

County of Placer
GRANITE BAY MUNICIPAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
175 Fulweiler Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603
County Contact: Linda Brown, District Director (916) 787-8954



February 23, 2015

Honorable Chairman Ken Denio
Members of the Planning Commission
Placer County Planning Commission
309 Court Center Drive, Suite 140
Auburn, CA 95603

RE: GBMAC Consideration and Recommendation regarding “Pond Pavilion & Craftsman Lofts”

Chairman Denio:

On behalf of the Granite Bay Municipal Advisory Council (GBMAC) the purpose of this letter is to provide the Planning Commission with a summary of our deliberations and the resulting recommendation regarding the Pond Pavilion & Craftsman Lofts project.

The project was presented by Roy Schaefer, Associate Planner. The developer, Lisa Powers was unable to attend. There were many Granite Bay residents in attendance that expressed concerns for the impact this project will have on nearby homeowners. They also expressed concern about this project requiring an amendment to the General Plan/Community Plan, Rezoning, Conditional Use permit and Variances. The community is concerned that this project and other new projects are seeking ways to build in Granite Bay without having to honor the exiting Community Plan, current Zoning and Use guidelines.

After hearing from Roy Schaefer and the public regarding this project, the GBMAC deliberated and voted in favor of recommending approval of the proposal. The Board was split, four to two, in the vote for approval. During the GBMAC’s deliberation there were questions and concerns regarding the impact of excessive noise on surrounding homeowners. Several board members expressed concerns that the noise would be a continuous issue. Mr. Schaefer reported the sound ordinance restricts sound levels to 50 to 80 decibels, that being a measure for residential areas. Other concerns regarded what days constitute a weekend; whether there will be an acceleration/deceleration lane for safety; whether there will be sidewalks; and concerns regarding the conditional use permit. Mr. Schaefer assured the Board that weekends consists of Saturdays and Sundays only; that there will be an 8-foot wide lane on the shoulder (although the shoulder is not actually an acceleration/deceleration lane); and an 8-foot wide sidewalk. There was no information given regarding the conditional use permit.

The motion was to recommend approval of the proposed plan with staff’s recommendations.

Thank you for the continued opportunity to review projects, work with the community and provide our input. Please contact me or any GBMAC Member if we can be of further assistance.

Warm Regards,
GRANITE BAY MUNICIPAL ADVISORY COUNCIL



SUZANNE JONES
CHAIR

CC: Honorable Kirk Uhler, Supervisor, District 4
Ms. Linda Brown, Field Representative, District 4 and GBMAC Administrator
Mr. Ken Prager, Vice Chair, GBMAC



COUNTY OF PLACER
Community Development Resource Agency

**ENVIRONMENTAL
COORDINATION
SERVICES**

Michael J. Johnson, AICP
Agency Director

Crystal Jacobsen, Coordinator

3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190 • Auburn • California 95603 • 530-745-3132 • fax 530-745-3080 • www.placer.ca.gov

INITIAL STUDY & CHECKLIST

This Initial Study has been prepared to identify and assess the anticipated environmental impacts of the following described project application. The document may rely on previous environmental documents (see Section C) and site-specific studies (see Section I) prepared to address in detail the effects or impacts associated with the project.

This document has been prepared to satisfy the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.) CEQA requires that all state and local government agencies consider the environmental consequences of projects over which they have discretionary authority before acting on those projects.

The Initial Study is a public document used by the decision-making lead agency to determine whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment. If the lead agency finds substantial evidence that any aspect of the project, either individually or cumulatively, may have a significant effect on the environment, regardless of whether the overall effect of the project is adverse or beneficial, the lead agency is required to prepare an EIR, use a previously-prepared EIR and supplement that EIR, or prepare a Subsequent EIR to analyze the project at hand. If the agency finds no substantial evidence that the project or any of its aspects may cause a significant effect on the environment, a Negative Declaration shall be prepared. If in the course of analysis, the agency recognizes that the project may have a significant impact on the environment, but that by incorporating specific mitigation measures the impact will be reduced to a less than significant effect, a Mitigated Negative Declaration shall be prepared.

Project Title: Pond Pavilion & Lofts	Plus# PGPA 20120354
Entitlement(s): Community Plan Amendment, Rezone, Conditional Use Permit, Vesting Tentative Parcel Map, and Variances	
Site Area: 5.2 acres	APN: 048-142-036-000
Location: 5630 Douglas Boulevard, on the south side of Douglas Boulevard immediately east of the Quarry Ponds Town Center, Granite Bay, Placer County	

A. BACKGROUND:

Project Description:

The applicant is requesting approval of the Pond Pavilion and Lofts proposal to rezone and develop a 5.2-acre parcel with a 7,500-square-foot event pavilion (2,717 square feet of indoor administration and catering kitchen space, and 4,783 square feet of interior event space). This proposal also includes two craftsman loft buildings totaling 23,662 square feet (Building A totals 12,000 square feet and Building B totals 11,662 square feet). The craftsman lofts would accommodate uses permitted within the Office and Professional zone district (i.e. Offices, medical services, personal services, mail order and vending, restaurants, etc.). The commercial event center (inside and outside areas) would accommodate up to a maximum of 500 people for various events (i.e. meetings, parties, weddings, receptions, dances, etc.) and would be utilized in a manner that is consistent with the commercial event center definition in the Placer County Zoning Ordinance.

The commercial event pavilion would operate within the following timeframes: Outside – Weekends Only 9:00 AM – 10:30 PM; Inside – Weekends Only 9:00 AM – 11:00 PM; Outside – Weekdays 9:00 AM – 9:30 PM; Inside – Weekdays 9:00 AM – 10:00 PM. Events would be catered by outside sourced catering services. The number of catering staff would vary with the size and scope of the event. Catering staff would only be on site during events and with a set-up and tear down time on either end of the event. Business hours for the craftsman lofts would be

from 6:00 AM – 9:00 PM on a daily basis and enforcement would be governed by the tenant lease agreement. A Commercial Event Center requires a parking ratio of one parking space for every 2.5 guests and one parking space for every permanent employees (based on 500 guests and four permanent employees a total of 204 parking spaces would be required). The parking requirements for the craftsman lofts based on the proposed uses would be 86 spaces. Therefore, the total parking spaces required would be 290. A total of 233 on-site parking spaces (181 parking spaces and 52 additional valet parking spaces) would be provided and in addition 57 off-site parking spaces would need to be made available on an as-needed basis depending upon the number of guests attending the Commercial Event Center.

Project Entitlements

The proposed project will require approval of a Community Plan Amendment, Rezone, Conditional Use Permit, Tentative Parcel Map, and Variances by the Placer County Board of Supervisors and the Placer County Planning Commission.

The General Plan/Community Plan amendment is to change the Zone District category from Residential to Commercial District and specifically include a Rezone from Residential Agriculture, combining a Building Site of 2.3-acre minimum, and Planned Development 0.44 Dwelling Units per acre (RA-B-100 PD=0.44) to Office and Professional District (OP). The Conditional Use Permit is to allow for a Commercial Event Center (Pond Pavilion) to be developed and operate on the project site. A Minor Land Division is proposed to create a Tentative Parcel Map with Parcel 1 (2.495 acres gross / 2.354 acres net) and Parcel 2 (2.671 acres gross / 2.626 acres net). Other entitlements include a Variance request for a reduced pond setback (50 foot from the high water mark) for Building D, the Pond Pavilion building and exterior open area, and for the southwest corner of the parking lot. A Variance is requested to the on-site parking standards to allow for 52 on-site valet parking spaces and 57 off-site parking on a nearby parking lot that can be utilized by this project. Also, a Variance is requested for a multi-tenant monument sign at the entry to the site.

Project Site (Background/Existing Setting):

The 5.2-acre undeveloped parcel is bound by Douglas Boulevard and existing development to the north, and an existing abandoned quarry pond to the south. The quarry pond is a remnant of historic placer mining in Strap Ravine. Portions of the property have been disturbed by grading activities associated with construction on the adjacent property (Quarry Ponds); these disturbed areas support mostly ruderal vegetation. The perimeter of the property is mostly undisturbed. Two small drainages flow north to south through the property and outlet in to the quarry pond. These drainages support a moderate riparian canopy consisting of mostly native species such as Fremont cottonwood, arroyo, and narrow-leaved willow.

The project site has a large flattened, graveled area where large trucks and heavy equipment were parked (with the exception of a small strip of land adjacent to Douglas Boulevard as well as a narrow strip along the pond) prior to the development of the Quarry Ponds shopping center to the west. Subsequent to the Quarry Ponds development a paved parking lot was constructed within the northern end of the project site. The project site is zoned Residential Agriculture (RA-B-100 PD=0.44), combining a minimum building site of 2.3 acres and combining Planned Development 0.44 dwelling units per acre. The site is designated Rural Residential 2.3 to 4.6 acre minimum parcel size in the Granite Bay Community Plan. The property is located on the south side of Douglas Boulevard immediately east of the Quarry Ponds Town Center. The property address is 5630 Douglas Boulevard, Granite Bay.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

Location	Zoning	Granite Bay Community Plan Designations	Existing Conditions and Improvements
Site	Residential Agriculture, combining a Building Site of 2.3-acre minimum, and Planned Development 0.44 Dwelling Units per acre (RA-B-100 PD=0.44)	Rural Residential (2.3 – 4.6-acre minimum)	Parking lot at north end of the parcel, undeveloped in the remaining areas of the parcel
North	Residential Single-Family, combining Building Site of 20,000-square-foot (RS-B-20)	Low Density Residential (0.4 - 0.9-acre minimum)	Shadowridge Community Church
South	Same as Project Site	Same as Project Site	Residential Development
East	Residential Agriculture, combining a Building Site of 2.3-acre minimum,	Same as Project Site	Residential Development

43

	and Planned Development 0.44 Dwelling Units per acre (RA-B-100 PD=0.44) and Residential Agriculture, combining a Building Site of 2.3-acre minimum (RA-B-100)		
West	General Commercial, combining Use Permit, combining Design Scenic Corridor (C2-UP-Dc)	Commercial	Quarry Ponds Shopping Center

C. PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT:

The County has determined that an Initial Study shall be prepared in order to determine whether the potential exists for unmitigatable impacts resulting from the proposed project. Relevant analysis from the County-wide General Plan and Community Plan Certified EIRs, and other project-specific studies and reports that have been generated to date, were used as the database for the Initial Study. The decision to prepare the Initial Study utilizing the analysis contained in the General Plan and Specific Plan Certified EIRs, and project-specific analysis summarized herein, is sustained by Sections 15168 and 15183 of the CEQA Guidelines.

Section 15168 relating to Program EIRs indicates that where subsequent activities involve site-specific operations, the agency would use a written checklist or similar device to document the evaluation of the site and the activity, to determine whether the environmental effects of the operation were covered in the earlier Program EIR. A Program EIR is intended to provide the basis in an Initial Study for determining whether the later activity may have any significant effects. It will also be incorporated by reference to address regional influences, secondary effects, cumulative impacts, broad alternatives, and other factors that apply to the program as a whole.

The following documents serve as Program-level EIRs from which incorporation by reference will occur:

- ➔ Placer County General Plan EIR
- ➔ Granite Bay Community Plan EIR

Section 15183 states that "projects which are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified shall not require additional environmental review, except as may be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or site." Thus, if an impact is not peculiar to the project or site, and it has been addressed as a significant effect in the prior EIR, or will be substantially mitigated by the imposition of uniformly applied development policies or standards, then additional environmental documentation need not be prepared for the project solely on the basis of that impact.

The above stated documents are available for review Monday through Friday, 8am to 5pm, at the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603. For Tahoe projects, the document will also be available in our Tahoe Division Office, 565 West Lake Blvd., Tahoe City, CA 96145.

D. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

The Initial Study checklist recommended by the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines is used to determine potential impacts of the proposed project on the physical environment. The checklist provides a list of questions concerning a comprehensive array of environmental issue areas potentially affected by the project (see CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G). Explanations to answers are provided in a discussion for each section of questions as follows:

- a) A brief explanation is required for all answers including "No Impact" answers.
- b) "Less Than Significant Impact" applies where the project's impacts are insubstantial and do not require any mitigation to reduce impacts.
- c) "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The County, as lead agency, must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level (mitigation measures from earlier analyses may be cross-referenced).
- d) "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

44

- e) All answers must take account of the entire action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts [CEQA Guidelines, Section 15063(a)(1)].
- f) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, Program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration [CEQA Guidelines, Section 15063(c)(3)(D)]. A brief discussion should be attached addressing the following:
 - ➔ **Earlier analyses used** – Identify earlier analyses and state where they are available for review.
 - ➔ **Impacts adequately addressed** – Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of, and adequately analyzed in, an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards. Also, state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - ➔ **Mitigation measures** – For effects that are checked as “Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- g) References to information sources for potential impacts (i.e. General Plans/Community Plans, zoning ordinances) should be incorporated into the checklist. Reference to a previously-prepared or outside document should include a reference to the pages or chapters where the statement is substantiated. A source list should be attached and other sources used, or individuals contacted, should be cited in the discussion.

I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (PLN)				X
2. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, within a state scenic highway? (PLN)				X
3. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (PLN)		X		
4. Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (PLN)		X		

Discussion- Item I-1:

The proposed project will not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista as it is not located on or near a scenic vista. There is no impact.

Discussion- Item I-2:

The proposed project will not substantially damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway as it is not located on or near a scenic highway. There is no impact.

Discussion- Items I-3,4:

The proposed project could negatively affect the visual character and quality of the site and its surroundings; however, the project will be subject to Appendix One of the Granite Bay Community Plan that is known as "Douglas Corridor – Design Elements and Landscape Goals". Appendix One would establish the required design elements including landscaping, architectural features, and the overall design of the new commercial buildings.

The project would include lighting typical of a commercial development, which could result in the creation of a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Mitigation set forth in this document would reduce potential impacts resulting from the creation of a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area, to a less than significant level. Therefore, mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures- Items I-3,4:

MM I.1 Concurrent with submittal of Improvement Plans, a detailed lighting and photometric plan shall be submitted to the Development Review Committee (DRC) for review and approval, which include the following:

1. The site lighting plan shall demonstrate compliance with the Granite Bay Community Plan and the Placer County Design Guidelines. The night lighting design shall be designed to minimize impacts to adjoining and nearby land uses. No lighting is permitted on top of structures.
2. Site lighting fixtures in parking lots shall be provided by the use of high pressure sodium (HPS), metal halide, or other as established by the DRC, mounted on poles not to exceed 14 feet in height. The metal pole color shall be such that the pole will blend into the landscape (i.e., black, bronze, or dark bronze). All site lighting in parking lots shall be full cut-off design so that the light source is fully screened to minimize the impacts discussed above. Wall pack or other non-cut-off lighting shall not be used.
3. Building lighting shall be shielded and downward directed such that the bulb or ballast is not visible. Lighting fixture design shall complement the building colors and materials and shall be used to light entries, soffits, covered walkways and pedestrian areas such as plazas. Roof and wall pack lighting shall not be used. Lighting intensity shall be of a level that only highlights the adjacent building area and ground area and shall not impose glare on any pedestrian or vehicular traffic.
4. Landscape lighting may be used to visually accentuate and highlight ornamental shrubs and trees adjacent to buildings and in open spaces. Lighting intensity shall be of a level that only highlights shrubs and trees and shall not impose glare on any pedestrian or vehicular traffic.

II. AGRICULTURAL & FOREST RESOURCES – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? (PLN)				X
2. Conflict with General Plan or other policies regarding land use buffers for agricultural operations? (PLN)				X
3. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, a Williamson Act contract or a Right-to-Farm Policy? (PLN)				X
4. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? (PLN)				X
5. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in the loss or conversion of Farmland (including livestock grazing) or forest land to non-agricultural or non-forest use? (PLN)				X

Discussion- All Items:

This is a project within an urbanized area of Granite Bay that is adjacent to a commercial development to the west, a church to the north, and low density residential developments to the east and south. The project site has not been historically used for agricultural purposes and is not designated as Prime, Unique, Statewide or Local Farmland as shown on maps pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. The property is not under a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, there is no impact associated with agricultural and forest resources.

III. AIR QUALITY – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (PLN, Air Quality)			X	
2. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (PLN, Air Quality)		X		
3. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (PLN, Air Quality)		X		
4. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (PLN, Air Quality)			X	
5. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (PLN, Air Quality)			X	

Discussion- Item III-1:

The project is located within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB) portion of Placer County and is under the jurisdiction of the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (APCD). An air quality analysis was conducted by an environmental consulting firm (Dudek) in October of 2014, utilizing the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod). Although the SVAB is designated as nonattainment for federal and state ozone (O₃) standards, nonattainment for the federal particulate matter standard (PM_{2.5}) and state particulate matter standard (PM₁₀), the analysis indicated that the project will not contribute a significant impact to the Region given that the project related emissions are below the District's thresholds of significance. Therefore the project will not result in a significant obstruction to the Sacramento Regional Air Quality Plan. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Items III-2,3:

As stated above, the SVAB is designated non-attainment for the federal and state ozone standards (ROG and NO_x), nonattainment for the federal particulate matter standard (PM_{2.5}) and non-attainment for the state particulate matter standard (PM₁₀).

According to the project description and CalEEMod analysis, the project will result in an increase in regional and local emissions from construction and operation of the project. However, these emissions will not exceed the APCD's threshold of significance of 82 pounds per day (lbs/day) of ROG, NO_x, or PM₁₀ for construction or operational activities. The project's related short-term construction air pollutant emissions will result primarily from site grading activities, diesel-powered construction equipment, trucks hauling building supplies, worker vehicle exhaust, and building painting activities. In order to reduce construction related air emissions, associated grading/improvement plans shall list the District's Rules and State Regulations. A Dust Control Plan shall be submitted to the Placer County Air Pollution Control District for approval prior to the commencement of earth disturbing activities demonstrating all proposed measures to reduce air pollutant emissions. With the implementation of the following mitigation measures, impacts related to construction activities will be reduced to a less than significant level.

Further, the project's long-term operational emissions would chiefly result from vehicle exhaust, utility usage, and water/wastewater usage. Although the project's operational emissions would not exceed the District's cumulative threshold of 10 lbs/day, the project will contribute incremental emissions of ROG, NO_x, and CO₂ to the cumulative impacts in Placer County. The implementation of the following mitigation measures would result in further reduction of the ROG, NO_x and CO₂ emissions and ensure the project's related cumulative impacts to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures- Items III-2,3:

MM III.1

1. Prior to approval of Grading or Improvement Plans, on project sites greater than one acre, the applicant shall submit a Construction Emission / Dust Control Plan to the Placer County APCD. To download the form go to www.placer.ca.gov/apcd and click on Dust Control Requirements. If the APCD does not respond within twenty (20) days of the plan being accepted as complete, the plan shall be considered approved. The applicant shall provide written evidence, provided by APCD to the County, that the plan has been submitted to APCD. It is the responsibility of the applicant to deliver the approved plan to the County. The applicant shall not break ground prior to receiving APCD approval of the Construction Emission / Dust Control Plan, and delivering that approval to the County.
2. Include the following standard note on all building plans approved in association with this project: Stationary sources or processes (i.e. certain types of engines, boilers, heaters, etc.) associated with this project shall be required to obtain an Authority to Construct (ATC) permit from the APCD prior to the construction of these sources. In general, the following types of sources shall be required to obtain a permit: 1). Any engine greater than 50 brake horsepower, 2). Any boiler that produces heat in excess of 1,000,000 Btu per hour, or 3) Any equipment or process which discharge 2 pounds per day or more of pollutants. All on-site stationary equipment requiring a permit shall be classified as "low emission" equipment and shall utilize low sulfur fuel. Developers / contactors should contact the APCD prior to construction for additional information.

Include the following standard notes on the Grading Plans or Improvement Plans:

3. The contractor shall use CARB ultra-low diesel fuel for all diesel-powered equipment.
4. In order to control dust, operational watering trucks shall be on site during construction hours. In addition, dry, mechanical sweeping is prohibited. Watering of a construction site shall be carried out in compliance with all pertinent APCD rules.
5. The prime contractor shall be responsible for keeping adjacent public thoroughfares clean of silt, dirt, mud, and

48

- debris, and shall "wet broom" the streets (or use another method to control dust as approved by the individual jurisdiction) if silt, dirt, mud or debris is carried over to adjacent public thoroughfares
6. The contractor shall apply water or use other method to control dust impacts offsite. Construction vehicles leaving the site shall be cleaned to prevent dust, silt, mud, and dirt from being released or tracked off-site.
 7. During construction, traffic speeds on all unpaved surfaces shall be limited to 15 miles per hour or less.
 8. The prime contractor shall suspend all grading operations when wind speeds (including instantaneous gusts) are excessive and dust is impacting adjacent properties.
 9. In order to minimize wind driven dust during construction, the prime contractor shall apply methods such as surface stabilization, establishment of a vegetative cover, paving, (or use another method to control dust as approved by the individual jurisdiction).
 10. The contractor shall suspend all grading operations when fugitive dust exceeds Placer County APCD Rule 228 (Fugitive Dust) limitations. The prime contractor shall be responsible for having an individual who is CARB-certified to perform Visible Emissions Evaluations (VEE). This individual shall evaluate compliance with Rule 228 on a weekly basis. It is to be noted that fugitive dust is not to exceed 40% opacity and not go beyond the property boundary at any time. Lime or other drying agents utilized to dry out wet grading areas shall not exceed Placer County APCD Rule 228 Fugitive Dust limitations. Operators of vehicles and equipment found to exceed opacity limits will be notified by APCD and the equipment must be repaired within 72 hours.
 11. Construction equipment exhaust emissions shall not exceed Placer County APCD Rule 202 Visible Emission limitations. Operators of vehicles and equipment found to exceed opacity limits are to be immediately notified by APCD to cease operations and the equipment must be repaired within 72 hours.
 12. A person shall not discharge into the atmosphere volatile organic compounds (VOC's) caused by the use or manufacture of Cutback or Emulsified asphalts for paving, road construction or road maintenance, unless such manufacture or use complies with the provisions of Rule 217.
 13. During construction the contractor shall utilize existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or clean fuel (i.e. gasoline, biodiesel, natural gas) generators rather than temporary diesel power generators.
 14. During construction, the contractor shall minimize idling time to a maximum of 5 minutes for all diesel powered equipment.
 15. During construction, no open burning of removed vegetation shall be allowed unless permitted by the PCAPCD. All removed vegetative material shall be either chipped on site or taken to an appropriate recycling site, or if a site is not available, a licensed disposal site.
 16. The prime contractor shall submit to the District a comprehensive inventory (e.g., make, model, year, emission rating) of all the heavy-duty off-road equipment (50 horsepower or greater) that will be used in aggregate of 40 or more hours for the construction project. If any new equipment is added after submission of the inventory, the prime contractor shall contact the District prior to the new equipment being utilized. At least three business days prior to the use of subject heavy-duty off-road equipment, the project representative shall provide the District with the anticipated construction timeline including start date, name, and phone number of the property owner, project manager, and on-site foreman.
 17. Prior to approval of Grading or Improvement Plans, whichever occurs first, the applicant shall provide a written calculation to the District for approval demonstrating that the heavy-duty (> 50 horsepower) 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% of NOx and 45% of DPM reduction as compared to CARB statewide fleet average emissions. 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.

Discussion- Item III-4:

The project includes grading operations which would result in short-term diesel exhaust emissions from on-site heavy-duty equipment and would generate diesel particulate matter (DPM) emissions from the use of off-road diesel equipment required for site grading. Additionally, DPM would result from occasional delivery equipment during the operations of the facility. Because of the dispersive properties of DPM and the temporary nature of the mobilized equipment use, short-term construction and operationally-generated Toxic Air Contaminant emissions would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and therefore would have a less than significant effect. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item III-5:

The project would result in additional air pollutant emissions generated by diesel-powered construction equipment, and vehicle exhaust from traffic that could create odors. However, the long-term operational emissions (vehicle traffic) from this project alone will not exceed the District's significant thresholds. Therefore, potential impacts from odors will be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish & Game, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service or National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries? (PLN)		X		
2. Substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number of restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species? (PLN)		X		
3. Have a substantial adverse effect on the environment by converting oak woodlands? (PLN)				X
4. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community, including oak woodlands, identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish & Game, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers or National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries? (PLN)				X
5. Have a substantial adverse effect on federal or state protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) or as defined by state statute, through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (PLN)				X
6. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nesting or breeding sites? (PLN)			X	
7. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources, including oak woodland resources? (PLN)		X		
8. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (PLN)				X

Discussion- Items IV-1,2:

A Biological Resources Assessment was originally conducted by Gibson and Skordal, LLC on July 18, 2011 and was updated on January 7, 2014. The original assessment for the project site identified potential habitat for special-status species and waters of the United States, including wetlands. This assessment, however, did not consider any physical development of the site; it only considered a proposed parcel map. The updated report is required to assess the development of the site with the two proposed craftsman loft buildings, the commercial event center and the associated parking.

According to the updated assessment the grassland habitat in the study area is potential foraging and nesting habitat for burrowing owls. Development of the site may impact nesting and foraging habitat; however, no burrowing owls or nesting sites/burrows were observed on the site during field investigations in July of 2011.

The grassland habitat and mature trees in the project site provide potential foraging and nesting habitat for the Swainson’s hawk, other raptors, and migratory birds and development may impact the foraging and nesting habitat. However, the closest recorded nest site for a Swainson’s hawk is approximately eight miles away and hawks were

not observed in the area, nor were any active or inactive nests observed at the site. In addition, there was no other raptor or migratory bird nests observed in the project area. With the following mitigation measures, impacts are considered less than significant:

Mitigation Measures- Items IV-1,2:

MM IV.1 Prior to any grading or tree removal activities, during the raptor nesting season (March 1 - September 1), a focused survey for raptor nests shall be conducted by a qualified biologist. A report summarizing the survey shall be provided to Placer County and the California Department of Fish & Wildlife (CDFW) within 30 days of the completed survey. If an active raptor nest is identified appropriate mitigation measures conducted by a qualified biologist. If an active raptor nest is identified appropriate mitigation measures shall be developed and implemented in consultation with CDFW. If construction is proposed to take place between March 1st and September 1st, no construction activity or tree removal shall occur within 500 feet of an active nest (or greater distance, as determined by the CDFW). Construction activities may only resume after a follow up survey has been conducted and a report prepared by a qualified raptor biologist indicating that the nest (or nests) is no longer active, and that no new nests have been identified. A follow up survey shall be conducted 2 months following the initial survey, if the initial survey occurs between March 1st and July 1st. Additional follow up surveys may be required by the DRC, based on the recommendations in the raptor study and/or as recommended by the CDFW. Temporary construction fencing and signage as described herein shall be installed at a minimum 500 foot radius around trees containing active nests. If all project construction occurs between September 1st and March 1st no raptor surveys will be required. Trees previously approved for removal by Placer County, which contain stick nests, may only be removed between September 1st and March 1st. A note which includes the wording of this condition of approval shall be placed on the Improvement Plans. Said plans shall also show all protective fencing for those trees identified for protection within the raptor report.

MM IV.2 Thirty days prior to grading, a qualified biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys of all potential habitat within 250 feet of the project area and record the presence of burrowing owls, signs of burrowing owls, and all burrows that are being actively used by burrowing owls. California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) survey protocol shall be used to conduct surveys. If pre-construction surveys do not identify any activity by burrowing owls, no further mitigation is proposed. If there are burrowing owls nesting on the project site or within 250 feet of the project site, the following mitigation measures are proposed: 1). No grading shall be allowed within 250 feet of an active burrow during the nesting season (February – August) until the young have fledged or approved by CDFW. For occupied burrows without active nesting, nesting burrows after the young have fledged, or work conducted outside the nesting season, passive relocation of the birds shall be performed. Passive relocation involves installing a one-way door at the burrow entrance and coordination with CDFW shall be conducted prior to installation. 2). All unoccupied burrows shall be collapsed after pre-construction surveys and prior to grading to prevent interim occupation by burrowing owls.

Discussion- Item IV-3:

An Arborist Report was prepared by Sierra Nevada Arborists on September 18, 2012. Project improvements at the site would require the removal of 28 trees that are protected under the Placer County Tree Ordinance (See Discussion item IV-7). These trees do not constitute "oak woodlands" as they do not account for at least ten percent or the canopy onsite or do they signify any significant stand of oak trees. As such, the proposed project will not result in the conversion of oak woodlands. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion- Item IV-4:

Project development will not occur within these areas as required by County Code and any future commercial development will be subject to setback requirements and Best Management Practices (BMPs). Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion- Item IV-5:

According to a jurisdictional delineation by LSA Associates, the project site contains 0.25 acre of wetlands and 0.40 acre of non-wetland waters regulated by the Army Corps of Engineers under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Impacting these areas would require prior authorization from the Army Corps of Engineers, Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Quality Certification), and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Streambed Alteration Agreement). The proposed project would not impact jurisdictional waters and as such, no mitigations measures are required.

Discussion- Item IV-6:

The project will not interfere with the movement of any known native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item IV-7:

A total of 28 protected trees are proposed to be removed and/or impacted as a result of the project improvements. With the following mitigation measure, impacts associated with the removal of the protected trees are considered less than significant:

Mitigation Measures- Item IV-7:

MM IV.3 Trees identified for removal, and/or trees with disturbance to their drip lines, shall be replaced with comparable species onsite, in an area to be reviewed and approved by the Design Review Committee, as follows: a) For each diameter inch of a tree removed, replacement shall be on an inch-for-inch basis. For example, if 100 diameter inches are proposed to be removed, the replacement trees would equal 100 diameter inches (aggregate). If replacement tree planting is required, the trees must be installed by the applicant and inspected and approved by the Design Review Committee, prior to the acceptance of improvements by the Engineering and Surveying Department. At its discretion, the Design Review Committee, may establish an alternate deadline for installation of mitigation replacement trees if weather or other circumstances prevent the completion of this requirement; or b) In lieu of the tree planting mitigation for tree removal listed above, a contribution of \$100 per diameter inch at breast height for each tree removed or impacted or the current market value, as established by an Arborist, Forester or Registered Landscape Architect, of the replacement trees, including the cost of installation, shall be paid to the Placer County Tree Preservation Fund. If tree replacement mitigation fees are to be paid in the place of tree replacement mitigation planting, these fees must be paid prior to acceptance of improvements.

Discussion- Item IV-8:

The project site is not located in an area subject to a Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Therefore, there is no impact.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Substantially cause adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5? (PLN)			X	
2. Substantially cause adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5? (PLN)			X	
3. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (PLN)			X	
4. Have the potential to cause a physical change, which would affect unique ethnic cultural values? (PLN)				X
5. Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? (PLN)				X
6. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (PLN)			X	

Discussion- Item V-1:

The updated Cultural Resources assessment (original report was in 2001) is dated July 6, 2011 and was prepared by Consulting Archaeologist Ric Windmiller. The original assessment conducted by Ric Windmiller indicated that the project site is not known to contain any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record or manuscript that meets the criteria for the listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code, § 5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4852). In addition, State and Federal inventories list no historic properties (buildings, structures, or objects) within the proposed subject property area. No mitigation measures are required.

52

Discussion- Items V-2,3,6:

The project site is not included in any known local register of historical resources, as defined in section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in the General Plan Background Report, Figure 8-4 "Concentrations of Historical Sites and Buildings". The project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a known unique archeological resource, directly or indirectly destroy any known unique paleontological resource, or site, or disturb any known human remains, including those that are located outside of a formal cemetery.

Although the project site is not included in any know local register of historical resources and impacts are not anticipated to occur based on factual research and reports prepared by the North Central Information Center (records search dated August 22, 2000) and the Native American Heritage Commission, construction of improvements required to vest the project could result in accidental discovery of previously unknown resources. The field survey was negative; the archaeologist (Ric Windmiller, Registered Professional Archaeologist) did not identify any historic or prehistoric archaeological resources. The paleontologist (Jere H. Lipps, PH.D.) also conducted a field survey of the project site and the results of the survey were negative. Therefore, the following standardized condition of approval will be placed on the project in accordance with General Plan policy in the event of accidental discovery of archaeological or paleontological resources, or human remains:

"If any archaeological artifacts, exotic rock (non-native), or unusual amounts of shell or bone are uncovered during any on-site construction activities, all work must stop immediately in the area and an archaeologist shall be retained to evaluate the deposit. The Placer County Planning Department and Department of Museums must also be contacted for review of the archaeological find(s).

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

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

No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item V-4:

The project does not have the potential to cause a physical change that will affect any known unique ethnic cultural values. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion- Item V-5:

No record exists of any known existing religious or sacred uses on the project site. Therefore, there is no impact.

VI. GEOLOGY & SOILS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Expose people or structures to unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures? (ESD)			X	
2. Result in significant disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcrowding of the soil? (ESD)		X		
3. Result in substantial change in topography or ground surface relief features? (ESD)		X		
4. Result in the destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features? (ESD)			X	
5. Result in any significant increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site? (ESD)		X		
6. Result in changes in deposition or erosion or changes in siltation which may modify the channel of a river, stream, or		X		



lake? (ESD)				
7. Result in exposure of people or property to geologic and geomorphological (i.e. Avalanches) hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards? (PLN, ESD)			X	
8. Be located on a geological unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse? (ESD)			X	
9. Be located on expansive soils, as defined in Chapter 18 of the California Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property? (ESD)			X	

Discussion- Items VI-1,4,9:

According to the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Soil Survey of Placer County and the United States Department of Agriculture ~ Natural Resources Conservation Service Web Soil Survey, the proposed project is located on several different soils classified as: Andregg coarse sandy loam, Cometa-Fiddymont complex, Rubble land, and Xerorthents. The predominant soil at the site is Xerorthents. The limitations identified for the soil classifications are slope (moderate to severe), expansive soil (moderate), depth to hard bedrock (minor), large stones (severe), and ponding/flooding (severe). The soils survey does not identify any unique geologic or physical features for the existing soil types. No known unique geologic or physical features exist on the site that will be destroyed or modified. The site is not known to be located on a geological unit or soil that is unstable or that will become unstable as a result of the project. Construction of the proposed buildings and associated parking/roadway improvements will not create any unstable earth conditions or change any geologic substructure resulting in unstable earth. The project will be constructed in compliance with the California Building Code to address building related soil issues and will obtain grading permits as necessary to address grading issues. The project will not be constructed in any area where ponding or flooding will occur. Therefore, this impact is less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Items VI-2,3:

To construct the improvements proposed, potentially significant disruption of soils on-site will occur, including excavation/compaction for the on-site buildings, roadway and parking area improvements, foundations, and various utilities. Approximately five acres will be disturbed by grading activities. The earthwork is proposed to include approximately 8,000 cubic yards and balance on site and not require any import or export of soil material. In addition, there are potentially significant impacts that may occur from the proposed changes to the existing topography. The project proposes maximum soil cuts or fills of up to approximately five feet and as shown on the preliminary grading plan. The soil on the site has the potential to contain large stones and the project may be required to use blasting techniques as part of the site disruption. The project's site specific impacts associated with soil disruptions and topography changes can be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures:

Mitigation Measures- Items VI-2,3:

MM VI.1 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 Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD) for review and approval. The plans shall show all physical improvements as required by the 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 and Placer County Fire Department improvement plan review and inspection fees with the 1st Improvement Plan submittal. (NOTE: Prior to plan approval, all applicable recording and reproduction cost 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 Development Review Committee (DRC) review is required as a condition of approval for the project, said review process shall be completed prior to submittal of Improvement Plans. Record drawings shall be prepared and signed by a California Registered Civil Engineer at the applicant's expense and

shall be submitted to the ESD in both hard copy and electronic versions in a format to be approved by the ESD prior to acceptance by the County of site improvements.

Conceptual landscape plans submitted prior to project approval may require modification during the Improvement Plan process to resolve issues of drainage and traffic safety.

Prior to the County's final acceptance of the project's improvements, submit to the Engineering and Surveying Department two copies of the Record Drawings in digital format (on compact disc or other acceptable media) in accordance with the latest version of the Placer County Digital Plan and Map Standards along with two blackline hardcopies (black print on bond paper) and two PDF copies. The digital format is to allow integration with Placer County's Geographic Information System (GIS). The final approved blackline hardcopy Record Drawings will be the official document of record.

MM VI.2 The Improvement Plans shall show all proposed grading, drainage improvements, vegetation and tree removal and all work shall conform to provisions of the County Grading Ordinance (Ref. Article 15.48, Placer County Code) and Stormwater Quality Ordinance (Ref. Article 8.28, 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 Development Review Committee (DRC). All cut/fill slopes shall be at a maximum of 2:1 (horizontal: vertical) unless a soils report supports a steeper slope and the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD) concurs with said recommendation. Fill slopes shall not exceed 1.5:1 (horizontal: vertical)

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 ensure proper installation and maintenance of erosion control/winterization before, during, and after project construction. Soil stockpiling or borrow areas, shall have proper erosion control measures applied for the duration of the construction as specified in the Improvement Plans. Provide for erosion control where roadside drainage is off of the pavement, to the satisfaction of the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD).

The applicant shall submit to the ESD a letter of credit or cash deposit in the amount of 110 percent of an approved engineer's estimate for winterization and permanent erosion control work prior to Improvement Plan approval to guarantee protection against erosion and improper grading practices. Upon the County's acceptance of improvements, and satisfactory completion of a one-year maintenance period, unused portions of said deposit shall be refunded to the project applicant or authorized agent.

If, at any time during construction, a field review by County personnel indicates a significant deviation from the proposed grading shown on the Improvement Plans, specifically with regard to slope heights, slope ratios, erosion control, winterization, tree disturbance, and/or pad elevations and configurations, the plans shall be reviewed by the 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.

Discussion- Items VI-5,6:

The disruption of the soil discussed in Items 2 and 3 above increases the risk of erosion and creates a potential for contamination of storm runoff with disturbed sediment or other pollutants introduced through typical grading practices. In addition, this soil disruption has the potential to modify any existing on site drainageways by transporting erosion from the disturbed area into local drainageways. Discharge of concentrated runoff after construction could also contribute to these impacts in the long-term. Erosion potential and water quality impacts are always present and occur when soils are disturbed and protective vegetative cover is removed. It is primarily the shaping of building pads, grading for transportation systems and construction for utilities that are responsible for accelerating erosion and degrading water quality. The project would increase the potential for erosion impacts without appropriate mitigation measures. The project's site specific impacts associated with erosion can be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures:

Mitigation Measures- Items VI-5,6:

MM VI.1, MM VI.2 and the following measures:

MM VI.3 The Improvement Plans shall show that water quality treatment facilities/Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall be designed according to the guidance of the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best

55

Management Practice Handbooks for Construction, for New Development / Redevelopment, and for Industrial and Commercial (or other similar source as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD) such as the Stormwater Quality Design Manual for the Sacramento and South Placer Regions).

Construction (temporary) BMPs for the project include, but are not limited to: Fiber Rolls (SE-5), Straw Bale Barrier (SE-9), Straw Wattles, Storm Drain Inlet Protection (SE-10), Velocity Dissipation Devices (EC-10), Hydroseeding (EC-4), Silt Fence (SE-1), Wind Erosion Control (WE-1), Stabilized Construction Entrance (TC-1), and revegetation techniques.

MM VI.4 Prior to Improvement Plan approval, the applicant shall obtain a State Regional Water Quality Control Board National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) construction stormwater quality permit and shall provide to the Engineering and Surveying Department evidence of a state-issued Waste Discharge Identification (WDID) number or filing of a Notice of Intent and fees.

MM VI.5 This project is located within the permit area covered by Placer County's Small Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit (State Water Resources Control Board National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit No.CAS000004, Order No. 2013-0001-DWQ), pursuant to the NPDES Phase II program. Project-related stormwater discharges are subject to all applicable requirements of said permit.

The project shall implement permanent and operational source control measures as applicable. Source control measures shall be designed for pollutant generating activities or sources consistent with recommendations from the California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA) Stormwater BMP Handbook for New Development and Redevelopment, or equivalent manual, and shall be shown on the Improvement Plans.

The project is also required to implement Low Impact Development (LID) standards designed to reduce runoff, treat stormwater, and provide baseline hydro modification management.

Discussion- Items VI-7,8:

The California Department of Mines and Geology classifies the project site as a low severity earthquake zone. The project site is considered to have low seismic risk with respect to faulting, ground shaking, seismically related ground failure and liquefaction. The site does not lie within an Alquist-Priolo special study zone for seismic impacts. The site is located in a relatively quiet seismic area when compared to other more active areas of California. The project site is considered to have low seismic risk with respect to faulting, ground shaking, seismically related ground failure and liquefaction. However, there is a potential for the site to be subjected to at least moderate earthquake shaking during the useful life of any future buildings. The project will be constructed in compliance with the California Building Code, which includes seismic standards. Therefore, these impacts are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant and/or cumulative impact on the environment? (PLN, Air Quality)		X		
2. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? (PLN, Air Quality)		X		

Discussion- All Items:

Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions of primary concern from land use projects include carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), and nitrous oxide (N₂O). Construction related activities resulting in exhaust emissions may come from fuel combustion for heavy-duty diesel and gasoline-powered equipment, portable auxiliary equipment, material delivery trucks, and worker commuter trips. Operational GHG emissions would result from motor vehicle trips generated by the patrons, workers, as well as on-site fuel combustion for landscape maintenance equipment.

The project would result in grading, subsequent paving and the construction of approximately 31,162 square feet of new buildings, along with associated parking areas. The project would consist of approximately 23,552 square feet

56

of space as "working lofts" and the other 7,500 square feet as an event center. The CalEEMod analysis included an analysis for Greenhouse Gases. The analysis utilized a factor of 200 events per year, and 500 people maximum, per event for the analysis. Based upon these limitations, the construction and operational related GHG emissions resulting from the project did not exceed APCD's accepted threshold of 1,100 metric tons of CO₂ equivalent (MT CO₂e), and therefore would not substantially hinder the State's ability to attain the goals identified in AB 32 (i.e., reduction of statewide GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020; approximately a 30 percent reduction from projected 2020 emissions). Thus, with the implementation of the mitigation measure included below, the construction and operation of the project would not generate substantial greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, which may be considered to have a significant impact on the environment, nor conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

Mitigation Measures- Items VII-1,2:

MM VII.1 The event center shall be limited to a maximum of 200 events annually and 500 attendees per event.

VIII. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine handling, transport, use, or disposal of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials? (EHS)			X	
2. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (EHS)			X	
3. Emit hazardous emissions, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (PLN, Air Quality)			X	
4. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (EHS)			X	
5. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (PLN)				X
6. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing in the project area? (PLN)				X
7. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? (PLN)				X
8. Create any health hazard or potential health hazard? (EHS)			X	
9. Expose people to existing sources of potential health hazards? (EHS)				X

Discussion- Items VIII-1,2:

The use of hazardous substances during normal construction activities is expected to be limited in nature, and will be subject to standard handling and storage requirements. Accordingly, impacts related to the release of hazardous substances are considered less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item VIII-3:

There are no known existing or proposed schools within one-quarter mile of the proposed project. The closest known school is Eureka Union Elementary School, which is approximately 0.35 miles south of the proposed project. Therefore, there would be a less than significant impact, and no mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item VIII-4:

The project is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. A Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment by A/C Industrial Services Corporation dated April 11, 2005 did not reveal any evidence of recognized environmental conditions in connection with the property. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item VIII-5:

The project is not located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has been adopted, or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. As such, the project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. There is no impact.

Discussion- Item VIII-6:

The project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip and as such, would not result in a safety hazard for people residing in the project area. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion- Item VIII-7:

Based on the project analysis, the project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires because there are no wildlands adjacent to residential parcels in the immediate developed area of Granite Bay. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion- Item VIII-8:

Mosquito breeding is not expected to significantly impact this project. Common problems associated with over watering of landscaping have the potential to breed mosquitoes. As a condition of this project, it is recommended that drip irrigation be used for landscaped areas and that the project adhere to the guidelines provided by the Placer Mosquito and Vector Control District in their letter to Powers Equity dated August 20, 2012. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item VIII-9:

The project will not expose people to existing sources of potential health hazards therefore there is no impact.

IX. HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Violate any federal, state or county potable water quality standards? (EHS)				X
2. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lessening of local groundwater supplies (i.e. the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? (EHS)				X
3. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area? (ESD)			X	
4. Increase the rate or amount of surface runoff? (ESD)		X		
5. Create or contribute runoff water which would include substantial additional sources of polluted water? (ESD)		X		

52