

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project consists of the adoption and implementation of the Foresthill Divide Community Plan (FDCP), which consists of the following elements:

- Community Development Element, including Population and Housing, Land Use, Community Design, Public Facilities, and Parks and Recreation
- Resource Management Element, including Natural Resources/Conservation/Open Space, Cultural Resources, and Air Quality
- Transportation and Circulation Element

The FDCP includes a land use and circulation plan for the Plan area. The proposed project also includes rezoning of properties within the Plan area as necessary and required to achieve consistency with the proposed FDCP land use designations.

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Section 15123(b)(1) of the Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (State CEQA Guidelines) provides that the summary shall identify each significant effect with proposed mitigation measures that would reduce or avoid that effect. This information is summarized in Table S-1, Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures. The impacts of the FDCP are analyzed in comparison to existing conditions in the Plan area. Potential impacts and mitigation measures applicable to inclusion of the Forest Ranch Concept Plan as a component of the FDCP are presented in the summary table with grey shading behind the text following each Foresthill Divide Community Plan impact and mitigation measure.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT

Section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires the EIR to describe a reasonable range of alternatives to the project or to the location of the project that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and to evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. The impacts of the proposed project that have been identified as significant after mitigation include provision of adequate fire protection services and facilities to serve the Plan area; new stationary and mobile sources of air pollutants caused by buildout of the proposed FDCP; emissions of dust and contaminants from construction activities associated with development of the proposed FDCP; and increased traffic throughout the Community Plan area due to development in accordance with the FDCP. Accordingly, alternatives that would reduce or avoid these impacts represent an environmentally superior alternative to the project. However, if the environmentally superior alternative is the “no project” alternative, the EIR must also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.

The EIR evaluates the following alternatives:

- No Project/Development Consistent with the 1981 General Plan Alternative
- Highest Density Alternative
- Lowest Density Alternative
- Reduced Density Alternative

The Reduced Density Alternative has been identified as the environmentally superior alternative; however, it would not achieve the project objectives (general community goals and vision statement formulated by the Foresthill Divide Community Plan Team.) The Highest Density Alternative would have greater impacts than the proposed FDCP, and both the No Project Alternative and the Lowest Density Alternative would have greater impacts than the Reduced Density Alternative. The alternatives and associated impacts are summarized as follows:

- **No Project/Development Consistent with the 1981 General Plan Alternative** consists of an analysis of the continuation of the existing plan, in which case the Plan area will be developed in accordance with the existing Foresthill General Plan without adoption of the FDCP. Under this alternative, the projected impacts of the proposed FDCP are compared to the impacts that would occur under the existing Foresthill General Plan. The 1981 Foresthill General Plan encompassed approximately 56 square miles, compared to 109 square miles within the FDCP area. It has an estimated buildout population of 14,400, compared to 109 square miles within the FDCP area with a projected Buildout population of 18,963. The additional area encompassed by the FDCP would develop in accordance with the Placer County General Plan or the Weimar/Clipper Gap/Applegate General Plan, depending upon the location. As described in Chapter Four, many of the original assumptions of the 1981 Foresthill General Plan are outdated or have proven to be faulty. Development in accordance with the existing General Plan could result in potentially significant and greater impacts, in comparison to the proposed FDCP, related to population and housing, land use, community design, public facilities, parks and recreation, natural resources/conservation/open space, cultural resources, air quality, transportation and circulation, and noise.
- **Highest Density Alternative** was considered and rejected by the FDCP Team. The Highest Density Alternative is shown in Figure 4-3 of Chapter 4 (the map shows residential areas only; other uses would be the same as the proposed FDCP). The Highest Density Alternative would accommodate a buildout population of 28,355 residents, compared to the FDCP buildout estimate of 18,963. In comparison to the proposed FDCP, densities in residential areas would be higher: residential densities in many areas are doubled and many areas shown in the proposed FDCP for Timberland uses are shown for residential uses (primarily at densities ranging from 2.3 du/acre to 4.6 du/acre) in the Highest Density Alternative. The estimated population for this alternative at buildout (28,355) is comparable to the estimated buildout population for the existing 1981 Foresthill General Plan in consideration of the fact that the 1981 plan was approximately ½ the square mile size of the proposed FDCP with a projected buildout population of 14,400. The FDCP Team rejected this alternative because it was not consistent with the Vision and General Goals formulated by the Team, which are described in Chapter 2 of this EIR.

As cited above in Section 15126.6(f) of the CEQA Guidelines, “The alternatives shall be limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project.” That is not the case for the Highest Density Alternative; however, it is evaluated in this EIR because it is an actual alternative that was considered and rejected in the process of developing the FDCP.

- **Lowest Density Alternative** The Lowest Density Alternative was also considered and rejected by the FDCP Team. The Lowest Density Alternative would accommodate a buildout population of 12,727 residents, or about half of the FDCP buildout estimate of 18,963. In comparison to the proposed FDCP, densities in residential areas would be reduced in the Todd’s Valley area, the Pomfret Estate (“Forest Ranch”) property, and some properties along Foresthill Road between Todd’s Valley and the Pomfret Estate property. Development in accordance with the Lowest Density Alternative could result in potentially significant impacts, similar to the proposed FDCP, related to fire protection, air quality, and transportation and circulation. Impacts on population and housing, land use, community design, other public facilities, parks and recreation, natural resources/conservation/open space, and noise would be slightly reduced. The FDCP Team rejected this alternative because it was not consistent with the general goals and vision for the Community Plan area, which call for concentrating population and residential development near the Core Area of Foresthill.
- **Reduced Density Alternative** would accommodate a buildout population of 9,250 residents. In comparison to the proposed FDCP, residential densities would be reduced throughout the Plan area, with the exception of areas that are already subdivided. Other planned land uses would be similarly reduced in area because the lower population would not support the amount of commercial, industrial and mixed-use development accommodated by the FDCP. Development in accordance with the Reduced Density Alternative would result in reduced impacts, in comparison with the proposed FDCP, related to fire protection, other public facilities and services, air quality, transportation and circulation, population and housing, land use, community design, parks and recreation, natural resources/conservation/open space, and noise.

AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

Section 15123(b)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines provides that the Summary shall identify areas of controversy known to the lead agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public, and issues to be resolved including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate the significant effects. Areas of controversy and issues to be resolved for the proposed FDCP and rezoning of which the lead agency is aware include the following:

- Reduction in residential densities on individual properties and establishment of Mixed-Use Districts
- Increased traffic and air quality impacts associated with new development

- Establishment of Foresthill Community Design Guidelines
- Effects of new development on public facilities and services on the Foresthill Divide
- Loss of open space
- Increased urban/suburban development on the Foresthill Divide
- Small wastewater treatment facilities with regard to maintenance and operation in a rural environment.