Blue Oaks Boulevard, and widen Watt Avenue from four to six lanes between Base Line Road and Elverta Road.</p>	<p>SU</p>
<p><b>6.12-14</b> The proposed project could increase daily traffic volumes using Sacramento County roadway segments resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>6.12-14 The project applicant shall pay its fair share of mitigation costs as defined in Mitigation Measure 6.12-1.  Segment A-B) Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-13.</p>	<p>SU</p>
<p><b>6.12-15</b> The proposed project could increase daily traffic volumes using Caltrans roadway segments exacerbating unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>6.12-15 The project applicant shall pay its fair share of mitigation costs as defined in Mitigation Measure 6.12-1.  Segment A-J) Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-13.</p>	<p>SU</p>
<p><b>6.12-16</b> The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Placer County intersections resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>6.12-16 The project applicant shall pay its fair share of mitigation costs as defined in Mitigation Measure 6.12-1.  Intersection A-C) Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-13. Intersection D) Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-13 and add a second northbound left-turn lane.</p>	<p>SU</p>
<p><b>6.12-17</b> The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using City of Roseville intersections resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>6.12-17 The project applicant shall pay its fair share of mitigation costs as defined in Mitigation Measure 6.12-1.  Intersection A-H) Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-13. Intersection C) Add a fourth through lane to the eastbound and westbound approaches.</p>	<p>SU</p>

LS = Less than Significant  
PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		Intersection H) Convert second eastbound through lane to a shared right-through lane.	
6.12-18 The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Sutter County intersections resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions.	S	6.12-18 The project applicant shall pay its fair share of mitigation costs as defined in Mitigation Measure 6.12-1. Intersection A) Implement Mitigation Measures 6.12-13 and add a second southbound left-turn lane.	SU
6.12-19 The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Sacramento County intersections resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions.	S	6.12-19 The project applicant shall pay its fair share of mitigation costs as defined in Mitigation Measure 6.12-1. Intersection A) Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-13 and add a third through lane on the eastbound and westbound approaches of the intersection. Intersection B) Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-13.	SU
6.12-20 The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Caltrans intersections resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions.	S	6.12-20 The project applicant shall pay its fair share of mitigation costs as defined in Mitigation Measure 6.12-1. Intersection A-B) Implement Mitigation Measures 6.12-13.	SU
6.12-21 The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Caltrans ramp junctions resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions.	S	6.12-21 The project applicant shall pay its fair share of mitigation costs as defined in Mitigation Measure 6.12-1. Ramp A-Q) Implement Mitigation Measure 6.12-13. Ramp J) Construct a continuous auxiliary lane from SR 65 eastbound on-ramp to the Rocklin Road eastbound off-ramp. Ramp K) Construct a second off-ramp lane to SR 65 that will become the third northbound through lane on SR 65. This would include a 1,300 ft auxiliary lane on I-80 (see Figure 6.12-30A).	SU

LS = Less than Significant  
PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>6.12-22</b> The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Roseville CIP intersections resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under 2020 conditions plus the RUSP with an extension of Watt Avenue to the project site.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>6.12-22 The project applicant shall pay its fair share of mitigation costs as defined in Mitigation Measure 6.12-1.</p> <p>Intersection A) Modify the traffic signal to split-phase and provide the following intersection turn lanes on Antelope Creek Drive.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eastbound – two left-turn lanes, one through/left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane</li> <li>• Westbound – two left-turn lanes, one through/left-turn lane, and one right-turn lane</li> </ul> <p>Intersection B) Modify the traffic signal and construct the following turn lanes at the Washington Boulevard/Pleasant Grove Boulevard intersection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Northbound – two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane</li> <li>• Eastbound – two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and one right-turn lane</li> <li>• Westbound – two left-turn lanes, four through lanes, and one right-turn lane</li> </ul>	<p>SU</p>
<p><b>6.12-23</b> The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Roseville CIP intersections resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under 2020 conditions plus the RUSP with an extension of Watt Avenue to Blue Oaks Boulevard.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>6.12-23 The project applicant shall pay its fair share of mitigation costs as defined in Mitigation Measure 6.12-1.</p> <p>Intersection A) No physical mitigation available due to right-of-way constraints. This finding was confirmed with City of Roseville Public Works Department staff.</p> <p>Intersection B) Modify the traffic signal to split-phase and construct the following turn lanes on Antelope Creek Drive.</p>	<p>SU</p>

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eastbound – two left-turn lanes, one through/left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane</li> <li>• Westbound – two left-turn lanes, one through/left-turn lane, and one right-turn lane</li> </ul> <p>Intersection C) No physical mitigation available due to right-of-way constraints. This finding was confirmed with City of Roseville Public Works Department staff.</p> <p>Intersection D) Modify the traffic signal and construct the following turn lanes on Foothills Boulevard.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Northbound – two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and one right-turn lane</li> <li>• Southbound – two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and one right-turn lane</li> </ul> <p>Intersection E) Widen Blue Oaks Boulevard from six to eight lanes between Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard and SR 65.</p> <p>Intersection F) Modify the traffic signal and construct the following turn lanes at the Washington Boulevard/Pleasant Grove Boulevard intersection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Northbound – two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane</li> <li>• Eastbound – two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and one right-turn lane</li> <li>• Westbound – two left-turn lanes, four through lanes, and one right-turn lane</li> </ul>	

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>6.12-24</b> The proposed project could increase demand for public transit service beyond that currently planned and may result in unmet transit needs.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>6.12-24 The project applicant shall contribute its fair share of the cost to provide public transit service to the study area as determined by Placer County through participation in a benefit or assessment district or through a separate agreement between the applicant and Placer County consistent with Mitigation Measure 6.12-1. At a minimum, service is expected to include the following components.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fixed-route bus service connecting the plan area to City of Roseville and Placer County transit with a minimum of hourly headways and a maximum of 15-minute headways added in peak periods.</li> <li>• Demand-responsive service meeting ADA paratransit requirements within the plan area.</li> <li>• Peak period (a.m. and p.m.) weekday commuter bus service to downtown Sacramento.</li> <li>• Costs shall include the capital costs of transit vehicles and facilities as well as the operating and maintenance cost of the service beyond what will be paid for through the transportation development act (TDA) funding.</li> </ul>	<p>SU</p>
<p><b>6.12-25</b> The proposed project could increase demand for non-motorized travel.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p><b>6.12-26</b> Mitigation measures implemented to reduce transportation impacts could adversely affect traffic in other jurisdictions.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>6.12-26 Placer County shall coordinate with the City of Roseville, Sacramento County, Sutter County and Caltrans to ensure that roadway improvements implemented in whole or in part as mitigation for the proposed project are designed to minimize impacts on existing and future roadways and intersections according to the LOS policies of affected jurisdictions.</p>	<p>SU</p>
<p><b>6.12-27</b> Mitigation measures implemented to reduce transportation impacts could adversely affect the natural environment.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>6.12.27 Implement the following Mitigation Measures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6.2-1, which requires mitigation for the loss of agricultural land in the County for agricultural land converted by the Regional University Specific Plan;</li> </ul>	<p>SU</p>

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6.3-1 and 6.3-2, which require dust control and measures to reduce air pollutant emissions;</li> <li>• 6.4-1 through 6.4-8, which require surveys for special status species and their habitat, habitat avoidance and compensation where needed, and protection of nesting raptors;</li> <li>• 6.5-1, 6.5-2, and 6.5-3, which describe the proper handling of discovered prehistoric or historic resources, human remains, and paleontological resources if they are discovered during construction;</li> <li>• 6.7-4, which uses existing Phase I Site Assessments to identify potential contamination, and specifies how to handle potential hazards to minimize the risk of exposure.</li> <li>• 6.8-1(a) - (d) and 6.8-3(a), which require site-specific drainage studies and ensure that project flows can be accommodated by storm drainage infrastructure and reduce the risk of flooding;</li> <li>• 6.9-2, which limits the hours during which grading can occur.</li> </ul>	
<b>6.13 Climate Change</b>			
<p><b>6.13-1 Development of the RUSP could potentially result in a cumulatively considerable incremental contribution to the significant cumulative impact of global climate change.</b></p>	S	<p>6.13-1 a) Implement Mitigation Measure 6.3-4(a), establishing guidelines for County review of future project-specific submittals for non-residential development within the Specific Plan area in order to reduce generation of air pollutants.</p> <p>b) Implement Mitigation Measure 6.3-4(b), requiring incorporation of passive solar building design and landscaping conducive to passive solar energy use.</p> <p>c) Implement Mitigation Measure 6.3-4(c), requiring measures to promote bicycle usage.</p>	SU

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>d) The following measures shall be used singularly or in combination to accomplish an overall reduction of 10 to 20% in residential energy consumption relative to the requirements of State of California Title 24:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of air conditioning systems that are more efficient than Title 24 requirements;</li> <li>• Use of high-efficiency heating and other appliances, such as water heaters, cooking equipment, refrigerators, and furnaces;</li> <li>• Installation of photovoltaic rooftop energy systems where feasible; and</li> <li>• Establishment of tree-planting guidelines that require residents to plant trees to shade buildings primarily on the west and south sides of the buildings. Use of deciduous trees (to allow solar gain during the winter) and direct shading of air conditioning systems shall be included in the guidelines.</li> </ul> <p>e) Transit usage and ride sharing shall be promoted by requiring participation in the development of a regional transit system at such time as a system is established and set-asides of land for park-and ride facilities. Fair share participation may consist of dedication of right-of-way, easements, capital improvements, and/or other methods of participation deemed appropriate. In addition, future project design shall ensure that an adequate number of developers in the plan area provide reservations for future installations of bus turnouts and passenger benches and shelters, to be installed at such time as transit service is established and as demand and service routes warrant. Transit centers shall be connected with the Class I bicycle trail. A public transit development fee shall be required for all development projects. The amount of this fee</p>	

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>shall be based upon the traffic generation potential of each project. A dial-a-ride transportation system shall be established to reduce individual vehicle trips and establish data for the eventual formation of a transit system within the plan area.</p> <p>In addition, the applicant or its successor(s) in interest shall provide each home and business with an information packet that will contain, at a minimum, the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commute options: to inform plan area occupants of the alternative travel amenities provided, including ridesharing and public transit availability/schedules;</li> <li>• Maps showing plan area pedestrian, bicycle, and equestrian paths to community centers, shopping areas, employment areas, schools, parks, and recreation areas; and</li> <li>• Information regarding PCAPCD programs to reduce county-wide emissions.</li> </ul> <p>f) Developers of both public and private schools shall be encouraged to incorporate the following measures into the design, construction, and operation of school buildings and facilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Install bicycle lockers and racks at all appropriate locations;</li> <li>• Post signage prohibiting the idling of diesel vehicles for longer than five minutes;</li> <li>• Construct at least one bus stop at a convenient location to be used for either fixed route service within the plan area or commuter service;</li> <li>• Provide a community notice board and information kiosk with information about community events, ride-sharing, and commute alternatives;</li> </ul>	

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide preferential parking for carpools and hybrid vehicles (vehicles with self-charging electric engines); and</li> <li>• Incorporate solar water heating systems and HVAC PremAir or similar catalyst systems in building design.</li> </ul> <p>g) The following measures shall be incorporated into the design, construction, and operation of public park areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The pedestrian/bikeway (P/B) master plan shall provide at least one Class I linkage to all school sites;</li> <li>• Additional Class I and II linkages shall be provided to provide convenient access to/from the park sites;</li> <li>• Install bicycle lockers and racks at all appropriate locations; and</li> <li>• Provide a community notice board and information kiosk with information about community events, ride-sharing, and commute alternatives.</li> </ul> <p>h) Prohibit open burning throughout the plan area. Include this prohibition in any project CC&amp;Rs that are established.</p> <p>i) Implement Mitigation Measures 6.12-1 through 6.12-26 to ease traffic congestion, in order to provide a pedestrian and bicycle-safe transportation and circulatory system within the Plan Area, thereby increasing the chance that residents will walk and ride within the RUSP.</p>	

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>j) Placer County and the project applicant shall work together to publish and distribute an Energy Resource Conservation Guide describing measures individuals can take to increase energy efficiency and conservation. The applicant shall provide a portion of the funding necessary to prepare the Guide, along with the developers of other projects in the region. The Energy Resource Conservation Guide shall be updated every 5 years and distributed at the public permit counter.</li> <li>k) The project applicants shall pay for an initial installment of Light Emitting Diode (LED) traffic lights in all Plan Area traffic lights.</li> <li>l) The project applicants and Placer County shall jointly develop a tree planting informational packet to help project area residents understand their options for planting trees that can absorb carbon dioxide.</li> <li>m) Prioritized parking within commercial and retail areas shall be given to electric vehicles, hybrid vehicles, and alternative fuel vehicles.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>6.13-2 The impacts of global climate change on water supply and availability could affect future water supply and availability in the Plan Area.</b></p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>NA</p>

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>6.14 Water Supply</b>			
<p><b>6.14-1 The water demand resulting from the proposed project could result in insufficient entitlements to surface water or exceed sustainable yield of groundwater supplies.</b></p>	PS	<p>6.14-1 a) Prior to approval of any small lot tentative subdivision map for a proposed residential project of more than 500 dwelling units, the County shall comply with Government Code section 66473.7. Prior to approval of any small lot tentative subdivision map for a proposed residential project of 500 or fewer units, the County need not comply with section 66473.7, or formally consult with PCWA or other public water system, but shall nevertheless make a factual showing or impose conditions similar to those required by section 66473.7 in order to ensure an adequate water supply for development authorized by the map. Prior to recordation of any final subdivision map, or prior to County approval of any similar project-specific discretionary approval or entitlement required for non-residential uses, the applicant shall demonstrate the availability of a long-term, reliable water supply from a public water system for the amount of development that would be authorized by the final subdivision map or project-specific discretionary nonresidential approval or entitlement. Such a demonstration shall consist of a written certification from the water service provider that either existing sources are available or that needed improvements will be in place prior to occupancy.</p> <p>b) The Specific Plan proponents shall, prior to the approval and recordation of the first small lot final subdivision map, prepare and submit a water conservation plan for review and approval by the Placer County Planning Department and PCWA. The plan shall identify specific measures that shall be implemented as part of the Specific Plan, supported by documentation of the estimated water savings to be anticipated through implementation of the conservation measures.</p>	LS

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 3-1

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>c) Prior to approval of any small lot tentative subdivision map or similar project level discretionary approval for land uses that do not require a tentative subdivision map, the Placer County Water Agency (PCWA) shall perform an analysis of the remaining wheeling capacity in the City of Roseville's system. This analysis shall consider all of the previously committed demand to Morgan Creek, Placer Vineyards, Regional University or other projects within southwest Placer County that rely on water conveyed through City of Roseville facilities and/or pursuant to the wheeling agreement between the City of Roseville and PCWA, as amended from time to time. The analysis shall be submitted to both the County and the City of Roseville. The County shall confirm with PCWA that uncommitted capacity remains to wheel the required amount of PCWA-supplied water to the Specific Plan area prior to approval of discretionary actions. In the event sufficient uncommitted capacity does not exist, the County shall not grant the proposed tentative subdivision map or other project level discretionary approval until the County determines that a water supply not dependent on water from PCWA that is wheeled through the Roseville system becomes available for the area at issue.</p> <p>d) Prior to approval of any small lot tentative subdivision map or similar project level discretionary approval for land uses that do not require a tentative subdivision map, the PCWA shall show that total RUSP groundwater withdrawal will be limited to less than 2,440 AFA for the entire Plan Area.</p>	
<p>6.14-2 The water demand resulting from the proposed project could result in the construction or expansion of existing facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>NA</p>

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**TABLE 3-1**

**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
6.14-3 The proposed project, in combination with other development projects in western Placer County, could result in cumulative impacts from curtailment of development due to shortfalls in water supplies.	LS	None required.	NA
6.14-4 The water demand resulting from the proposed project, in combination with other development served by PCWA, could result in insufficient entitlements to surface water and exceed sustainable yield of groundwater supplies.	LS	None required.	NA
6.14-5 The water demand resulting from the proposed project, in combination with other development, may result in the construction or expansion of existing facilities.	S	6.14-5 Implement Mitigation Measure 6.14-1.	LS

LS = Less than Significant  
 PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
 NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
 NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**TABLE 7-1  
COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES**

Impact	Proposed Project (After Mitigation)	Alternative 1 No Project/ No Development	Alternative 2: Reduced Units/ Same Development Footprint	Alternative 3: Reduced Units/ Reduced Development Footprint	Alternative 4: Same Units/ Reduced Development Footprint	Alternative 5: SACOG/ Blueprint Increased Units/ Same Development Footprint
<b>6.1 AESTHETICS</b>						
6.1-1 Development of the proposed project could be incompatible with the agricultural character of the natural landscape in the project site and its surrounding areas.	SU	NI(-)	SU(=)	SU(=)	SU(=)	SU(=)
6.1-2 Development of the proposed project could introduce new source of light and glare to the specific plan and surrounding areas, which could contribute to the discomfort glare or disability glare experienced by adjacent residences and other uses.	SU	NI(-)	SU(=)	SU(=)	SU(=)	SU(=)
6.1-3 The proposed project, in combination with other cumulative development in west Placer County, could be incompatible with the agricultural character of the natural landscape in the project site and its surrounding areas.	SU	NI(-)	SU(=)	SU(=)	SU(=)	SU(=)
6.1-4 The proposed project, in combination with other cumulative development in west Placer County, could contribute to sky glow and diminished views of the night sky experienced by residents of west Placer County.	SU	NI(-)	SU(=)	SU(=)	SU(=)	SU(=)
<b>6.2 AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES</b>						
6.2-1 The proposed project could convert Important Farmland (Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Local Importance) as defined in the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program to non-agricultural uses.	SU	NI(-)	SU(=)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(=)
6.2-2 The proposed project could create potential conflicts with County goals, policies, and standards that may lead to physical impacts on the environment.	SU	NI(-)	SU(=)	LS(-)	LS(-)	SU(=)
6.2-3 The proposed project could conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or with a Williamson Act contract.	SU	NI(-)	SU(=)	LS(-)	LS(-)	SU(=)

LS = Less than Significant  
PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**TABLE 7-1  
COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES**

Impact	Proposed Project (After Mitigation)	Alternative 1 No Project/ No Development	Alternative 2: Reduced Units/ Same Development Footprint	Alternative 3: Reduced Units/ Reduced Development Footprint	Alternative 4: Same Units/ Reduced Development Footprint	Alternative 5: SACOG/ Blueprint Increased Units/ Same Development Footprint
6.2-4 The proposed project, in conjunction with other development in Placer County, could convert Important Farmland (Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Local Importance) as defined in the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, to non-agricultural uses.	SU	NI(-)	SU(=)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(=)
6.2-5 The proposed project, in conjunction with other development in Placer County, could create potential conflicts with County goals, policies, and standards that may lead to physical impacts on the environment.	SU	NI(-)	SU(=)	LS(-)	LS(-)	SU(=)
6.2-6 The proposed project, in conjunction with other development in west Placer County, could conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or with a Williamson Act contract.	SU	NI(-)	SU(=)	LS(-)	LS(-)	SU(=)
<b>6.3 AIR QUALITY</b>						
6.3-1 The proposed project could generate PM <sub>10</sub> through land-clearing and other earth-moving activities during construction.	SU	NI(-)	SU(=)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(=)
6.3-2 The proposed project could generate emissions of ROG, NO <sub>x</sub> , and CO during construction.	SU	NI(-)	SU(=)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(=)
6.3-3 The proposed project could generate PM <sub>2.5</sub> through the use of heavy-duty equipment during construction.	SU	NI(-)	SU(=)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(=)
6.3-4 The proposed project's long-term operational emissions could exceed PCAPCD thresholds of significance for PM <sub>10</sub> , ROG, NO <sub>x</sub> , and CO.	SU	NI(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(=)	SU(+)
6.3-5 CO concentrations could exceed the CAAQS at any intersections as a result of the proposed project.	LS	NI(-)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(=)	LS(+)
6.3-6 The proposed project could expose receptors to unhealthy levels of TAC.	LS	NI(-)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(=)	LS(+)
6.3-7 The proposed project could expose sensitive receptors to objectionable odors.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.3-8 Future residents, employees, and students in the Plan Area could be exposed to pesticide spray drift from adjacent agricultural operations.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(=)

LS = Less than Significant  
PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**TABLE 7-1  
COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES**

Impact	Proposed Project (After Mitigation)	Alternative 1 No Project/ No Development	Alternative 2: Reduced Units/ Same Development Footprint	Alternative 3: Reduced Units/ Reduced Development Footprint	Alternative 4: Same Units/ Reduced Development Footprint	Alternative 5: SACOG/ Blueprint Increased Units/ Same Development Footprint
6.3-9 Construction of the proposed project, in combination with other construction and agricultural activities in the vicinity of the Plan Area, could add to cumulative levels of PM <sub>10</sub> during construction.	SU	NI(-)	SU(=)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(=)
6.3-10 Construction of the proposed project, in combination with other sources of criteria pollutants in the region, could temporarily add to criteria pollutant levels in the air basin.	SU	NI(-)	SU(=)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(=)
6.3-11 The proposed project could contribute to cumulative levels of PM <sub>2.5</sub> .	SU	NI(-)	SU(=)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(=)
6.3-12 The proposed project's long-term operational emissions could add to the cumulative levels of criteria pollutant levels in the air basin.	SU	NI(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(=)	SU(+)
6.3-13 CO emissions from operation of the proposed project could contribute to significant cumulative CO levels.	LS	NI(-)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(=)	LS(+)
<b>6.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>						
6.4-1 Development of the proposed project, including off-site infrastructure, could result in the conversion of the project site to another use, which could affect the availability of habitat and biological function.	SU	NI(-)	SU(=)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(=)
6.4-2 The proposed project could result in the filling or adverse modification of jurisdictional wetlands, non-jurisdictional wetlands, and other "waters of the U.S."	SU	NI(-)	SU(=)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(=)
6.4-3 Development of the proposed project could result in the loss of special-status vernal pool crustacean and amphibian species and degradation and/or loss of their habitat.	SU	NI(-)	SU(=)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(=)
6.4-4 The proposed project could result in the loss and/or degradation of rare plant populations.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(=)
6.4-5 Construction of the proposed project could result in loss of valley elderberry longhorn beetles and their habitat.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(=)
6.4-6 The proposed project could result in the loss and/or degradation of western pond turtles and their habitat.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(=)
6.4-7 The proposed project could result in the direct loss or disturbance of nesting birds, including burrowing owls and raptors (birds-of-prey).	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(=)

LS = Less than Significant  
PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**TABLE 7-1  
COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES**

Impact	Proposed Project (After Mitigation)	Alternative 1 No Project/ No Development	Alternative 2: Reduced Units/ Same Development Footprint	Alternative 3: Reduced Units/ Reduced Development Footprint	Alternative 4: Same Units/ Reduced Development Footprint	Alternative 5: SACOG/ Blueprint Increased Units/ Same Development Footprint
6.4-8 The proposed project could result in the loss of foraging habitat for Swainson's hawk, white tailed kite, burrowing owl, and other raptors.	SU	NI(-)	SU(=)	LS(-)	LS(-)	SU(=)
6.4-9 The proposed project could result in loss of nesting habitat for non-raptor special-status bird species.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(=)
6.4-10 The proposed project could result in the modification of on-site drainages, disrupting the associated habitat.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(=)
6.4-11 Development of the proposed project could result in the loss of bat roosting habitat.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.4-12 Development of the proposed project could result in habitat fragmentation and wildlife population isolation.	SU	NI(-)	SU(=)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(=)
6.4-13 Construction of the proposed project, in combination with other development in the county, could contribute to the loss of native plant communities, wildlife habitat values, special-status species and their potential habitat, and wetland resources in the region.	SU	NI(-)	SU(=)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(=)
<b>6.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>						
6.5-1 The proposed project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource or an historical resource as defined in Section 21083.2 of CEQA and Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines.	PSU	NI(-)	PSU(=)	PSU(-)	PSU(-)	PSU(=)
6.5-2 The proposed project could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(=)
6.5-3 The proposed project could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(=)
6.5-4 The proposed project, in combination with other development in the Sacramento region, could adversely affect unique archaeological resources or historical resources as defined in Section 21083.2 of CEQA and Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines.	SU	NI(-)	SU(=)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(=)

LS = Less than Significant  
PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**TABLE 7-1  
COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES**

Impact	Proposed Project (After Mitigation)	Alternative 1 No Project/ No Development	Alternative 2: Reduced Units/ Same Development Footprint	Alternative 3: Reduced Units/ Reduced Development Footprint	Alternative 4: Same Units/ Reduced Development Footprint	Alternative 5: SACOG/ Blueprint Increased Units/ Same Development Footprint
6.5-5 The proposed project, in combination with other development in the Sacramento region, could adversely affect human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(=)
6.5-6 The proposed project, in combination with other development in Placer County, could adversely affect unique paleontological resources.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(=)
<b>6.6 GEOLOGY</b>						
6.6-1 The proposed project could expose people or structures to fault rupture.	NI	NI(-)	NI(=)	NI(=)	NI(=)	NI(=)
6.6-2 The proposed project could expose people or structures to strong seismic groundshaking.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.6-3 The proposed project could expose people or structures to landslides.	NI	NI(-)	NI(=)	NI(=)	NI(=)	NI(=)
6.6-4 Construction activities resulting in ground disturbance have the potential to result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil as well as topographic alterations.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.6-5 Construction of the proposed project on expansive soils could result in potential impacts to foundations, structures, roadways, and other near surface improvements.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.6-6 New development on the project site could be exposed to unstable soil conditions.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.6-7 The proposed project could result in the loss of, or loss of access to, mineral resources identified in a Mineral Resource Zone by the California Geological Survey.	NI	NI(-)	NI(=)	NI(=)	NI(=)	NI(=)
6.6-8 Cumulative development in Placer County, including the proposed project, could expose people and structures to hazards associated with seismic groundshaking.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.6-9 Cumulative development in Placer County, including the proposed project, could result in erosion and topsoil loss.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)

LS = Less than Significant  
PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**TABLE 7-1  
COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES**

Impact	Proposed Project (After Mitigation)	Alternative 1 No Project/ No Development	Alternative 2: Reduced Units/ Same Development Footprint	Alternative 3: Reduced Units/ Reduced Development Footprint	Alternative 4: Same Units/ Reduced Development Footprint	Alternative 5: SACOG/ Blueprint Increased Units/ Same Development Footprint
6.6-10 Cumulative development in Placer County, including the proposed project, could be constructed on expansive soils or soils that could become unstable.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
<b>6.7 HAZARDS</b>						
6.7-1 Construction of the proposed project could involve the use, storage, and transportation of hazardous materials, which could be a safety hazard for people living and working within the Plan Area.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.7-2 Operation of the University campus and commercial land uses in the Plan Area could involve the use, storage, and transportation of hazardous materials, which could be a safety hazard for people living and working within the Plan Area.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.7-3 In the future, the project site could be included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 or could pose a risk from other hazardous releases and, therefore, may pose a significant hazard to the public or the environment.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.7-4 Recycled water from the PGWWTP could be used to irrigate publicly accessible areas such as landscaped parks and roadway medians.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.7-5 The project could include development where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas, which could present a safety hazard.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.7-6 The proposed project could be located near a private airstrip and could create a safety hazard for people residing or working within the Plan Area.	NI	NI(=)	NI(=)	NI(=)	NI(=)	NI(=)
6.7-7 The development of the Plan Area could physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.7-8 The proposed project could include stormwater basins and open channels that could provide breeding opportunities for mosquitoes.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)

LS = Less than Significant  
PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**TABLE 7-1  
COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES**

Impact	Proposed Project (After Mitigation)	Alternative 1 No Project/ No Development	Alternative 2: Reduced Units/ Same Development Footprint	Alternative 3: Reduced Units/ Reduced Development Footprint	Alternative 4: Same Units/ Reduced Development Footprint	Alternative 5: SACOG/ Blueprint Increased Units/ Same Development Footprint
6.7-9 Cumulative development, including the proposed project, could expose people and the environment to hazards and hazardous materials through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.7-10 Cumulative development, including the proposed project, could expose people to hazards associated with soil or groundwater contamination.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.7-11 The proposed project, in combination with other development in south Placer County, could increase the use of recycled water for irrigation in publicly accessible areas.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.7-12 Cumulative development, including the proposed project, could result in a cumulative increase in the number of people and structures that could be exposed to wildland fire hazards.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.7-13 Cumulative development, including the proposed project, could result in a cumulative increase in the number of people and structures that could be exposed to aircraft hazards.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.7-14 Cumulative development, including the proposed project, could temporarily affect local roadway emergency access routes during construction activities, but there could be no long-term or permanent changes in emergency routes or access.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.7-15 The proposed project, in combination with other development in south Placer County, could result in an increase in the extent of new or improved stormwater basins that could temporarily store water. The basins could provide breeding opportunities for mosquitoes. Cumulative development could also increase the number of people who could be exposed to mosquito hazards.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
<b>6.8 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</b>						
6.8-1 The proposed project could increase peak runoff rates and volumes which could exceed the capacity of local drainages and result in on- and off-site flooding hazards.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(=)

LS = Less than Significant  
PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**TABLE 7-1  
COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES**

Impact	Proposed Project (After Mitigation)	Alternative 1 No Project/ No Development	Alternative 2: Reduced Units/ Same Development Footprint	Alternative 3: Reduced Units/ Reduced Development Footprint	Alternative 4: Same Units/ Reduced Development Footprint	Alternative 5: SACOG/ Blueprint Increased Units/ Same Development Footprint
6.8-2 The proposed project could increase the amount (volume) of stormwater which could exceed the capacity of Curry Creek, exacerbating on- or off-site flooding.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(=)
6.8-3 The proposed off-site infrastructure improvement areas could increase impervious surfaces which could affect stormwater runoff rates and volumes.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.8-4 The proposed project could increase the amount (volume) of treated wastewater discharged into Pleasant Grove Creek which could exceed the capacity of the creek, exacerbating on- or off-site flooding during the 100-year storm event.	LS	NI(-)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(=)
6.8-5 The proposed project could construct residences and other structures within the pre-construction 100-year FEMA flood, potentially exposing people and structures to flooding.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.8-6 Construction activities for the proposed project could result in sediment and other construction-related pollutants entering local drainages.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(=)
6.8-7 Implementation of the proposed project could result in urban pollutants entering local drainages, which could exceed or violate water quality standards.	LS	NI(-)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(+)
6.8-8 The proposed project, in combination with the buildout in the Curry Creek watershed, could result in stormwater peak flows that could result in on- or off-site flooding.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(=)
6.8-9 The proposed project, in combination with the buildout of the Placer County and City of Roseville General Plan, could result in stormwater volumes that could result in on- or off-site flooding.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(=)
6.8-10 The proposed project, in combination with the buildout of Placer County and the City of Roseville General Plans, could result in degradation of water quality from stormwater runoff.	SU	NI(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(+)

LS = Less than Significant  
PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**TABLE 7-1  
COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES**

Impact	Proposed Project (After Mitigation)	Alternative 1 No Project/ No Development	Alternative 2: Reduced Units/ Same Development Footprint	Alternative 3: Reduced Units/ Reduced Development Footprint	Alternative 4: Same Units/ Reduced Development Footprint	Alternative 5: SACOG/ Blueprint Increased Units/ Same Development Footprint
6.8-11 The proposed project, in combination with the buildout of Placer County and the City of Roseville General Plans, could result in the construction of residences and other structures within the 100-year FEMA flood zone.	SU	NI(-)	SU(=)	SU(=)	SU(=)	SU(=)
6.8-12 The proposed project, in combination with buildout of Placer County and City of Roseville General Plans within the Pleasant Grove Creek watershed, could result in an incremental increase in the amount (volume) of treated wastewater discharged to Pleasant Grove Creek. This could exceed the capacity of the creek and exacerbate on- or off-site flooding during the 100-year storm event.	LS	NI(-)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(=)	LS(+)
6.8-13 The proposed project, in combination with the buildout of Urban Growth Areas that could be served by the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant, could result in degradation of water quality from increased wastewater discharge to Pleasant Grove Creek.	LS	NI(-)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(=)	LS(+)
<b>6.9 NOISE</b>						
6.9-1 Construction of the proposed project could generate noise in the existing noise environment.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.9-2 Construction activities associated with the proposed project could produce groundborne vibration.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.9-3 During operation of the proposed project, sensitive receptors could be exposed to ambient noise levels that exceed County standards.	LS	NI(-)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(+)
6.9-4 Aircraft noise could affect new receptors developed as part of the proposed project.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.9-5 Noise from the University athletic facilities, including a stadium, that could be developed as part of the proposed project could affect sensitive receptors.	SU	NI(-)	SU(=)	SU(=)	SU(=)	SU(=)
6.9-6 Construction of the proposed project, in combination with other construction in the vicinity of the project site, could expose receptors to noise.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)

LS = Less than Significant  
PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**TABLE 7-1  
COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES**

Impact	Proposed Project (After Mitigation)	Alternative 1 No Project/ No Development	Alternative 2: Reduced Units/ Same Development Footprint	Alternative 3: Reduced Units/ Reduced Development Footprint	Alternative 4: Same Units/ Reduced Development Footprint	Alternative 5: SACOG/ Blueprint Increased Units/ Same Development Footprint
6.9-7 Construction of the proposed project, in combination with other construction in the vicinity of the project site, could generate groundborne vibration.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.9-8 Operations of the proposed project could add to cumulative ambient noise levels.	LS	NI(-)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(+)
6.9-9 The proposed project could experience a cumulative noise impact from airport noise.	NI	NI(-)	NI(=)	NI(=)	NI(=)	NI(=)
<b>6.10 PUBLIC SERVICES</b>						
6.10-1 The proposed project could increase the demand for police protection services requiring additional personnel.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.10-2 The urban response time standards set forth in the Placer County General Plan could be unattainable from the existing Sheriff's service center in Loomis. Development of the proposed project could require new facilities, including a Sheriff's service center, equipment, and patrol vehicles.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.10-3 Public safety could be compromised if the Specific Plan does not adequately consider public safety issues in its design.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.10-4 Construction of a sheriff's service center and related facilities within the Specific Plan area could lead to physical impacts on the environment.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.10-5 Cumulative impacts on law enforcement services could occur due to development of the proposed project.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.10-6 Development of the proposed project could require additional personnel to serve new fire stations.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.10-7 Development of the proposed project could require additional fire protection infrastructure including construction of fire stations and purchase of fire trucks and equipment to serve the proposed project.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)

LS = Less than Significant  
PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**TABLE 7-1  
COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES**

Impact	Proposed Project (After Mitigation)	Alternative 1 No Project/ No Development	Alternative 2: Reduced Units/ Same Development Footprint	Alternative 3: Reduced Units/ Reduced Development Footprint	Alternative 4: Same Units/ Reduced Development Footprint	Alternative 5: SACOG/ Blueprint Increased Units/ Same Development Footprint
6.10-8 Development of the proposed project could create additional fire hazards in large open space/natural areas and utility corridors by limiting pre-suppression and suppression accessibility. High fuel loading could result in areas of restricted or limited access. Development of residential areas in close proximity to utility infrastructure and open space areas increases the potential for fire related hazards.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.10-9 Construction of fire stations and related facilities within the Specific Plan area could lead to physical impacts on the environment.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.10-10 Cumulative impacts on fire services could occur due to development of the proposed project.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.10-11 Buildout of the Specific Plan area could substantially increase the public school student population, exceeding current school capacities.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.10-12 A change in school district boundaries could adversely affect one or more of the three school districts.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.10-13 Construction of schools within the Specific Plan area could lead to physical impacts on the environment.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.10-14 The proposed project could contribute to cumulative increases in demand for schools.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.10-15 Development of the Specific Plan area could result in an inadequate amount of developed passive and active parkland and related facilities.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.10-16 Additional population in the Specific Plan area may result in increased reliance upon park facilities and services in neighboring jurisdictions.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.10-17 Parks within the Specific Plan area have the potential to be poorly maintained if an adequate funding source is not identified.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.10-18 Development of the Specific Plan area will create a demand for community recreation facilities.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.10-19 Development of the Specific Plan area could result in cumulative impacts on passive and active parkland and related facilities.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)

LS = Less than Significant  
PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**TABLE 7-1  
COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES**

Impact	Proposed Project (After Mitigation)	Alternative 1 No Project/ No Development	Alternative 2: Reduced Units/ Same Development Footprint	Alternative 3: Reduced Units/ Reduced Development Footprint	Alternative 4: Same Units/ Reduced Development Footprint	Alternative 5: SACOG/ Blueprint Increased Units/ Same Development Footprint
6.10-20 Development of the Specific Plan area could result in inadequate library facilities.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.10-21 The Specific Plan could contribute to cumulative demand for library services.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
<b>6.11 PUBLIC UTILITIES</b>						
6.11-1 The proposed project could fail to meet the wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.	LS	NI(-)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(+)
6.11-2 The proposed project could require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.11-3 The proposed project, in combination with other developments that could contribute wastewater flows to the PGWWTP, could fail to meet the wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.	LS	NI(-)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(+)
6.11-4 The proposed project, in combination with other development, could require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.11-5 The proposed project could require the construction of new or the expansion of an existing landfill, which could result in a significant adverse environmental effect.	LS	NI(-)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(+)
6.11-6 The proposed project could require the construction of new or expansion of the existing MRF, resulting in significant adverse environmental effects.	LS	NI(-)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(+)
6.11-7 The proposed project, in combination with other development, could require the construction of new or expansion of the existing landfill and MRF, which could result in significant adverse environmental effects.	SU	NI(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(+)
6.11-8 The proposed project could require the construction of new facilities to provide electrical and natural gas service, which could result in significant environmental effects.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)

LS = Less than Significant  
PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**TABLE 7-1  
COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES**

Impact	Proposed Project (After Mitigation)	Alternative 1 No Project/ No Development	Alternative 2: Reduced Units/ Same Development Footprint	Alternative 3: Reduced Units/ Reduced Development Footprint	Alternative 4: Same Units/ Reduced Development Footprint	Alternative 5: SACOG/ Blueprint Increased Units/ Same Development Footprint
6.11-9 The proposed project could require the construction of new facilities to provide cable and communication service, which could result in significant environmental effects.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.11-10 The proposed project, combined with other development, could require the construction of new or expansion of existing facilities in order to provide electrical, natural gas, cable, or communication services.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
<b>6.12 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION</b>						
6.12-1 The proposed project could contribute to traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of the regional roadway network under existing plus project conditions.	SU	NI(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(+)
6.12-2 The proposed project could increase daily traffic volumes using City of Roseville roadway segments resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under existing plus project conditions.	SU	NI(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(+)
6.12-3 The proposed project could increase daily traffic volumes using Sacramento County roadway segments exacerbating unacceptable LOS conditions under existing plus project conditions.	SU	NI(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(+)
6.12-4 The proposed project could increase daily traffic volumes using Caltrans roadway segments exacerbating unacceptable LOS conditions under existing plus project conditions.	SU	NI(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(+)
6.12-5 The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Placer County intersections resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under existing plus project conditions.	LS	NI(-)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(+)
6.12-6 The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using City of Roseville intersections resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under existing plus project conditions.	SU	NI(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(+)
6.12-7 The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Sutter County intersections resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under existing plus project conditions.	SU	NI(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(+)

LS = Less than Significant  
PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**TABLE 7-1  
COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES**

Impact	Proposed Project (After Mitigation)	Alternative 1 No Project/ No Development	Alternative 2: Reduced Units/ Same Development Footprint	Alternative 3: Reduced Units/ Reduced Development Footprint	Alternative 4: Same Units/ Reduced Development Footprint	Alternative 5: SACOG/ Blueprint Increased Units/ Same Development Footprint
6.12-8 The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Sacramento County intersections resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under existing plus project conditions.	SU	NI(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(+)
6.12-9 The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Caltrans intersections resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under existing plus project conditions.	SU	NI(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(+)
6.12-10 The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Caltrans ramp junctions resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under existing plus project conditions.	SU	NI(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(+)
6.12-11 The proposed project could generate substantial vehicle traffic flows before and after special events at the stadium that may exceed the typical weekday peak hour operational capacity of the local and regional roadways.	SU	NI(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(+)
6.12-12 The proposed project could generate vehicle parking demand that may exceed available supply during special events at the stadium.	SU	NI(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(+)
6.12-13 The proposed project could increase daily traffic volumes using City of Roseville roadway segments resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions.	SU	NI(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(+)
6.12-14 The proposed project could increase daily traffic volumes using Sacramento County roadway segments resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions.	SU	NI(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(+)
6.12-15 The proposed project could increase daily traffic volumes using Caltrans roadway segments exacerbating unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions.	SU	NI(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(+)
6.12-16 The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Placer County intersections resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions.	SU	NI(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(+)

LS = Less than Significant  
PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**TABLE 7-1  
COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES**

Impact	Proposed Project (After Mitigation)	Alternative 1 No Project/ No Development	Alternative 2: Reduced Units/ Same Development Footprint	Alternative 3: Reduced Units/ Reduced Development Footprint	Alternative 4: Same Units/ Reduced Development Footprint	Alternative 5: SACOG/ Blueprint Increased Units/ Same Development Footprint
6.12-17 The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using City of Roseville intersections resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions.	SU	NI(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(+)
6.12-18 The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Sutter County intersections resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions.	SU	NI(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(+)
6.12-19 The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Sacramento County intersections resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions.	SU	NI(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(+)
6.12-20 The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Caltrans intersections resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions.	SU	NI(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(+)
6.12-21 The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Caltrans ramp junctions resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under cumulative plus project conditions.	SU	NI(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(+)
6.12-22 The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Roseville CIP intersections resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under 2020 conditions plus the RUSP with an extension of Watt Avenue to the project site.	SU	NI(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(+)
6.12-23 The proposed project could increase peak hour traffic volumes using Roseville CIP intersections resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions under 2020 conditions plus the RUSP with an extension of Watt Avenue to Blue Oaks Boulevard.	SU	NI(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(+)
6.12-24 The proposed project could increase demand for public transit service beyond that currently planned and may result in unmet transit needs.	SU	NI(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(+)
6.12-25 The proposed project could increase demand for non-motorized travel.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.12-26 Mitigation measures implemented to reduce transportation impacts could adversely affect traffic in other jurisdictions.	SU	NI(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(+)

LS = Less than Significant  
PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**TABLE 7-1  
COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES**

Impact	Proposed Project (After Mitigation)	Alternative 1 No Project/ No Development	Alternative 2: Reduced Units/ Same Development Footprint	Alternative 3: Reduced Units/ Reduced Development Footprint	Alternative 4: Same Units/ Reduced Development Footprint	Alternative 5: SACOG/ Blueprint Increased Units/ Same Development Footprint
6.12-27 Mitigation measures implemented to reduce transportation impacts could adversely affect the natural environment.	SU	NI(-)	SU(=)	SU(=)	SU(=)	SU(=)
<b>6.13 CLIMATE CHANGE</b>						
6.13-1 Development of the RUSP could potentially result in a cumulatively considerable incremental contribution to the significant cumulative impact of global climate change.	SU	NI(-)	SU(=)	SU(-)	SU(-)	SU(+)
6.13-2 The impacts of global climate change on water supply and availability could affect future water supply and availability in the Plan Area.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
<b>6.14 WATER SUPPLY</b>						
6.14-1 The water demand resulting from the proposed project could result in insufficient entitlements to surface water or exceed sustainable yield of groundwater supplies.	LS	NI(-)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(+)
6.14-2 The water demand resulting from the proposed project could result in the construction or expansion of existing facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.14-3 The proposed project, in combination with other development projects in western Placer County, could result in cumulative impacts from curtailment of development due to shortfalls in water supplies.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)
6.14-4 The water demand resulting from the proposed project, in combination with other development served by PCWA, could result in insufficient entitlements to surface water and exceed sustainable yield of groundwater supplies.	LS	NI(-)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(-)	LS(+)
6.14-5 The water demand resulting from the proposed project, in combination with other development, may result in the construction or expansion of existing facilities.	LS	NI(-)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)	LS(=)

LS = Less than Significant  
PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

S = Significant  
NA = Not Applicable

PS = Potentially Significant  
NI = No Impact

SU = Significant and Unavoidable