

County's discretion, in-lieu fees may be stipulated. In this event, the in-lieu fees would be used for park improvements within the *Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan* area.

Although it cannot be guaranteed that project residents will not use facilities in Roseville and Sacramento County, the proposed Specific Plan includes 10 acres of parkland and 123.9 acres of open space dedicated for active and passive recreation, which meets or exceeds the County's standard. Between recreational facilities within the Specific Plan Area and the County's facilities, such as the nearby Dry Creek Regional Park, the Specific Plan Area's residents would be adequately served by the open space, park land, and recreational facilities and would make it more likely that the residents would not overuse existing park facilities in surrounding areas and cause physical deterioration. In addition, sharing of facilities is viewed as desirable in some respects, and is the reason trail networks in Sacramento County, Placer County, and Roseville are to be connected.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Less than Significant

**L. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

**Impact 15-1** Accidental releases of hazardous materials or hazardous waste during construction due to presence of construction-related hazardous materials. This impact is considered *Potentially Significant*.

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation:**

Hazardous materials could be used and stored in the Plan Area during construction. Local and state requirements for interim storage of hazardous and flammable materials have been adopted to ensure proper use, storage, and handling of these materials. Ensuring compliance with these regulations would reduce potential impacts from accidental releases. With implementation of the specified mitigation measures, impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 15-1a: Comply with Placer County EHS and Fire Department requirements**

Each phase of construction within the Riolo Vineyard specific plan area shall comply with Placer County EHS and Fire Department requirements for temporary storage of combustible/flammable liquids at construction sites. These requirements include inspection to verify maintenance of a vegetation break and identification of emergency shutoff valves and switches. If electrical connections are provided to these facilities, the County will additionally require permitting through the County Building Department.

**Mitigation Measure 15-1b: Comply with Placer County EHS requirements regarding releases of hazardous materials**

Each future construction project within the Riolo Vineyard specific plan area shall comply with Placer County EHS requirements for reporting releases of hazardous materials. If a release of hazardous materials should occur, it will be contained and immediately reported to the County EHS. Impacted soil shall be excavated and disposed as required by the agency with regulatory jurisdiction.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Less than Significant

**Impact 15-2** Release of hazardous materials or hazardous waste during construction due to existing site conditions on project-related parcels. This impact is considered *Potentially Significant*.

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation:**

Disturbance of on-site soils during construction could result in exposure to workers and the environment to potentially contaminated soil. However, implementation of mitigation measures would reduce the impacts to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 15-2a: Remediate contaminated properties in accordance with applicable regulations**

Contamination found during construction is reported to EHS, which in turn confers with state oversight agencies as necessary for removal. If near surface soil sampling and testing is conducted, a letter documenting the sampling program and test results shall be submitted to the DTSC, and no construction activities shall be initiated at the site until the DTSC issues a letter authorizing such activities, which should be based upon a risk assessment. Prior to Grading or Improvement Plan approval, the Applicant shall complete a risk assessment with DTSC and submit the results to EHS. The risk assessment shall address future use as open space as well as removal of fill materials proposed for areas with past vineyard, orchard, or soil stockpile use.

As discussed in Section 15.1.2 and presented in Tables 15-1 and 15-2, some preliminary removal of contaminated materials of project-level parcels has already occurred and been documented. Additionally, an evaluation of possible pesticide contamination associated with past agricultural uses has been conducted (Ramcon, 2007a, 2007b).

The potential for worker contact with hazardous materials and hazardous release of waste or materials at the project-level parcels during construction activities would be subject to a risk assessment and appropriate remediation, if necessary, or if not already completed. Prior to Final Map approval, the Applicant shall complete and certify any remedial action required by DTSC. Remediation, if required, may include a range of activities, including restrictions on use, soil excavation, disposal off the site, or encapsulation in appropriate areas away from sensitive receptors.

**Mitigation Measure 15-2b: Remove debris and report possible contamination to DTSC**

Partial removal of debris has already occurred on certain parcels (Ramcon, 2004a and 2005b). During future construction, projects within the Riolo Vineyard specific plan area shall include removal of debris and reporting of any possible contamination to DTSC in their construction contracts.

Prior to initiating construction, all abandoned refuse on the site shall be removed and disposed of appropriately. Construction contract specifications shall require that during the course of construction of any individual project within the boundaries of the Riolo Vineyard Specific Plan, if evidence of soil and/or

groundwater contamination with hazardous material (i.e., soil staining, unusual odors) is encountered, the Applicant shall stop work and immediately contact the DTSC and/or RWQCB. If such a condition is identified, then (1) the condition shall be resolved (i.e., through soil excavation, remediation, covering, or other method) to the satisfaction of DTSC and/or the RWQCB, and (2) construction activities shall not commence until the DTSC and/or RWQCB issue a letter of authorizing such activities.

**Mitigation Measure 15-2c: Implement Preliminary Endangerment Assessment in accordance with DTSC protocols**

A Preliminary Endangerment Assessment (PEA) will be conducted in accordance with DTSC protocols prior to grading or other earth-moving activities to address the potentially significant health and environmental risks associated with the current concentrations of arsenic detected in the soils assessments conducted for the project site that are above the most recently developed PRGs. DTSC will evaluate the PEA as part of the Voluntary Cleanup Agreement and provide additional project-specific requirements.

**Mitigation Measure 15-2d: Obtain "No Further Action" letter from DTSC**

Prior to grading and other earth-moving activities, the Applicant shall obtain notice from DTSC that the property in question does not require further investigation and action.

**Mitigation Measure 15-2e: Implement Mitigation Measure 15-2a (Remediate contaminated properties in accordance with applicable regulations)**

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Less than Significant

**Impact 15-3** Potential hazards associated with unused wells. This impact is considered *Potentially Significant*.

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation:**

All wells within the project-level parcels will be abandoned according to applicable standards. Proper closure of these older wells of unknown construction according to local and state regulations would eliminate this impact.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 15-3a: Abandon onsite wells in accordance with local and state regulations**

The Applicant shall ensure that unused wells on the site are closed in accordance with local and state regulations prior to initiating any construction activities. A permit for well destruction shall be obtained from the Placer County EHS and a licensed contractor shall perform the work, as required. The abandonment of the onsite wells would need to occur prior to occupancy of development within the project phase containing the well site in question.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Less than Significant

**Impact 15-4 Accidental releases of hazardous materials or hazardous waste during project operation. This impact is considered *Potentially Significant*.**

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation:**

Accidental releases of hazardous materials and hazardous waste after construction could occur from onsite or offsite sources. During the storage and/or use of chemical products, the risk of an accidental release exists. However, based on the types and quantities of hazardous substances anticipated to be used, the risk of a release of a significant quantity of hazardous substances on the Plan Area is considered minimal. By following local and state requirements for the management of hazardous materials, the risk of a release of hazardous substances on the Plan Area would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 15-4a: Comply with requirements for filing of emergency response and hazardous materials storage/containment plans**

Comply with Placer County EHS requirements for preparation and filing of Emergency Response Plans and Hazardous Materials Storage and Containment Plans.

All future development within the boundaries of the Riolo Vineyard specific plan area will comply with EHS requirements for preparation and filing of Emergency Response Plans and Hazardous Materials Storage and Containment Plans. These requirements apply to any commercial business that stores an acutely hazardous substance or 55 gallons and/or 50 pounds of a hazardous substance or 200 cubic feet of combustible gas. These plans would be prepared under Article 80 of the Uniform Fire Code. Copies of these documents must be provided to the Placer County Division of Environmental Health as the CUPA.

**Mitigation Measure 15-4b: Comply with underground storage tank and aboveground storage tank regulations of Placer County EHS and the RWQCB**

Comply with underground and aboveground storage tank regulations of the County EHS.

Any commercial businesses located within the boundaries of the Riolo Vineyard specific plan area that have underground storage tanks and/or aboveground storage tanks shall comply with the underground storage tank regulations of Placer County and the aboveground storage tank regulations of the RWQCB.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Less than Significant

**Impact 15-5 Potential health hazard caused by mosquitoes and other vectors. This impact is considered *Potentially Significant*.**

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation:**

The Plan Area includes wetland, park, agricultural, and open space areas that have the potential to become locations for mosquito breeding. If not managed properly, residents and businesses may be exposed to diseases transmitted by vectors such as mosquitoes. This is considered a potentially significant impact. The Placer Mosquito Abatement and Vector Control District would be allowed to perform vector control in all common areas of the proposed project in perpetuity. These measures would reduce the resulting impacts to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 15-5a: Avoid occurrence of standing water during construction (Proposed)**

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 disease vectors. Direct pumping and/or ditching will be used to reduce to the amount of standing water or reduce the length of time water can stand in low areas following rainfall events. The target holding period is 72 hours, which is consistent with guidelines being developed by the Placer County Mosquito Abatement and Vector Control District (Scott, 2007).

**Mitigation Measure 15-5b: Grant access to Placer Mosquito Abatement and Vector Control District for vector control**

The Placer Mosquito Abatement and Vector Control 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 specific plan area.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Less than Significant

**Impact 15-6 Potential health and safety hazard caused by abandoned septic systems on project-level parcels. This impact is considered *Potentially Significant*.**

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation:**

All existing septic systems on project-level parcels would be abandoned and existing and future residents would be provided sewer service. The presence of existing and probable abandoned septic systems in the specific plan area is considered a potentially significant impact. Mitigation includes appropriate site-specific evaluations of possible septic systems conducted in accordance with County policy and the destruction of septic facilities in accordance with state and Placer County regulations. This mitigation measure would reduce the impacts associated with onsite septic systems on project-level parcels to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 15-6a: Destroy existing septic systems in accordance with Placer County EHS criteria**

Site-specific evaluation shall be conducted in accordance with County policy at each identified existing and former dwelling area to identify surface indications and locations of septic tanks or cesspools prior to

demolition of existing residences. Identified septic tanks shall be destroyed according to Placer County EHS criteria prior to recordation of final small lot subdivision map for the affected property. The locations of existing septic systems shall be shown on the final small lot subdivision map to ensure that the septic system remains with the associated parcel.

Surface conditions shall be evaluated by Placer County EHS when the dwellings are vacated, and prior to demolition of the structures regarding the possibility of previous site uses that may have included hazardous materials that could have been disposed of in onsite wastewater disposal systems.

Tank or cesspool destruction shall be performed under permit with Placer County EHS. Any required remediation work shall be completed in accordance with state and Placer County regulations prior to recordation of a final small lot subdivision map for the affected property.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Less than Significant

**Impact 15-7** Potential health hazard caused by asbestos in older structures to be demolished. This impact is considered *Potentially Significant*.

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation:**

The possible presence of asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) in the Plan Area is considered a potentially significant impact. If ACMs are identified, mitigation of the potential hazards associated with ACMs would include pre-demolition surveys performed by a Certified Asbestos Consultant followed by proper removal and disposal accomplished by a California licensed asbestos abatement contractor. Implementation of this mitigation would reduce the impacts associated with ACMs to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 15-7a: Evaluate and abate ACMs in accordance with regulations**

Surveys of structures that are planned for demolition during Specific Plan development shall be conducted by a Certified Asbestos Consultant licensed with the California Department of Occupational Safety and Health to determine if friable Regulated ACMs or non-friable ACMs are present within the structure demolition areas. This is required in order to obtain a demolition permit from the Placer County Building Department. The Placer County Air Pollution Control District does not have delegation for Asbestos National Emission Standard for Hazardous Air Pollutants enforcement. Accordingly, asbestos notifications will be sent to the U.S. EPA Region IX and the California Air Resources Board. (Nishikawa, 2007). Any regulated ACMs found in the investigated areas shall be removed and disposed of by a California licensed asbestos abatement contractor. All removal of ACMs shall be completed prior to recordation of final maps for the affected property.

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Less than Significant

**Impact 15-8** Release of hazardous materials or hazardous waste during construction due to existing site conditions on program-level parcels. This impact is considered *Potentially Significant*.

**Findings:**

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

**Explanation:**

Program-level parcels have not been subjected to Phase I ESAs. Phase I ESAs would be required prior to approval of development on program-level parcels, and all appropriate remediation performed, if necessary. Additionally, mitigation measures identified for release of hazardous materials or hazardous waste during construction due to existing site conditions on project-level parcels would be required for program-level parcels. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure 15-8a: Conduct Phase I Environmental Site Assessments on program-level parcels proposed for development, and comply with Placer County requirements for remediation, if required**

For each program-level parcel proposed for development, properties not previously evaluated with a current Phase I ESA may be required to complete an ESA determined by Environmental Health Services. If past uses are disclosed that could have resulted in persistent contamination, then soil sampling shall be conducted within appropriate areas according to guidelines developed by the DTSC Phase II Environmental Site Assessment and/or equivalent protocol.

The site investigation including sampling shall be conducted by a California registered environmental professional, performed with oversight from Placer County Environmental Health Services, in accordance with applicable permits. As a result of soil investigation, a limited and restricted area of contamination may be identified and judged suitable for simple removal. If this is the case, remediation will be required to meet state and County regulations. If a result of soil investigation, widespread residual concentrations of chemicals or other contaminants maybe identified at levels where they individually or in combination meet or exceed U.S. EPA, California EPA Preliminary Remediation Goals, or equivalent screening levels, a risk assessment will be required. Risk assessments shall include a DTSC Preliminary Endangerment Assessment or no further action determination, or equivalent.

Any remedial action indicated by a risk assessment shall be completed and certified. Remediation shall include a DTSC Remedial Action Workplan, or equivalent, and involve a range of activities, including deed restrictions, soil excavation and offsite disposal, or encapsulation away from sensitive receptors in the Specific Plan Area.

**Mitigation Measure 15-8b: Implement Mitigation Measure 15-2a (Remediate contaminated properties in accordance with applicable regulations)**

**Mitigation Measure 15-8c: Implement Mitigation Measure 15-2b (Remove debris and report possible contamination to Placer County EHS)**

**Significance after Mitigation:**

Less than Significant

**Impact 15-9** Potential health and safety hazard caused by abandoned septic systems on program-level parcels. This impact is considered *Potentially Significant*.

## Findings:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

## Explanation:

All existing septic systems on program-level would be abandoned as landowners apply for development permits. Future residents of these parcels would be provided sewer service. The presence of existing and probable abandoned septic systems in the specific plan area is considered a potentially significant impact. Mitigation includes appropriate site-specific evaluations of possible septic systems conducted by a qualified professional and the destruction of septic facilities in accordance with state and Placer County regulations. This mitigation measure would reduce the impacts associated with onsite septic systems to a less-than-significant level.

## Mitigation Measures:

**Mitigation Measure 15-9a: Destroy existing septic systems in accordance with Placer County EHS criteria on program-level parcels when these lots receive development entitlements**

## Significance after Mitigation:

Less than Significant

## X. GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS

The CEQA Guidelines require an EIR to evaluate indirect or secondary effects of a project, which may include growth-inducing effects. Section 15126(d) of the CEQA Guidelines states that a project could be considered growth inducing if it could "foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment." A development project may have growth-inducing potential if, for example, it extends infrastructure (e.g., water, sewer, roads) to undeveloped areas or increases the capacity of existing infrastructure; promotes similar development to occur on adjacent parcels; increases the area's housing supply; or introduces new employment to an area.

In the absence of other favorable conditions, however, it is unlikely that any one of these components could induce significant growth. A mix of economic, political, physical, and social factors ultimately determines the magnitude, location, and timing of growth. Variables, including regional economic trends, housing demand, land availability and cost, quality of infrastructure and public services, proximity to employment centers, and regulatory considerations, affect the way in which growth occurs.

### **Growth Anticipated in the *Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan***

The *Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan* provides for development of land within the Riolo Vineyard Specific Plan area and within the Community Plan area. The development visions for the specific plan area expressed in the Community Plan include low-density residential development and two commercial centers, located along PFE Road with its intersections with Watt Avenue and Walerga Road. The proposed project would provide for a level of growth beyond that anticipated in the Community Plan by allowing up to 933 dwelling units, as opposed to the approximately 650 units envisioned in the Community Plan. This would introduce an unanticipated increase in population of approximately 670 persons within the proposed project area.

Small parcels of undeveloped or vacant land lie south of PFE Road, west of Watt Avenue, and within the Dry Creek floodplain. The lands surrounding the proposed Plan Area are currently undergoing rapid development. Except for areas within the 100-year floodplain of Dry Creek, surrounding lands are identified for low-density residential

development. The largest component of envisioned development identified for the immediately surrounding area in the Community Plan is the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan area. As approved, Placer Vineyards will change the character of the western portion of the Community Plan area from rural to urban.

### **Current Constraints to Growth**

As discussed in the EIR, there are few principal constraints to substantial new growth in the vicinity of the study area. Surrounding parcels are designated for Low-Density Development or other urban uses. Such land use designations anticipate growth; they do not provide a constraint to growth. Portions of the surrounding area rely on individual septic systems. Water and sewer pipelines serve portions of the Community Plan area from the west, up to Walerga Road. Additional growth would require extensions of these services, including (depending on location) annexation into PCWA's Zone 1 and into the West Dry Creek (Basin 5A) service area of the Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant. These are modest constraints, as are the existing two-lane roadways in the Community Plan area that cannot adequately support a substantial increase in traffic. Therefore, the present lack of infrastructure is not considered a substantial constraint to growth.

### **Removal of Growth Constraints**

If the Applicant constructs the necessary infrastructure to extend water, sewer, gas and electricity to support the specific plan area, the modest constraint to growth afforded by lack of water and sewer service would be removed. More substantively, if planned improvements to roadways surrounding the Plan Area are constructed, the additional capacity of improved roadways would remove a constraint to growth.

## **XI. PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**

These findings address whether the various alternatives lessen or avoid any of the significant unavoidable impacts associated with the project and consider the feasibility of each alternative. Under CEQA, "'(f)feasible' means capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors." (CEQA Guidelines § 15364.) The concept of feasibility permits agency decisionmakers to consider the extent to which an alternative is able to meet some or all of a project's objectives. In addition, the definition of feasibility encompasses desirability to the extent that an agency's determination of infeasibility represents a reasonable balancing of competing economic, environmental, social, and technological factors.

As stated in Section 15126.6(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, the primary intent of the alternatives evaluation in an EIR is to:

"...describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives."

The feasibility of an alternative may be determined based on a variety of factors including, but not limited to, site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, General Plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and site accessibility and control (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)(1)).

The Board of Supervisors has considered the Project Alternatives presented and analyzed in the EIR and presented during the comment period and public hearing process. Some of these Alternatives have the potential to avoid or reduce certain significant or potentially significant environmental impacts, as set forth below. The Board of Supervisors finds, based on specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, that these Alternatives are infeasible and/or would not satisfy project objectives (either in whole or significant part). Each Alternative and the facts supporting the finding of infeasibility of each Alternative are set forth below.

## A. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND DISMISSED FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION

Consistent with CEQA, primary consideration was given to alternatives that would reduce significant impacts while still meeting most of the project objectives. Those alternatives that would have impacts identical to or more severe than the project, or that would not meet most of the project objectives (either in whole or in significant part), were rejected from further consideration. Alternatives exceeding the significance thresholds for the aforementioned issue areas would not substantially lessen any significant environmental impacts identified in the EIR and were rejected from further analysis.

### 1. Onsite Alternatives

The significant impacts of the proposed project are associated with a change in land use and associated changes in the visual character of the Plan Area, fill in the floodplain, increased traffic and an associated decrease in air quality and increase in noise, and current lack of adequate school capacity to meet the needs of projected residents.

The County worked to identify onsite alternatives that would avoid or substantially lessen any of these significant effects. The efforts centered on reducing the project footprint, avoiding fill in the floodplain, and decreasing the density within the Plan Area. A reduction in density of 50 percent of the proposed project was considered, but eliminated because it would not be likely to produce enough revenue to construct the required water, sewer, recycled water and roadway infrastructure, or provide sufficient revenue for the maintenance of public open-space areas and park facilities, infrastructure, and public services. Given that the Plan Area lies between two roadways destined to become major arterials, Watt Avenue and Walerga Road, the Plan Area is a good candidate for more dense development in accordance with the Sacramento Area Council of Government's *Blueprint for Regional Growth*, and a substantially reduced density alternative beyond those analyzed in the EIR would not be consistent with those principles.

### 2. Offsite Alternatives

The *West Placer/Dry Creek Community Plan* identifies the Plan Area for future residential and commercial uses, and requires that a Specific Plan be prepared prior to approving development. There are no remaining areas within the Community Plan area that could feasibly accommodate a project of this size. One of the objectives identified in the *Riolo Vineyards Specific Plan* is to conform to the *Placer County General Plan* and *Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan*, which designate the proposed project area for urban development. Development outside of the Community Plan area would not achieve the goals and policies of the Community Plan, and would instead amount to a reconsideration of the long range planning decision the Community Plan represents.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)(2)(A) states that the key question and first step in analysis is whether any of the significant effects of the project would be avoided or substantially lessened by putting the project in another location. Only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project need be considered for inclusion in the EIR. Development of the project at an alternative site would include the same uses and, therefore, many of same effects would still occur. An alternative location would generally displace, but not necessarily eliminate, the impacts identified for the Project.

The significant and unavoidable environmental impacts of the project on air quality and loss of agricultural land would not be avoided if the project were located at an alternative location. The Plan Area is located in an area served by existing regional infrastructure and arterial roadways, and is located adjacent to existing urban development in Sacramento County, as well as existing and planned urban areas within Placer County. Development of the proposed project at an alternative location within Placer County would require the extension of additional infrastructure and public services compared to the project site, and would not represent an efficient use of existing public investments. In addition, an offsite alternative would require an expansion of urban uses to areas within Placer County that are designated under the General Plan for agricultural use or to areas unsuitable for development compared to the project site due to environmental or habitat constraints. For these reasons, an offsite

alternative was not identified in this Draft EIR.

## **B. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN THE EIR**

The EIR provides a comparative analysis of the merits of alternatives to the proposed project pursuant to Section 15126.6 of the state CEQA Guidelines, as amended. The purpose of the alternatives analysis is to explain potentially feasible ways to avoid or minimize significant effects of the project. According to the CEQA Guidelines, the EIR need only examine in detail those alternatives that could feasibly meet most of the basic objectives of the project. When addressing feasibility, the CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 states that "among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the applicant can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to alternative sites." The CEQA Guidelines also specify that the alternatives discussion should not be remote or speculative, and need not be presented in the same level of detail as the assessment of the proposed project.

Therefore, based on the CEQA Guidelines, several factors need to be considered in determining the range of alternatives to be analyzed in an EIR and the level of analytical detail that should be provided for each alternative. These factors include: (1) the nature of the significant impacts of the proposed project; (2) the ability of alternatives to avoid or lessen the significant impacts associated with the project; (3) the ability of the alternatives to meet the objectives of the project; and (4) the feasibility of the alternatives. These factors would be unique for each project. These considerations narrowed the alternatives for analysis in the EIR to those described below. This analysis primarily evaluates alternatives for their ability to eliminate or substantially reduce residual (post-mitigation) impacts or effects attributed to the proposed project and the impacts of mitigation measures.

The No Project Alternative is comprised of two sub-alternatives:

- Alternative 1A: No Development Alternative
- Alternative 1B: Community Plan Development Alternative

Three additional project alternatives, described below, were selected to represent the range of project options for purposes of evaluating environmental impacts. In addition to the No Project Alternatives, project alternatives include the following:

- Alternative 2: Floodplain Encroachment Avoidance Alternative
- Alternative 3: Reduced Density Alternative
- Alternative 4: Clustered Development Alternative

Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 analyzed in the EIR were considered as potentially feasible scenarios for different development at the site. Together with the two No Project sub-alternatives, the analyses capture a reasonable range of site alternatives, from continuation of the existing conditions to other development that might reasonably occur.

### **1. Alternative 1A - No Development Alternative**

#### **Description**

CEQA requires the evaluation of the comparative impacts of the "No Project" alternative. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(1)). The No Development Alternative describes an alternative in which no development would occur on the project site and the uses on the site would remain the same as under existing conditions. Under the No Development Alternative, the project site would likely continue to be used for agricultural production and open space. The site-specific impacts of the No Development alternative are best described by the existing conditions presented in the environmental setting sections of the EIR.

## Analysis of the Alternative's Ability to Reduce Significant Unavoidable Project Impacts

The No Development alternative would produce no changes on the project site, effectively eliminating those project impacts discussed in the EIR. Because the site would remain in its current condition, there would be no environmental impacts associated with introducing buildings and people into an area that is currently undeveloped. There would be no proposed cancellation of a Williamson Act contract. Under the No Development Alternative, there would be no change in the existing visual environment. No light sources would be created and there would be no change to the existing visual character of the project site. There would be no increase in air pollutants associated with project construction nor an increase in pollutants associated with more vehicles accessing the area. The loss of productive agricultural land would not occur. There would be no increase in noise associated with project construction and/or any noise impacts associated with future operational activities. Greenhouse gas emissions that could contribute to global warming would remain the same. Under this alternative, the number of vehicles accessing the site would not change; therefore, there would be no operational impacts to the surrounding roadway network or freeway.

### **2: Alternative 1B - Community Plan Development Alternative**

#### Description

Section 15126(e) of the CEQA Guidelines also refers to analysis of "what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project was not approved based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services." As a result of the existing *Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan* land use designations applicable to the project site, it is anticipated that development on the project site would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the proposed project were not approved.

Under this alternative, the Plan Area would be built out under the permitted conditions described in the Community Plan. The Community Plan designates portions of the project site as Low Density Residential (LDR), Open Space, and Commercial, and notes the need for cemetery expansion. It identifies about 230 upland acres for LDR uses. This alternative assumes that 650 LDR lots could be developed on approximately 230 upland acres within the Plan Area under the existing Community Plan. This alternative assumes that the minimum lot size standards and the density transfer provisions of the Community Plan (see Community Plan pages 41 and 46) would be applied to development on the project site.

## Analysis of the Alternative's Ability to Reduce Significant Unavoidable Project Impacts

This alternative is environmentally superior to the proposed project in most respects. It would, by definition, meet the project objectives related to implementing the County's *General Plan* and *Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan*. It would meet many but not all of the Applicant's objectives as well. It would not fully meet the following objectives: preservation of agricultural uses, enhancement of trail connectivity, enhancement of smart growth principles and the Sacramento Area Council of Government's *Blueprint for Regional Growth*, and providing a full range of housing densities and product choices, including medium and high density residential development.

This Alternative would convert existing land use designated Open Space to urban land uses, in a similar but less intense manner than the proposed project. The alternative would devote less acreage for residential units (230 acres) and more acreage for commercial uses (26.1 acres) than the proposed project (265.6 acres for residential units and 7.5 for acres for commercial uses). The combined acreage of both residential and commercial uses for the Community Plan Development Alternative would be 256.1 acres, which is 7.5 acres less than the combined acreage of residential and commercial uses for the proposed project (273.1 acres). Impacts related to conversion of land use from agricultural and open space to urban uses would be less than significant under this alternative, although Alternative 1B would not incorporate Agricultural-10 parcels where agricultural uses would be continued, as would the proposed project.

Under this Alternative, temporary and long-term visual impacts due to construction would be similar but likely not last as long as under the proposed project, since the number of dwelling units under this Alternative would be reduced by approximately 30 percent. View obstruction and change to landscape character for motorists on adjacent roadways as well as visual intrusion and adverse change in visual character due to new residences in views from Roseville Cemetery would also be similar.

This Alternative would generate approximately 837 fewer weekday daily trips than the proposed project. Overall, the impacts to transportation would be less than the proposed project. However, even with mitigation similar to that identified for the proposed project, impacts to transportation and circulation under this Alternative would still likely be significant.

Construction of this Alternative would be expected to generate fewer emissions over the full duration of the construction activities and would be expected to generate the same or fewer emissions during the peak day of construction. Similar to the proposed project, short-term construction impacts would likely be significant. During operations, this Alternative would generate 837 fewer trips than the proposed project because, although there would be approximately 30 percent fewer lots, the increase in commercial land use would provide additional trips as compared to the commercial trips generated by the proposed project. This Alternative would generate approximately 8 percent fewer criteria pollutant emissions. Assuming these reductions in emission sources, the operational emissions of NOX, ROG, and CO would still be significant.

Alternative 1B would generate 837 fewer trips than the proposed project. Therefore, noise levels due to the trips to/from the Plan Area can reasonably be expected to be less than for the proposed project. Mitigation measures identified for the proposed project would be applicable to Alternative 1B. Noise impacts would be less than significant, unlike the proposed project. With respect to noise, Alternative 1B would result in a lesser degree of impact than the proposed project.

### 3. Alternative 2 - Floodplain Encroachment Avoidance Alternative

#### Description

Under Alternative 2, development would not encroach into the floodplain. The six Agricultural Residential parcels under the proposed project would not be developed, and thus this alternative would not provide for management of this portion of the project site for agricultural use. With the exception of the loss of these 6 proposed units and the Dry Creek Class 1 trail system proposed under the project, the level of development would remain the same under Alternative 2, resulting in a land plan with a greater density of development on a per-acre basis than under the proposed project. In addition, Alternative 2 would limit internal site connectivity by omitting the proposed crossing of the Southern Tributary of Dry Creek.

#### Analysis of the Alternative's Ability to Reduce Significant Unavoidable Project Impacts

Alternative 2 would convert existing land use designated Open Space to urban land uses, in a similar but less intense manner than the proposed project. Compared to the proposed project, this alternative would construct the same number of dwelling units on 30 percent fewer acres, resulting in higher density. Alternative 2 would create 58.5 acres of agricultural land use, as compared to 91.1 acres of agriculture and Agricultural-10 land uses under the proposed project, and would provide a 83 percent increase in land devoted to open space and recreation purposes. (Landscape corridor acreages are not calculated in open space and recreation uses for the proposed project.) This alternative would be similar to the proposed project with respect to compatibility of the Plan Area with adjacent uses and would better implement the vision of the *West Placer/Dry Creek Community Plan* with respect to allowing no development in the floodplain, but would not preserve most existing agriculture nor would it provide as much opportunities for agriculture as the proposed project. Permanent loss of farmland, and the Williamson Act Contract cancellation, would be significant and unavoidable impacts of Alternative 2 (similar to the proposed project). With respect to land use, Alternative 2 would result in a greater degree of impact than the proposed project.

Under Alternative 2, temporary and long-term visual impacts due to construction would be similar to the proposed project. View obstruction and change to landscape character for motorists on adjacent roadways as well as visual intrusion and adverse change in visual character due to new residences in views from Roseville Cemetery would also be similar, assuming that new public access to open space comparable to that identified under the proposed project would be provided.

Alternative 2 would generate approximately 72 fewer weekday daily trips than the proposed project. Due to the change in connectivity internal to this alternative, there would be approximately 700 more trips using the middle half of PFE Road between Watt Avenue and Walerga Road. Some of these trips would be additional turning movements at the Watt Avenue/PFE Road intersection. At the Watt Avenue end of PFE Road, there would be approximately 900 more trips, because vehicles traveling north on Watt Avenue would travel along PFE Road to enter the site, rather than using a Watt Avenue entrance to get to internal connector roads. Approximately 200 of these trips are included in the 700 trips on PFE Road described above, and the rest would be entering the western portion of the site from PFE Road. Other roadway and intersection impacts during project operation would be nearly the same as for the proposed project. Overall, the impacts to transportation would be similar. Even with mitigation similar to that identified for the proposed project, impacts to transportation and circulation under this alternative would still be significant, especially under cumulative conditions, similar to the proposed project.

Under Alternative 2, the level of construction activity would likely be similar to the proposed project, since the same number of units would be constructed. Therefore construction of this alternative would be expected to generate similar emissions over the full duration of the construction activities. Similar to the proposed project, short-term construction impacts would likely be significant. During operations, Alternative 2 would generate 72 fewer trips than the proposed project. This is not substantially different from the proposed project (less than 1 percent). Since the number of dwelling units, new vehicle trips and area sources would all be expected to be similar to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would result in similar emissions as the proposed project during project operation.

Alternative 2 would generate 72 fewer trips than the proposed project. Therefore, noise levels due to the trips to/from the Plan Area can reasonably be expected to be similar. Mitigation measures identified on the proposed project would be applicable to Alternative 2. Noise impacts would be significant, similar to the proposed project.

#### 4. Alternative 3 – Reduced Density Alternative

##### Description

Alternative 3 assumes that residential land uses would be reduced in density as compared to the proposed project, but that development would occur within the same land area as proposed under the project. Residential land uses would be 62 percent of the proposed project within approximately the same footprint. This alternative was formulated to lessen or avoid the significant traffic impacts of the proposed project by reducing the amount of development. It would also reduce several of the project impacts related to air quality and noise. All residential products would be single-family housing except for the high-density residential area in the southwest corner of the Plan Area, which would satisfy the County's affordable housing requirements. The six Agricultural-10 parcels proposed under the proposed project would not be allowed, and thus would not be managed for agricultural use. Other features of the proposed project would remain under Alternative 3, although the acreage of improved park facilities within the project site would be reduced as a result of the reduction in population under this alternative.

##### Analysis of the Alternative's Ability to Reduce Significant Unavoidable Project Impacts

Alternative 3 would convert existing land use designated Open Space to urban uses, in a similar but less intense and less dense manner than the proposed project. The alternative would result in slightly more land developed for residential units due to a reduction in park acreage and landscape corridors, as compared to the proposed project. Impacts related to permanent loss of farmland, and the Williamson Act Contract cancellation would remain significant under this alternative, and would be more severe than under the proposed project because of the

proposed Agricultural-10 parcels under the proposed project.

Under Alternative 3, temporary and long-term visual impacts due to construction would be similar but likely not last as long as under the proposed project, since the number of dwelling units under this alternative would be reduced by approximately 30 percent. View obstruction and change to landscape character for motorists on adjacent roadways as well as visual intrusion and adverse change in visual character due to new residences in views from Roseville Cemetery would also be similar, assuming comparable open space access, landscape setbacks on adjoining roads, preservation of onsite open space, and other similar features of the proposed project.

Alternative 3 would generate approximately 2,515 fewer trips than the proposed project. Construction traffic impacts would be less because there would be less development under this alternative. With approximately 20 percent fewer trips than the proposed project, roadway and intersection impacts during project operation would be less severe than the proposed project. Overall, the impacts to transportation would be less than the proposed project. However, even with mitigation similar to that identified for the proposed project, impacts to transportation and circulation under this alternative would still be significant, especially under cumulative conditions. With respect to transportation and circulation, Alternative 3 would result in a lesser degree of impact than the proposed project. With fewer dwelling units, it would contribute less to the traffic CIP to make transportation improvements that are needed on a cumulative basis with or without the proposed project.

Under Alternative 3, the length of construction activity would likely be less than for the proposed project. This is because fewer units would be constructed. The peak construction period could have the same level of activity or less than the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, short-term construction impacts would likely be significant. During operations, Alternative 3 would generate 2,515 fewer trips than the proposed project. Alternative 3 would generate approximately 20 percent fewer criteria pollutant emissions. Since this alternative would include 30 percent fewer dwelling units, there would be a 30 percent reduction in the sources of non-transportation-related operational emissions. Assuming these reductions in emission sources, the operational emissions of NOX, ROG, and CO would still be significant. The PM<sub>10</sub> operational emissions would be less than significant.

Alternative 3 would generate 2,515 fewer trips than the proposed project. Therefore, noise levels due to the trips to/from the Plan Area can reasonably be expected to be less than for the proposed project. Mitigation measures identified for the proposed project would be applicable to Alternative 3. Noise impacts would be significant at one location along Walerga Road and potentially at some locations along PFE Road, as is the case with the proposed project.

## 5. Alternative 4 – Clustered Development Alternative

### Description

Alternative 4 would include the same number of residential units as the proposed project, resulting in higher development densities within a reduced development footprint, resulting in more open space. Compared to the proposed project, this alternative would provide increased number of medium- and high density residential units, while reducing the level of low-density, single-family residences within the project site. This alternative would include affordable housing in accordance with County requirements and a trail system similar to the proposed project, as well as a commercial land use in the southeastern corner of the site. This alternative would provide for the expansion of the cemetery. The six Agricultural-10 parcels proposed under the proposed project would not be allowed, and thus would not be managed for agricultural use. The intent of this alternative is to reduce impacts associated with the conversion of open spaces areas within the project site to urban uses.

### Analysis of the Alternative's Ability to Reduce Significant Unavoidable Project Impacts

Alternative 4 would convert existing land use designated Open Space to urban land uses, in a denser manner on substantially fewer acres than the proposed project. The alternative would develop the same number of residential units as the proposed project on nearly half of the acreage identified under the proposed project. Almost all of this

development would be outside of the Dry Creek floodplain. This alternative would reduce land designated for agricultural activities by 27 percent compared to the proposed project. It would include 114 percent more land for open space and recreational uses than the proposed project. Impacts related to permanent loss of farmland would be reduced as compared to the proposed project, but would remain significant under this alternative. This alternative would be different than the proposed project with respect to compatibility of the Plan Area with adjacent uses and implementation of the Community Plan, because while it would preserve substantially more open space and land in agricultural production, it would provide a much more compact, urban feel with a 141 percent increase in density within the area being developed. This would result in reduced compatibility with adjacent land uses as compared to the proposed project.

Under Alternative 4, temporary and long-term visual impacts due to construction would be similar to the proposed project. View obstruction and change to landscape character for motorists on adjacent roadways would be reduced as compared to the proposed project. Because less open space would be converted to development, there is the potential for this alternative to preserve greater scenic resources than the proposed project and thus be visually superior, assuming that comparable public access were provided, and similar site design standards were incorporated.

Alternative 4 would generate approximately 700 fewer weekday daily trips than the proposed project, because higher density development generates fewer trips than low-density development on a per-unit basis. Construction traffic impacts would depend on phasing in this alternative. Concentrating development in a smaller area could reduce construction traffic because more high-density residential uses could be constructed faster than the same number of low-density residential units. With approximately 6 percent fewer trips than the proposed project, roadway and intersection impacts during project operation would be less severe than the proposed project. However, even with mitigation similar to that identified for the proposed project, impacts to transportation and circulation under this alternative would still be significant, especially under cumulative conditions.

Under Alternative 4, the level of construction activity would likely be similar to the proposed project, since the same number of units would be constructed. Therefore construction of this alternative would be expected to generate similar emissions over the full duration of the construction activities. Similar to the proposed project, short-term construction impacts would likely be significant. During operations, Alternative 4 would generate 700 fewer weekday daily trips than the proposed project. Alternative 4 would therefore generate approximately 6 percent fewer criteria pollutant emissions than the proposed project. Assuming these reductions in emission sources, the operational emissions of NOX, ROG, CO, and PM<sub>10</sub> would still be significant. The number of dwelling units would be similar to the proposed project, so area sources, such as consumer products and landscaping, would be expected to be similar to the proposed project.

Alternative 4 would generate approximately 700 fewer trips than the proposed project. Therefore, noise levels due to the trips to/from the Plan Area can reasonably be expected to be less than for the proposed project. Mitigation measures identified on the proposed project would be applicable to Alternative 4. Noise impacts would be significant for one receptor location on Walerga Road and potentially at some locations along PFE Road, similar to the proposed project.

## **6. Comparative Evaluation of the Project and Alternatives to Satisfy Proposed Project Objectives**

This section of the Findings examines whether (or to what extent) each of the Alternatives selected for more detailed analysis meets the proposed project's objectives. As described earlier in these findings, the concept of "feasibility" encompasses the question of whether a particular alternative or mitigation measure promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project. (*Sequoyah Hills Homeowners Assn. v. City of Oakland* (1993) 23 Cal.App.4th 704, 715.) "[F]easibility' under CEQA encompasses 'desirability' to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, and technological factors." (*City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 410, 417.)

1. **Implement the County's General Plan and Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan, which designate the proposed project area for urban development.** Alternative 1A, the no development alternative, would not satisfy this objective. The remaining alternatives involve the development of urban uses on the project site, and would achieve this objective in a comparable manner. It is recognized that with the exception of Alternative 1B, the Community Plan Development alternative, the proposed project and the remaining alternatives would require amendments to the *Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan* to be implemented.
2. **Preserve the scenic Dry Creek riparian corridor and enhance trail connectivity to complement a regional recreation corridor for bicycle, pedestrian, and equestrian users.** Because of the floodplain topography adjacent to Dry Creek, the riparian corridor would be preserved under all of the alternatives. However, under Alternative 1A, the no-development alternative, the objective of a connected recreational trail corridor would not be implemented. A corridor trail does not currently exist along Dry Creek within the project area, and Alternative 1A would maintain the status quo in this regard. It is assumed that a trail facility would be constructed under any of the remaining alternatives, in light of Community Plan requirements for this facility.
3. **Provide a well-designed community with neighborhood identity in close proximity to jobs and services in Placer and Sacramento Counties.** By retaining the project area as undeveloped land, Alternative 1A would not achieve this objective. Alternatives 1B and 3 would achieve this objective to a reduced extent when compared to the proposed project, in that fewer residents would be placed in close proximity to existing jobs and services in Placer and Sacramento Counties. Given the higher population of residents associated with the proposed project, Alternatives 2 and 4 would achieve this objective in a comparable manner. However, Alternatives 2 and 4, by eliminating Agricultural-10 parcels proposed by the project, represent a greater departure from the existing agricultural identity of the area that the project seeks to preserve.
4. **Create a high-quality environment containing a mix of residential, open-space, and recreational land uses in an overall design that advances "smart growth" principles.** By retaining the project area as undeveloped land, Alternative 1A would not achieve this objective. Alternatives 1B and 3 would achieve this objective to a reduced extent when compared to the proposed project. The smaller population associated with these alternatives would result in a reduced opportunity to capitalize on the location of the project area in relation to existing developed areas to reduce sprawl. While Alternative 4 could be said to exemplify "smart growth" principles among the alternatives analyzed, the net effect on a regional level would be the same as the proposed project, in that the number of proposed units would be the same.
5. **Design a project that minimizes encroachment into the existing 100-year floodplain in the plan area while balancing the housing needs and densities of the SACOG Blueprint process and the character of the local community.** The proposed project proposes minor encroachment and fill into the existing 100-year floodplain of Dry Creek. This fill is necessary in order to facilitate the roadway design of the project (including internal connection) and to provide building sites for residences on Agricultural-10 parcels. Alternative 1A would maintain the existing floodplain but would not meet any of the housing needs identified by the County General Plan, the Community Plan, or the SACOG Blueprint. Alternative 1B would avoid fill in the floodplain, allowing for a density transfer, but the realization of only 650 units under this alternative would reduce attainment of housing objectives to a significant degree. Alternative 2 would also avoid fill in floodplain areas but would increase density within developed areas to compensate for the reduction in developed acreage. This increase in development density would result in a greater departure from the character of the local community than the proposed project. Alternative 3 would involve fill in the floodplain to approximately the same extent as the proposed project (excluding the Agricultural-10 building pads), but similar to Alternative 1B would result in a reduced attainment of housing objectives. Alternative 4 would achieve the housing objectives to the same degree as the project but, as a result of the increase in High- and Medium-Density Residential uses, would do so at the expense of community character. Alternatives 1B, 2, 3, and 4 would not provide for Agricultural-10 parcels and would not preserve or maintain historical agricultural use within the Specific Plan, which is a defining characteristic of the local

community.

6. **Provide for increased residential densities in areas presently planned for urban growth and development with accessible infrastructure, consistent with areawide infrastructure plans and growth policies identified in SACOG's Blueprint for Regional Growth.** The project area is currently planned for urban growth and development by the *Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan*. By retaining the project area as undeveloped land, Alternative 1A would not achieve this objective. Alternatives 1B and 3 would achieve this objective to a reduced extent when compared to the proposed project, in that fewer residents would be placed in close proximity to existing jobs and services and existing accessible infrastructure. Given the higher population of residents associated with the proposed project, Alternatives 2 and 4 would achieve this objective in a comparable manner.
7. **Reduce growth pressures on outlying areas of Placer County by efficiently utilizing the project area to accommodate residential growth and development.** The project area is currently planned for urban growth and development by the *Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan*. By retaining the project area as undeveloped land, Alternative 1A would not achieve this objective and would increase growth pressures on land farther from existing urbanized areas in Placer County. Alternatives 1B and 3 would achieve this objective to some extent, but would increase growth pressures on outlying areas when compared to the proposed project. Given the higher population of residents associated with the proposed project, Alternatives 2 and 4 would achieve this objective in a comparable manner.
8. **Incorporate an appropriate level of medium- and high-density residential development to take advantage of the proximity of the proposed project area to region-serving arterials and support opportunities for transit to serve the proposed development.** The project site is located along Watt Avenue, Walerga Road, and PFE Road, which are or will become major arterials as development of west Placer County continues. These arterials are expected to become transit routes. Watt Avenue is planned to provide Bus Rapid Transit lanes in each direction, dedicated exclusively to transit use. Alternative 1A would not provide any development of the site, and would not achieve this objective. Alternative 1B would retain the Commercial designation applicable to the parcel on the northeast corner of Watt and PFE Road, but the size of this parcel (3.2 gross acres) would not generally be suitable for commercial uses that could be served by transit patrons. Instead, it would be expected that commercial uses in this location would be in the form of a service station, fast food restaurant, or other service uses that would be visited by vehicles instead of transit users. As a result, Alternative 1B would not take advantage of future transit opportunities to the same extent as the project. Alternative 2 proposes High-Density Residential development in the same amount and at the same location as the proposed project and would achieve this objective to the same extent. By reducing the level of High-Density Residential development, Alternative 3 would achieve this objective to a reduced extent when compared to the proposed project or Alternative 2. Alternative 4 would provide substantially more High- and Medium-Density Residential development than the proposed project and would achieve this objective to a higher extent, albeit at the expense of achieving other project objectives.
9. **Provide for a cohesive plan of development that maximizes internal connectivity within the project area for pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular travel.** A goal of the proposed project is to reduce vehicle trips on surrounding arterial roadways by creating internal connectivity within the Specific Plan area. Alternative 1A would not provide any development of the site and would not achieve this objective. It is noted that Alternative 1A does not contribute additional trips to arterial roadways because it would preserve existing conditions. Alternatives 1B and 2 would not provide a roadway connection over the Southern Tributary; they would require vehicle trips on PFE Road to connect the east and west development areas on the site, and would not provide internal connectivity to pedestrians. Alternatives 3 and 4 would provide this roadway and sidewalk connection, as does the proposed project, and would achieve this objective to a similar degree.
10. **Provide for a full range of housing densities and product choices affordable to all income levels.** Alternative 1A would not provide for development of additional housing on the project site and would not achieve this objective. Alternative 1B would provide for approximately 650 residential units. However,

under the existing Community Plan, residential development would be exclusively large-lot single family parcels, which would not result in a range of densities or housing affordable to multiple income levels. Alternative 2 would provide for a mix of residential densities similar to the proposed project and would achieve this objective to a similar degree. Alternative 3 would provide a similar mix of densities as the project, but the reduction in the number of total units under this alternative limits the achievement of this objective when compared to the proposed project or Alternative 2. Alternative 4 would significantly increase High- and Medium-Density Residential housing on the site, while reducing Low-Density Residential development. This alternative would increase affordable housing opportunities when compared to other alternatives, at the expense of being a substantive departure from the Community Plan.

11. **Provide a comprehensively planned project that offers maximum feasible protection of sensitive environmental habitat and resources.** As Alternative 1A proposes to maintain existing conditions on the site, this alternative would likely maximize protection and preservation of existing habitat resources. However, it should be noted that this Alternative would not preclude intensification of agricultural operations on the site, including areas of existing sensitive habitat such as wetlands. Depending on the nature of future agricultural operations, the existing foraging value of grassland habitat throughout the site for the Swainson's Hawk could be reduced under Alternative 1A without the need for agency approval or mitigation. The proposed project would convert existing grassland areas above the floodplain elevation to urban use but would preserve extensive areas of grassland in the floodplain area in perpetuity through dedication as open space or through land use restrictions applicable within the Agricultural-10 parcels. Alternative 1B would provide for development of upland areas at a similar extent of acreage, albeit at a reduced density, but would not necessarily provide for the preservation of foraging habitat values within the floodplain area through land use restrictions. Alternatives 2 and 3 would result in a slightly greater level of maintenance of existing habitat conditions within the floodplain area and, in this regard, satisfy this objective to a greater degree than the proposed project. Alternative 4 would maximize the amount of open space area preserved within the site and would achieve this objective to a higher degree than the proposed project, albeit at the expense of achieving other objectives.
12. **Create a community that recognizes, respects, and preserves historic agricultural uses of the project area through active management within Agricultural Residential parcels.** By maintaining existing conditions, Alternative 1A would achieve this objective as a general matter, depending on the level of agricultural activity that occurs in the future. Alternatives 1B, 2, 3, and 4 would not provide for active management of areas within the Specific Plan for agricultural purposes (with the exception of the Singh parcel) and would not achieve this objective.
13. **Provide a planned infrastructure system with all public facilities and services necessary to meet the needs of development with the proposed project area.** By maintaining existing conditions on the project site, Alternative 1A would neither necessitate nor provide for public facilities or services and would not contribute toward the achievement of this objective. Alternatives 1B and 3 would reduce development density and thus would reduce contributions to existing and proposed County fee programs for public facilities identified as needed to serve cumulative development in West Placer County. Alternative 2, by proposing a similar mix and degree of development as the proposed project, would achieve this objective to the same extent as the project. Alternative 4 would provide the same number of units as the proposed project but would be weighted heavily toward Medium- and High-Density Residential units, which typically maintain a lower property value and assessment on a per unit basis than Low-Density units or Agricultural-10 parcels.
14. **Provide a sufficient number of residential units within the project area to support necessary improvements to local and regional public facilities.** By maintaining existing conditions on the project site, Alternative 1A would neither necessitate nor provide for public facilities or services and would not contribute toward the achievement of this objective. Alternatives 1B and 3 would reduce development density and thus would reduce contributions to existing and proposed County fee programs for public facilities identified as needed to serve cumulative development in the West Placer County region. When

compared to the proposed project, the public infrastructure demands of Alternatives 1B or 3 are not significantly reduced, which results in a significantly higher infrastructure cost on a per-unit basis under these alternatives. Alternative 2, by proposing a similar mix and degree of development as the proposed project, would achieve this objective to the same extent as the project. Alternative 4 would provide the same number of units as the proposed project but would be weighted heavily toward Medium and High-Density Residential units, which typically maintain a lower property value and assessment on a per unit basis than Low-Density or Agricultural-10 parcels and a reduced ability to spread facilities and services costs in a feasible manner.

**15. Provide for dedication of land within the project area for the expansion of the Union Cemetery.**

Alternative 1A would perpetuate existing conditions within the Specific Plan area, including the existing area of the Union Cemetery, and would not achieve this objective. Alternative 1B would provide for development under the existing Community Plan, which does not envision nor require that additional land be dedicated for public use at no cost for cemetery purposes. Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 would designate an expansion area for future cemetery purposes, but dedication of the land at no cost to the public by the landowner has not been proposed under these alternatives.

Alternative 1A is impractical and unrealistic, in the sense that the permanent preservation of status quo conditions is not consistent with the General Plan and Community Plan as currently written. Despite the fact that most, if not all, of the significant impacts associated with implementation of the project would be reduced in significance under this Alternative, the implementation of the No Development Alternative would fail to achieve any of the project objectives. The No Development Alternative's desirability is not on balance with the project in terms of its economic, environmental, social and technological elements. The project is the more desirable choice for the community and the region. The Board finds the No Development Alternative to be infeasible for the above reasons and rejects it as a viable alternative to the project.

Alternative 1B would, by definition, meet the project objectives related to implementing the County's *General Plan* and *Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan*. It would not fully meet the following objectives: preservation of agricultural uses, enhancement of trail connectivity, enhancement of smart growth principles and the Sacramento Area Council of Government's *Blueprint for Regional Growth*, and providing a full range of housing densities and product choices, including medium and high density residential development. The smaller population associated with this Alternatives would result in a reduced opportunity to capitalize on the location of the project area in relation to existing developed areas to reduce sprawl. Alternatives 1B would not extend an internal roadway connection through the Plan Area from Watt Avenue to Walerga Road, which is necessary to provide an alternative means of travel between these two roads in the event that PFE Road is not available. Alternative 1B would not avoid or substantially decrease significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed project on visual quality, traffic, and air quality. The desirability of Alternative 1B is not on balance with the project in terms of its economic, environmental, social and technological elements. The project is the more desirable choice for the community and the region. The Board finds the Community Plan Development Alternative to be infeasible for the above reasons and rejects it as a viable alternative to the project.

Alternative 2 would meet and exceed the project objectives related to implementing the County's *General Plan* and *Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan*. Alternative 4 would not meet the objectives of providing enhanced trail connectivity, and preservation of agricultural uses. Avoidance of all fill within the floodplain would eliminate the ability to extend an internal roadway connection through the Plan Area from Watt Avenue to Walerga Road, which is necessary to provide an alternative means of travel between these two roads in the event that PFE Road is not available. Alternative 2 would not avoid or substantially decrease any of the significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed project. The desirability of Alternative 2 is not on balance with the project in terms of its economic, environmental, social and technological elements. The project is the more desirable choice for the community and the region. The Board finds the Floodplain Avoidance Alternative to be infeasible for the above reasons and rejects it as a viable alternative to the project.

Alternative 3 (Reduced Density) would meet most of the project objectives related to implementing the County's

*General Plan and Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan.* It would meet many but not all of the Applicant's objectives as well. It would not fully meet the following objectives: enhancement of trail connectivity, preservation of agricultural uses, enhancement of smart growth principles and the Sacramento Area Council of Government's *Blueprint for Regional Growth*, and providing a full range of housing densities and product choices, specifically medium density residential development. It may not provide enough development to create a fiscally responsible and balanced community, and would provide a reduced contribution to support necessary improvements to local and regional public facilities. In this case, the cost of the public infrastructure and improvements to local and regional public facilities, both new and upgrades to existing facilities, need to be spread among a sufficient number of homes that will be constructed and sold to make the overall project feasible from the economic and marketability standpoint. The total cost burden of backbone infrastructure and impact fees for the Specific Plan site is estimated to be approximately \$67.4 million, or approximately \$72,260 for each of the 933 units proposed under the specific plan. This infrastructure cost is approximately 18 percent of the estimated average sales price (\$400,000) for a dwelling unit in the Specific Plan area (Mackay and Soms, 2007). A fee and cost burden to sales price ratio of 20 percent is generally regarded as the upper limit of feasibility for development (EPS, 2007). Under the Reduced Density Alternative, backbone infrastructure costs would remain roughly equivalent to the proposed project, but would be spread over 652 units instead of 933, resulting in a fee and cost burden in excess of the 20 percent threshold of feasibility. As a result, it would be impracticable to develop this alternative under existing or foreseeable market conditions. The Board finds the Reduced Density Alternative to be infeasible for the above reasons and rejects it as a viable alternative to the project.

Alternative 4 would meet the project objectives related to implementing the County's *General Plan and Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan*, at least in terms of unit count. It would provide enhancement of the following objectives as compared to the proposed project: enhancement of smart growth principles and the Sacramento Area Council of Government's *Blueprint for Regional Growth*, and providing a more balanced range of housing densities and product choices. Alternative 4 would not provide for enhanced trail connectivity, nor would it provide for preservation of agricultural uses in the same manner as the proposed project. Development of the site with substantial medium- and high-density development would result in a substantial departure from the established low-density character of the Community Plan Area. Alternative 4 would provide the same number of units as the proposed project but would be weighted heavily toward Medium and High-Density Residential units, which typically maintain a lower property value and assessment on a per unit basis than Low-Density or Agricultural-10 parcels and a reduced ability to spread facilities and services costs in a feasible manner. Alternative 4 would maximize the amount of open space area preserved within the site and would achieve this objective to a higher degree than the proposed project, at the expense of achieving other important objectives. The desirability of Alternative 4 is not on balance with the project in terms of its economic, environmental, social and technological elements. The project is the more desirable choice for the community and the region. The Board finds the Clustered Development Alternative to be infeasible for the above reasons and rejects it as a viable alternative to the project.

## 7. Environmentally Superior Alternative

### Basis for Identifying Environmentally Superior Alternative

An EIR is required to identify the environmentally superior alternative from among the range of reasonable alternatives that are evaluated. Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an environmentally superior alternative be designated, and states that "if the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives." Table 16-6 in the Draft EIR compares the five alternatives to the proposed project in terms of the impact areas that were analyzed in the Revised Draft EIR. The conclusions contained in the table are subjective and required that judgments be made on emphasis in some areas of analysis.

### Identification of Environmentally Superior Alternative

The analysis in the EIR indicates that Alternative 1A, the No Development Alternative, would be the Environmentally Superior Alternative. Among the "build" alternatives, Alternative 3, the Reduced

Density Alternative, was determined in the EIR to be the Environmentally Superior Alternative, for the reasons discussed below.

Alternative 2 and Alternative 4 were eliminated from consideration as the Environmentally Superior Alternative because they would introduce a higher number of new residents than other alternatives, which would have ripple effects on traffic, air, noise, and public utilities and services. The development patterns in Alternative 2, the Floodplain Encroachment Avoidance Alternative, would avoid building in the floodplain and decrease associated impacts in many resource areas, including biological resources and hydrology. Its smaller footprint would also translate to decreased impacts to cultural resources, soils and geology, and hazardous materials. However, as Alternative 2 would generate the same number of new residents as the proposed project, it would therefore not reduce impacts on traffic, air quality, noise or public utilities and services as compared to most other alternatives.

Under Alternative 4, the Clustered Density Alternative, the only development in the floodplain would be at the Watt Avenue entrance to the Plan Area, near Walerga Road, at the internal roadway connection, with the Rural Residential flag lot, and with the ultimate widening of PFE Road. This alternative would allocate the most land for open space, which would decrease impacts to biological resources and hydrology. Like Alternative 2, its smaller footprint would translate to decreased impacts to cultural resources, soils and geology, and hazardous materials. But similar to Alternative 2, this alternative would generate nearly the same number of new residents as the proposed project and Alternative 2. While clustered development tends to reduce vehicle trips and corresponding emissions of criteria pollutants and noise, this alternative would nevertheless generate the second highest number of vehicle trips of all alternatives. Other impacts associated with Alternative 2 would be similar under Alternative 4.

Alternative 1B, the Community Plan Development Alternative, and Alternative 3, the Reduced Density Alternative, were the strongest candidates for the Environmentally Superior Alternative. Both would generate approximately 70 percent of the population of the build alternatives and of the proposed project, resulting in less demand on the transportation network and on public services. Both alternatives would concentrate most of their development outside of the floodplain, with Alternative 1B avoiding the floodplain entirely. Alternative 1B and Alternative 3 would also have less acreage devoted to farmlands than the proposed project and the other two build alternatives. This would result in loss of more farmland but would further reduce impacts on biological resources. Alternative 3 would generate substantially fewer vehicle trips than all of the other alternatives. This would reduce but not eliminate significant impacts of the proposed project and all of the other alternatives related to traffic congestion, air quality, and noise. It would also result in less demand on public utilities and services. For these reasons, Alternative 3, the Reduced Density Alternative, is found to be the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

## **XII. FINDINGS RELATED TO THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LOCAL SHORT-TERM USES OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND MAINTENANCE AND ENHANCEMENT OF LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY.**

Based on the EIR and the entire record before the Board of Supervisors, the Board of Supervisors makes the following findings with respect to the project's balancing of local short term uses of the environment and the maintenance of long term productivity:

- a. As the Project is implemented, certain impacts would occur on a short-term level. Such short term impacts are discussed fully above, as well as in the EIR document. Such short term impacts may include, without limitation, impacts on traffic and circulation, air quality and noise, although measures have been and will be incorporated to mitigate these impacts to the extent feasible.
- b. The long-term implementation of the project would serve to provide necessary housing, employment opportunities and recreational/open space uses to the County of Placer. Notwithstanding the foregoing, some long term impacts would result. These impacts include, without limitation, impacts on transportation and circulation and air quality. However, implementation of the Project would provide many benefits, as set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, below.

- c. Although there are short term adverse impacts from the Project, the short and long-term benefits justify its implementation.

### XIII. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

As set forth in the preceding sections, the Placer County Board of Supervisors' approval of the Riolo Vineyard Specific Plan Project will result in significant adverse environmental effects that cannot be avoided even with the adaption of all feasible mitigation measures, and there are no feasible project alternatives which would mitigate or substantially lessen the impacts. Despite the occurrence of these effects, however, the Board chooses to approve the project because, in its view, the economic, social, and other benefits that the project will produce will render the significant effects acceptable.

In making this Statement of Overriding Considerations in support of the findings of fact and the project, the Board of Supervisors has considered the information contained in the Final EIR for the project as well as the public testimony and record in proceedings in which the project was considered. The Board has balanced the project's benefits against the unavoidable adverse impacts identified in the Final EIR. The Board hereby determines that the project's benefits outweigh the significant unmitigated adverse impacts.

#### A. SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

As discussed in Section IX above, the Riolo Vineyard Specific Plan project will result in the following significant and unavoidable impacts, even with the implementation of all feasible mitigation:

##### Project-Specific Impacts

- Permanent loss of farmland
- Williamson Act Contract cancellation
- Inconsistency with plans and policies, if the Placer County General Plan and *Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan* Amendments are not adopted
- Temporary and long-term visual impacts due to construction
- Contribute to traffic volumes on regional roadways and intersections that would exceed their capacity with or without the proposed project
- Additional transit patrons would not be accommodated by existing transit service
- Construction activities would increase short-term criteria air pollutant emissions
- Operational air quality impacts, including significant PM<sub>10</sub>, ROG, and NOX emissions in the short term and significant PM<sub>10</sub> and ROG emissions in the long-term
- Inconsistent with the *Placer County Air Quality Attainment Plan*
- Emissions of greenhouse gases potentially contributing to global warming
- Construction equipment would generate short-term noise level increases at noise-sensitive locations
- Transportation noise sources in excess of an Ldn of 60 dBA externally at the property line and in excess

of 45 dBA internally at second floor elevations.

### Cumulative impacts

- Permanent loss of farmland
- Loss of vegetation and wildlife habitat
- Transformation in landscape character from rural to urban
- Increase in ambient night sky illumination
- Unacceptable levels of service along some roadway segments and at some intersections within the transportation analysis study area:
  - With PFE Road open, the proposed project would cause PFE Road east of Watt Avenue to operate at LOS E. Walerga Road south of PFE Road and Baseline Road west of Locust Road would have an increased volume to capacity ratio of more than 1 percent at an already substandard LOS;
  - With PFE Road closed, the proposed project would cause Watt Avenue south of Baseline Road and PFE Road, east of Watt Avenue, to operate at LOS E. Walerga Road south of PFE Road and Baseline Road from Watt Avenue Walerga Road would have an increased volume to capacity ratio of more than 1 percent at a substandard LOS.
  - With PFE Road open or closed, the proposed project would cause the intersection of Watt Avenue at PFE Road to operate at LOS D, and the following intersections to have an increase in the volume to capacity ratio of more than 1 percent at a substandard LOS: Watt Avenue at Baseline Road, Fiddlyment Road/Walerga Road at Baseline Road, Walerga Road at PFE Road, and Cook-Riolo Road at PFE Road;
  - With PFE Road closed, the proposed project would cause the intersection of Galleria Boulevard and Antelope Creek Drive to operate beyond acceptable LOS thresholds;
  - With PFE Road open, the proposed project would contribute traffic to the freeway segment between Riego Road and Elkhorn Boulevard on SR 70/99, and between Watt Avenue and Eureka Road on I-80, which would be operating at LOS F;
  - With PFE Road closed, the proposed project would cause the freeway segment of SR 70/99 between Riego Road and Elkhorn Boulevard, SR 65 between Blue Oaks Boulevard and I-80, and I-80 between Watt Avenue and Eureka Road to operate beyond acceptable LOS thresholds;
- Increase in regional criteria pollutant emissions during construction and operation
- Increase in noise levels

### **B. OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS**

In the Board's judgment, the proposed project and its benefits outweigh its unavoidable significant effects. The following statement identifies the reasons why, in the Board's judgment, the benefits of the project as approved outweigh its unavoidable significant effects. Any one of these reasons is sufficient to justify approval of the project. Thus, even if a court were to conclude that not every reason is supported by substantial evidence, the Board would stand by its determination that each individual reason is sufficient. The substantial evidence supporting the various

benefits can be found in the preceding findings, which are incorporated by reference into this Section (XIII), and in the documents found in the Record of Proceedings, as defined in Section V.

Some of the Project's benefits include the following principles:

1. **Encourage distinctive, attractive communities with quality design.** The project will create a distinctive community designed in harmony with the land. Open space is a defining element of the Specific Plan, providing a sense of balance with the environment. The riparian area of Dry Creek and the adjacent floodplain will provide an appealing landscape throughout the Riolo Vineyard community, enhanced by the preservation of the existing native oak trees and the development of trail corridors for bicyclists, pedestrians, and equestrians. The Specific Plan community will provide several community and neighborhood parks, all within walking distance from residences. Quality design is defined by the project's adopted Development Standards and Design Guidelines.
2. **Offer housing choices and opportunities.** The Specific Plan provide opportunities for single-family residential development, as well as smaller percentages of medium and high-density housing. In this manner, the Riolo Vineyard plan provides a choice of housing design and community living to meet diverse housing needs and individual preferences. The medium and high-density communities in the Riolo Vineyard plan respond to the unmet need for such housing in the south Placer County area by young families, seniors and others who prefer such communities to a traditional single family residential lifestyle. In so doing, the Riolo Vineyard will contribute to Placer County's efforts to provide affordable housing.
3. **Take advantage of compact development.** SACOG has recognized that creating environments that are more compactly built and use space in an efficient but more aesthetic manner can encourage more walking, biking, and public transit use. The Riolo Vineyard plan is an important component of achieving this principle in the south Placer County region. By incorporating medium and high-density residential communities in an area suitable for these communities, the Riolo Vineyard plan will reduce future development pressure on outlying agricultural and open space areas and assist in preserving such areas for generations to follow. Moreover, the Riolo Vineyard plan will enhance pedestrian and bicycle access through trailways, paths and sidewalks, and bike paths throughout the site.
4. **Preserve open space, farmland, and natural beauty through natural resources conservation.** The Riolo Vineyard site is located along the Dry Creek riparian corridor, and Riolo Vineyard plan will preserve this unique resource and its natural beauty, along with seasonal wetland areas and grasslands occurring within the 100-year flood plain of Dry Creek. The Specific Plan will develop trail amenities throughout, in order to enhance the scenic and recreational potential of Dry Creek.
5. **Capitalize on Existing Infrastructure Investments.** An existing network of roads and infrastructure serving the area form the foundation of the Riolo Vineyard plan, and additional improvements will be implemented by the Riolo Vineyard plan to improve access and services. The project site is located between two sub-region serving arterials (Watt Avenue and Walerga Road) and will contribute toward the widening of these arterials to their ultimate planned width. The Riolo Vineyard property is surrounded by existing and planned development, including the Doyle Ranch and Morgan Creek residential communities and the approved Placer Vineyard Specific Plan. The Riolo Vineyard plan will tie into these surrounding developments and contribute to the overall community fabric of the area as it transitions into urbanization.
6. **Support a variety of transportation choices.** It is anticipated that future residents of the Riolo Vineyard community will primarily rely upon personal motor vehicles as the means of transportation. However, by providing a mix of residential product types, including medium and high density communities, the Riolo Vineyard plan will support the availability of transit to serve the area. In addition, the Riolo Vineyard plan is intended to facilitate on-site circulation by pedestrians and bicyclists

through an inviting network of walkways, trails and bike paths connecting residential communities to neighborhood parks and to one another. The Riolo Vineyard plan will capitalize on the unique opportunities afforded by the adjacent Dry Creek by enhancing trail facilities along the creek to compliment a regional recreation corridor.

7. **Facilitate the construction of new public facilities to serve County residents.** The project will provide, or contribute its fair share to the provision of, all public facilities and services necessary to meet the needs of development within the Specific Plan area. The Development Agreement provides for payments towards, the dedication of, or the accelerated construction of local and regional transportation infrastructure, wastewater infrastructure, and other public facilities which are over and above the measures required to mitigate for the impacts of the Project.

### C. CONCLUSION

The Board has balanced these benefits and considerations against the potentially significant unavoidable environmental effects of the project and has concluded that the impacts are outweighed by these benefits, among others. After balancing environmental costs against project benefits, the Board has concluded that the benefits the County will derive from the project, as compared to existing and planned future conditions, outweigh the risks. The Board believes the project benefits outlined above override the significant and unavoidable environmental costs associated with the project.

In sum, the Board adopts the mitigation measures in the final Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, attached to and incorporated by reference into the Riolo Vineyard Specific Plan, and finds that any residual or remaining effects on the environment resulting from the project, identified as significant and unavoidable in the preceding Findings of Fact, are acceptable due to the benefits set forth in this Statement of Overriding Considerations.

**Before the Board of Supervisors  
County of Placer, State of California**

**In the matter of: A RESOLUTION AMENDING  
THE PLACER COUNTY GENERAL PLAN**

**Resolution No. 2009-\_\_\_\_\_**

**The following resolution was duly passed by the Board of Supervisors  
of the County of Placer at a regular meeting held March 10, 2009,  
by the following vote:**

**Ayes:**

**Noes:**

**Absent:**

**Signed by me after its passage.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**F. C. Rockholm, Chairman**

**Attest:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Ann Holman  
Clerk of said Board**

**WHEREAS**, on December 18, 2008, the Placer County Planning Commission ("Planning Commission") held a public hearing to consider the Riolo Vineyard Specific Plan ("Specific Plan"), including certain proposed amendments to the Placer County General Plan ("General Plan"), and the Planning Commission has made recommendations to the Board of Supervisors ("Board") related thereto, and

**WHEREAS**, on March 10, 2009, the Board held a public hearing to consider the recommendations of the Planning Commission and to receive public input regarding the proposed amendments to the General Plan, and the Board then closed the public hearing, and

**WHEREAS**, the Board has reviewed the proposed amendments to the General Plan, considered the recommendations of the Planning Commission, received and considered the written and oral comments submitted by the public thereon, and has adopted Resolution No. 2009- \_\_\_\_\_ certifying the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Regional University Specific Plan, and

**WHEREAS**, the Board finds the proposed amendments will serve to protect and enhance the health, safety and general welfare of the residents of specific plan areas and the County as a whole, and

**WHEREAS**, the Board further finds the proposed amendments are consistent with the provisions of the General Plan and are in compliance with applicable requirements of State law, and

**Attachment "B"**  
**353**

**WHEREAS**, notice of all hearings required has been given and all hearings have been held as required by County ordinance and State law, and

**WHEREAS**, the Board finds that the foregoing recitals setting forth the actions of the County are true and correct,

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF PLACER** that Policies 1.H.6, 1.O.1, 3.A.7, 3.A.8, 3.A.12, and 7.B.1 of the Placer County General Plan are hereby amended as shown and described in Exhibit A, attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference, and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that this Resolution shall take force and become effective only in the event that Resolution 2007-230 adopted by the Board on July 16, 2007, is for any reason determined to be invalid by a final order issued in the case Sutter County v. Placer County et al., Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 2007-00883516 or in any related matter.

**Exhibit A  
Proposed General Plan Amendments**

General Plan Policy Number	Proposed Amendment
<b>Agricultural Land Use</b>	
1.H.6.	<p>The County shall require new non-agricultural development immediately adjacent to agricultural lands to be designed to provide a buffer in the form of a setback of sufficient distance to avoid land use conflicts between the agricultural uses and the non-agricultural uses <u>except as it may be determined to be unnecessary or inappropriate within a Specific Plan as part of the Specific Plan approval.</u> Such setback or buffer areas shall be established by recorded easement or other instrument, subject to the approval of County Counsel. A method and mechanism (e.g., a homeowners association or easement dedication to a non-profit organization or public entity) for guaranteeing the maintenance of this land in a safe and orderly manner shall be also established at the time of development approval.</p>
<b>Development Form and Design</b>	
1 O.1	<p>Except as otherwise provided in the Design Guidelines of an approved Specific Plan, the County shall require all new development to be designed in compliance with applicable provisions of the Placer County Design Guidelines Manual.</p>
<b>Streets and Highways</b>	
3.A.7	<p>The County shall develop and manage its roadway system to maintain the following minimum levels of service (LOS), <u>or as otherwise specified in a Community or Specific Plan</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LOS "C" on rural roadways, except within one-half mile of state highways where the standard shall be LOS "D "</li> <li>• LOS "C" on urban/suburban roadways except within one-half mile of state highways where the standard shall be LOS "D."</li> <li>• <u>An LOS no worse than specified in the Placer County Congestion Management Program (CMP) for the state highway system.</u></li> </ul> <p>The County may allow exceptions to these levels of service standards where it finds that the improvements or other measures required to achieve the LOS standards are unacceptable based on established criteria. In allowing any exception to the standards, the County shall consider the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The number of hours per day that the intersection of roadway segment would operate at conditions worse than the standard.</li> <li>• The ability of the required improvement to significantly reduce peak hour delay and improve traffic operations.</li> <li>• The right-of-way needs and the physical impacts on surrounding properties.</li> <li>• The visual aesthetics of the required improvement and its impact on community identity and character.</li> <li>• Environmental impacts including air quality and noise impacts.</li> <li>• Construction and right-of-way acquisition costs.</li> <li>• The impacts on general safety</li> <li>• The impacts of the required construction phasing and traffic maintenance.</li> <li>• The impacts on quality of life as perceived by residents.</li> <li>• Consideration of other environmental, social, or economic factors on which the County may base finding to allow an exceedance of the standards.</li> </ul> <p>Exceptions to the standards will only be allowed after all feasible measures and options are explored, including alternative forms of transportation.</p>
3.A.8.	<p>A General Plan amendment is proposed to delete Policy 3.A.8 since the policy is proposed to</p>

General Plan Policy Number	Proposed Amendment
<b>Agricultural Land Use</b>	
	<p>be included in Policy 3.A.7, as described above.</p> <p>Proposed General Plan Amendment:</p> <p><del>The County's level of service standards for the State highway system shall be no worse than those adopted in the Placer County Congestion Management Program (CMP).</del></p>
3.A.12.	<p>The County shall require an analysis of the effects of traffic from all land development projects. Each such project shall construct or fund improvements necessary to mitigate the effects of traffic from the project consistent with Policy 3.A.7. Such improvements may include a fair share of improvements that provide benefits to others.</p>
<b>Land Use Conflicts</b>	
7.B.1.	<p>The County shall identify and maintain clear boundaries between urban/suburban and agricultural areas and require land use buffers between such uses where feasible, <u>except as may be determined to be unnecessary or inappropriate within a Specific Plan as part of the Specific Plan approval.</u></p> <p>These buffers shall occur on the parcel for which the development permit is sought and shall favor protection of the maximum amount of farmland.</p>

**Before the Board of Supervisors  
County of Placer, State of California**

**In the matter of: A RESOLUTION AMENDING  
THE DRY CREEK/WEST PLACER COMMUNITY PLAN**

**Resolution No. 2009-\_\_\_\_\_**

**The following resolution was duly passed by the Board of Supervisors  
of the County of Placer at a regular meeting held March 10, 2009,  
by the following vote:**

**Ayes:**

**Noes:**

**Absent:**

**Signed by me after its passage.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**F. C. Rockholm, Chairman**

**Attest:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Ann Holman  
Clerk of said Board**

**WHEREAS**, on December 18, 2008, the Placer County Planning Commission ("Planning Commission") held a public hearing to consider the Riolo Vineyard Specific Plan ("Specific Plan"), including certain proposed amendments to the Placer County General Plan ("General Plan") and the Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan (the "Community Plan"), and the Planning Commission has made recommendations to the Board of Supervisors ("Board") related thereto, and

**WHEREAS**, on March 10, 2009, the Board held a public hearing to consider the recommendations of the Planning Commission and to receive public input regarding the proposed amendments to the Community Plan, and

**WHEREAS**, the Board has reviewed the proposed amendments to the Community Plan, considered the recommendations of the Planning Commission, received and considered the written and oral comments submitted by the public thereon, and has adopted Resolution No. 2009-\_\_\_\_\_ certifying the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Regional University Specific Plan, and

**WHEREAS**, the Board finds the proposed amendments will serve to protect and enhance the health, safety and general welfare of the residents of the Community Plan area and the County as a whole, and

**Attachment "C"**

359

**WHEREAS**, the Board further finds the proposed amendments are consistent with the provisions of the General Plan and other provisions of the Community Plan and are in compliance with applicable requirements of State law, and

**WHEREAS**, notice of all hearings required has been given and all hearings have been held as required by County ordinance and State law, and

**WHEREAS**, the Board finds that the foregoing recitals setting forth the actions of the County are true and correct,

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF PLACER** that Goals 2, 25, and the description of the Low Density Residential (LDR) land use of Section II(B)—Land Use Plan, Goals 4 and 5 of Section II(D)—Public Services, Goal 14 of Section III(A)—Natural Resources, and Goals 6 and 9 of Section IV(A)—Circulation of the Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan are hereby amended to read as shown and described in Exhibit A, attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference, and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that this Resolution shall take force and become effective as to the amendment of Goals 6 and 9 of Section IV(A)—Circulation of the Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan only in the event that Resolution 2007-231 adopted by the Board on July 16, 2007, is for any reason determined to be invalid by a final order issued in the case Sutter County v. Placer County et al., Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 2007-00883516 or in any related matter, and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that this Resolution shall take force and become effective immediately as to the amendment of Goals 2, 25, and the description of the Low Density Residential (LDR) land use of Section II(B)—Land Use Plan, Goals 4 and 5 of Section II(D)—Public Services, and Goal 14 of Section III(A)—Natural Resources, of the Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan.

**Exhibit A  
Proposed Community Plan Amendments**

Policy Number	Proposed Amendment
<b>II. Community Development: Land Use</b>	
2	The County shall require new non-agricultural development immediately adjacent to agricultural lands to be designed to provide a buffer in the form of a setback of sufficient distance to avoid land use conflicts between the agricultural uses and the non-agricultural uses <u>except as it may be determined to be unnecessary or inappropriate within a Specific Plan as part of the Specific Plan approval.</u> Such setback or buffer areas shall be established by recorded easement or other instrument, subject to the approval of County Counsel. A method and mechanism (e.g., a homeowners association or easement dedication to a non-profit organization or public entity) for guaranteeing the maintenance of this land in a safe and orderly manner shall be also established at the time of development approval.
25	Continue to implement zoning policies which minimize potential loss of property and threat to human life caused by flooding and prohibit the creation of new building sites within the floodplain. <u>Through the adoption of a Specific Plan, the County may approve alteration of the existing 100-year floodplain, based upon a demonstration that such alteration will not result in an significant increase in flood risk under post-development conditions.</u>
Description of Low Density Residential (LDR) Land Use District. Item (c). page 39	<p>The LDR district allows for the greatest number of new dwelling units in the Plan area and, consequently, the greatest change to the existing rural environment. Approximately 1,128 acres or 12% of the Plan area is encompassed by this land use district. It allows for a range of densities from 1-2 dwelling units per acre or approximately 1/2-1 acre lot sizes and can accommodate in excess of 2,000 homes. It is less than 10% built-out at present.</p> <p>The LDR district is found in two separate areas. Much of the land south of Dry Creek and north of the Sacramento County line is included in this district as is an area between Roseville City limits and East Drive in the north-eastern portion of the Plan area. In the area adjoining Roseville, this district will provide a lower density transition area between the higher densities in Roseville, lower densities to the west, and commercial uses along Baseline Road.</p> <p>To the south of Dry Creek and west of Walerga Road a large area (330± acres) included in the LDR district also has a "Development Reserve" (DR) designation attached to it. For several reasons it is believed that this "DR" area should be planned as a distinct unit and therefore subject to approval by the County of a "Specific Plan" which would address a wide range of issues relative to development. Much of the property in this DR area is encumbered with California Land Conservation Act (Williamson Act) contracts which guarantee that the land will stay in agricultural use for a period of years. The landowners have filed "notices of non-renewal" meaning that the property will not be so encumbered after 1998. (In some cases land in this area will be out of the Williamson Act as early as 1992.) Also, the floodplain of Dry Creek in this area is exceptionally broad thus rendering a significant amount of land unsuitable for homes but, possibly useful for parks, golf courses, open space, or other recreational uses. The only cemetery in the Plan area also lies within this "DR" area. A need exists to expand this use and such an expansion should be included in any design for the area. As a tool to ensure the preservation of the floodplain and associated, woodlands, density can be permitted to be transferred off of the floodplain and used on adjoining lands. In this area the result could be a significant increase in density on the lands which are found to be suitable for development. And finally, the land remains in relatively large parcels thus increasing the opportunity for cooperative planning for the ultimate and most appropriate use of the land. The Specific Plan process can address the issues of timing of development, provision of infrastructure, preservation and appropriate use of the floodplains, and placement of permitted density within the area. With a specific plan, this area should be considered as a whole and permit the relocation of commercial uses to the best possible location and still be considered compatible with the Community Plan. Also, minimum lot sizes in PUDs within the LDR district should not be less than 12-15,000 sq. ft. A small percentage of lots, up to a maximum of 20%, in any PUD in this district may be as small as 10,000 sq ft. Smaller lot sizes may be permitted within an adopted Specific Plan.</p>
<b>II. Community Development: Public Services</b>	
4	Maintain natural conditions within the 100-year floodplain of all streams except where work is required to maintain the stream's drainage characteristics and where such work is done in accordance with the Placer County Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance, Department of Fish and

361

Policy Number	Proposed Amendment
	Game regulations and Clean Water Act provisions administered by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, or when facilities for the treatment of urban run-off can be located in the floodplain providing that there is no destruction of riparian vegetation. <u>Through the adoption of a Specific Plan, the County may approve alteration of the existing 100-year floodplain, based upon a demonstration that such alteration will not result in an significant increase in flood risk under post-development conditions.</u>
5	Designate the 100-year floodplain of Dry Creek, including the major tributaries as open space, and provide for some compatible use of these areas in order to encourage their preservation. <u>Through the adoption of a Specific Plan, the County may approve alteration of the existing 100-year floodplain, based upon a demonstration that such alteration will not result in an significant increase in flood risk under post-development conditions.</u>
<b>III. Environmental Resources Management: Natural Resources</b>	
14	No construction activities shall occur within the Dry Creek floodplain and only limited alteration of its tributaries shall be permitted except as part of the development of the floodplain as a recreational area, or for stream enhancement, or where work is done in accordance with the Placer County Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance, Department of Fish and Game Regulations, and Clean Water Act Provisions administered by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. <u>Through the adoption of a Specific Plan, the County may approve alteration of the existing 100-year floodplain, based upon a demonstration that such alteration will not result in an significant increase in flood risk under post-development conditions.</u>
<b>IV. Transportation / Circulation: Circulation</b>	
6	The rights-of-way for roads shall be wide enough to accommodate roadways, trails, bikeways, drainage, public utilities, landscaping/vegetation, and suitable separation between facilities. Minimum right-of-way width for Walerga Road shall be 144 feet. Minimum right-of-way width shall be 120 feet for PFE Road, Baseline Road, Cook-Riolo Road, Don Julio Blvd., and Walt Avenue. Other roads shall have a 60-foot minimum right-of-way width. <u>Through the adoption of a Specific Plan, the County may modify these right-of-way standards, and may elect to exclude landscaped areas, sidewalks and utilities from the defined public right-of-way.</u>
9	<p>The level of service (LOS) on roadways and intersections identified in the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) shall be a Level C or better. The first priority for available funding shall be the correction of potential hazards.</p> <p><del>Land development projects shall be approved only if LOS C can be sustained on the CIP roads and intersection after:</del></p> <p><del>a. Traffic from approved projects has been added to the system.</del></p> <p><del>b. Improvements funded by this program have been constructed.</del></p> <p><u>The County may allow exceptions to this level of service (LOS) standard where it finds that the improvements or other measures required to achieve the LOS standard are unacceptable based on established criteria. In allowing any exception to the standard, the County shall consider the following factors:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>The number of hours per day that the intersection or roadway segment would operate at conditions worse than the standard.</u></li> <li>• <u>The ability of the required improvement to significantly reduce peak hour delay and improve traffic operations.</u></li> <li>• <u>The right-of-way needs and the physical impacts on surrounding properties.</u></li> <li>• <u>The visual aesthetics of the required improvement and its impact on community identity and character.</u></li> <li>• <u>Environmental impacts including air quality and noise impacts.</u></li> <li>• <u>Construction and right-of-way acquisition costs.</u></li> <li>• <u>The impacts on general safety.</u></li> <li>• <u>The impacts of the required construction phasing and traffic maintenance.</u></li> <li>• <u>The impacts on quality of life as perceived by residents.</u></li> <li>• <u>Consideration of other environmental, social, or economic factors on which the County may base</u></li> </ul>

Policy Number	Proposed Amendment
	<u>findings to allow an exceedance of the standards.</u> <u>Exceptions to the standard will only be allowed after all feasible measures and options are explored, including alternative forms of transportation.</u>