



**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT/RESOURCE AGENCY
ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATION SERVICES
County of Placer**

**NOTICE OF INTENT
TO ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

The project listed below was reviewed for environmental impact by the Placer County Environmental Review Committee and was determined to have no significant effect upon the environment. A proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared for this project and has been filed with the County Clerk's office.

PROJECT: TPA Warehouse (PLN18-00484)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project proposes to construct two 14,400 square foot warehouses, with a storage yard and parking area. The warehouses would consist of 1-story metal buildings, each with front entrances, two roll-up doors for truck access in front, and four roll-up doors at the rear for truck access.

PROJECT LOCATION: 1770 Booth Road, Roseville, Placer County

APPLICANT: Michael Kent Murphy Architect

The comment period for this document closes on March 18, 2020. A copy of the Mitigated Negative Declaration is available for public review at the County's web site:

<https://www.placer.ca.gov/2826/Negative-Declarations>

Community Development Resource Agency public counter, and at the Roseville Public Library. Property owners within 300 feet of the subject site shall be notified by mail of the upcoming hearing before the Zoning Administrator. Additional information may be obtained by contacting the Environmental Coordination Services, at (530)745-3132, between the hours of 8:00 am and 5:00 pm. Comments may be sent to cdraecs@placer.ca.gov or 3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190, Auburn, CA 95603.

Sent to 300' Property Owners on February 18, 2020



Legend

- Roads
- County Boundary
- World Street Map
- Parcels

Notes

THIS MAP IS NOT TO BE USED FOR NAVIGATION

This map is a user generated static output from an Internet mapping site and is for reference only. Data layers that appear on this map may or may not be accurate, current, or otherwise reliable.



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT/RESOURCE AGENCY
Environmental Coordination Services
County of Placer

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

In accordance with Placer County ordinances regarding implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, Placer County has conducted an Initial Study to determine whether the following project may have a significant adverse effect on the environment, and on the basis of that study hereby finds:

- ☐ The proposed project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment; therefore, it does not require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report and this **Negative Declaration** has been prepared.
- ☒ Although the proposed project could have a significant adverse effect on the environment, there will not be a significant adverse effect in this case because the project has incorporated specific provisions to reduce impacts to a less than significant level and/or the mitigation measures described herein have been added to the project. A **Mitigated Negative Declaration** has thus been prepared.

The environmental documents, which constitute the Initial Study and provide the basis and reasons for this determination are attached and/or referenced herein and are hereby made a part of this document.

PROJECT INFORMATION

Title: TPA Warehouse	Project # PLN18-00484
Description: The project proposes to construct two 14,400 square foot warehouses, with a storage yard and parking area. The warehouses would consist of 1-story metal buildings, each with front entrances, two roll-up doors for truck access in front, and four roll-up doors at the rear for truck access.	
Location: 1770 Booth Road, Roseville, Placer County	
Project Owner: Pavel Tyukayev	
Project Applicant: Michael Kent Murphy Architect, Michael Kent Murphy	
County Contact Person: Shirlee I. Herrington	530-745-3132

PUBLIC NOTICE

The comment period for this document closes on **March 18, 2020**. A copy of the Mitigated Negative Declaration is available for public review at the County's web site (<https://www.placer.ca.gov/2826/Negative-Declarations>), Community Development Resource Agency public counter, and at the Roseville Public Library. Property owners within 300 feet of the subject site shall be notified by mail of the upcoming meeting before the **Zoning Administrator**. Additional information may be obtained by contacting the Environmental Coordination Services, at (530)745-3132 between the hours of 8:00 am and 5:00 pm at 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603.

If you wish to appeal the appropriateness or adequacy of this document, address your written comments to our finding that the project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment: (1) identify the environmental effect(s), why they would occur, and why they would be significant, and (2) suggest any mitigation measures which you believe would eliminate or reduce the effect to an acceptable level. Regarding item (1) above, explain the basis for your comments and submit any supporting data or references. Refer to Section 18.32 of the Placer County Code for important information regarding the timely filing of appeals.

INITIAL STUDY & CHECKLIST

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

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

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

Project Title: TPA Warehouse	Project # PLN18-00484
Entitlement(s): Design Review and Minor Use Permit	
Site Area: 2.3 acres / 100,188 square feet	APN: 473-040-023-000
Location: 1770 Booth Road, Roseville, Placer County	

A. BACKGROUND:

Project Description:

The project proposes a Minor Use Permit to construct two 14,400 square foot warehouses, with a storage yard and parking area. The warehouses would consist of 1-story metal buildings, each with front entrances, two roll-up doors for truck access in front, and four roll-up doors at the rear for truck access. The warehouses will be used as a contractor's service warehouse and yard for the storage and maintenance of the contractor's private equipment and materials. There would be a total of two to six employees onsite. Typical hours of operation would be weekdays from 9am-5pm, but no public services would be offered.

Additional site improvements include 30 paved parking spaces (two accessible spaces included). A total of 12 parking spaces would be located at the front of the property adjacent to Booth Road, and the remaining 18 spaces would be located behind the warehouses at the rear of the property where the storage yard areas are proposed. A vegetated swale would be located between the front parking lot and Booth Road for stormwater drainage purposes. Since the project site is moderately sloping to the north, a series of retaining walls are proposed for the northern boundary where the storage yards and parking would be located. An existing paved driveway off of Booth Road would serve the warehouse building on the east portion of the property, and a second driveway access on the southwestern side of the property to serve the warehouse building located on the west portion of the property. The project proposes to upgrade one half of street frontage (Booth Road) to County standards. The project would be served by public sewer and water.

Project Site (Background/Existing Setting):

The 2.3-acre parcel is zoned IN-UP-Dc-SP (Industrial combining Design Corridor, combining Special Purpose area). The parcel includes an existing graveled parking lot that is used to park vehicles and store construction materials and equipment.

Booth Road (a public road) forms the southern boundary of the parcel. A metal storage building is located on the property to the west, and single-family residences are located to the north, east, and south. The City of Roseville's Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant is located further to the west at the end of Booth Road.

Vegetation on the project site consists of non-native annual grassland, with scattered trees lining the western and southern boundaries. The northeastern corner of the project site contains the majority of the remaining almond trees which are remnants of the former orchard. There are also several oak trees scattered mainly along the eastern and southern boundaries of the project site. The property includes perimeter fencing, and on its eastern portion there is a graveled driveway that leads to a storage area including construction equipment and materials.

B. Environmental Setting:

Location	Zoning	General Plan/Community Plan Designations	Existing Conditions and Improvements
Site	IN-UP-Dc-SP (Industrial combining Design Corridor, Combining Special Purpose area)	Industrial	Undeveloped
North	IN-UP-Dc-SP (Industrial combining Design Corridor, Combining Special Purpose area)	Industrial	Single-Family Residence
South	IN-UP-Dc-SP (Industrial combining Design Corridor, Combining Special Purpose area), O (Open Space)	Industrial, Green Belt & Open Space	Single-Family Residence
East	IN-UP-Dc-SP (Industrial combining Design Corridor, Combining Special Purpose area)	Industrial	Single-Family Residence
West	IN-UP-Dc-SP (Industrial combining Design Corridor, Combining Special Purpose area)	Industrial	Storage Building

C. NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES: Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

Pursuant to Assembly Bill 52 (Chapter 532, Statutes of 2014), consultation requests were sent to tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area on January 9, 2019. A letter from the United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC) requesting consultation was received January 16, 2019. UAIC requested copies of any records and/or searches prepared for the project which were provided. On January 18, 2019, the UAIC provided recommended mitigation measures to address inadvertent discoveries. The inadvertent discoveries mitigation measure has been incorporated into this Mitigated Negative Declaration. No other tribe contacted the County.

NOTE: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

D. PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT:

The County has determined that an Initial Study shall be prepared in order to determine whether the potential exists for unmitigable impacts resulting from the proposed project. Relevant analysis from the County-wide General Plan and Community Plan Certified EIRs, and other project-specific studies and reports that have been generated to date,

were used as the database for the Initial Study. The decision to prepare the Initial Study utilizing the analysis contained in the General Plan and Specific Plan Certified EIRs, and project-specific analysis summarized herein, is sustained by Sections 15168 and 15183 of the CEQA Guidelines.

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

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

- ➔ Placer County General Plan EIR
- ➔ Dry Creek / West Placer Community Plan EIR

E. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

- a) A brief explanation is required for all answers including "No Impact" answers.
- b) "Less Than Significant Impact" applies where the project's impacts are insubstantial and do not require any mitigation to reduce impacts.
- c) "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The County, as lead agency, must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level (mitigation measures from earlier analyses may be cross-referenced).
- d) "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- e) All answers must take account of the entire action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts [CEQA Guidelines, Section 15063(a)(1)].
- f) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, Program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration [CEQA Guidelines, Section 15063(c)(3)(D)]. A brief discussion should be attached addressing the following:
 - ➔ **Earlier analyses used** – Identify earlier analyses and state where they are available for review.
 - ➔ **Impacts adequately addressed** – Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of, and adequately analyzed in, an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards. Also, state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - ➔ **Mitigation measures** – For effects that are checked as "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- g) References to information sources for potential impacts (i.e. General Plans/Community Plans, zoning ordinances) should be incorporated into the checklist. Reference to a previously-prepared or outside document should include a reference to the pages or chapters where the statement is substantiated. A source list should be attached and other sources used, or individuals contacted, should be cited in the discussion.

I. AESTHETICS – Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (PLN)			X	
2. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, within a state scenic highway? (PLN)				X
3. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? (PLN)			X	
4. Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (PLN)			X	

Discussion Item I-1, 3, 4:

The 2.3-acre parcel is zoned IN-UP-Dc-SP (Industrial combining Design Corridor, combining Special Purpose area). A metal storage building is located on the property to the west, and single-family residences are located to the north, east, and south. No views in the vicinity of the project site meet criteria to be classified as scenic because the views are unremarkable in their character or in the context of their setting. Additionally, although there is existing residential development located to the north, south, and east of the project site, all surrounding properties are currently zoned for industrial use or are designated for future industrial development.

The parcel includes an existing graveled parking lot that is used to park vehicles and store construction materials and equipment. Booth Road forms the southern boundary of the parcel. Vegetation on the project site consists of non-native annual grassland, with scattered trees lining the western and southern boundaries of the project site. The northeastern corner of the project site contains the majority of the remaining almond trees which make up the former orchard. There are also several oak trees scattered mainly along the eastern and southern boundaries of the project site. The property includes perimeter fencing, and on its eastern portion there is a graveled driveway that leads to a storage area including construction equipment and materials.

The project would require County Design Review and be subject to design standards established in the Dry Creek / West Placer Community Plan to ensure that the project would meet goals and policies of the Community Plan for non-residential development. Design criteria would also include outdoor lighting standards conforming to the requirements of the Placer County Design Guidelines Manual; therefore, the project would not result in a substantial new source of light or glare that could adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion Item I-2:

The proposed project is not located near a state scenic highway and does not include scenic elements such as outstanding trees, rock outcroppings or historic buildings that could be impacted as a result of the project. Therefore, there is no impact.

II. AGRICULTURAL & FOREST RESOURCES – Would the project:

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

Discussion Item II-1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6:

The subject property is not considered Prime or Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance. The subject property is located within an area designated for Industrial uses by the Zoning Ordinance. Furthermore, although the majority of surrounding properties are developed with single-family residences, these properties are designated for future Industrial uses as well by the Zoning Ordinance and Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan. While the combining Agriculture zone district does allow for some agricultural uses, there are no agricultural operations located on or immediately adjacent to the subject property that would require a land use buffer. Though the parcel historically supported an almond orchard, the orchard has been abandoned and no agricultural activities occur onsite. In addition, the proposed project would not conflict with the existing zoning for Forest land for an agricultural use, and none of the surrounding properties are enrolled in a Williamson Act contract. Finally, the proposed project would not result in changes to the environment that would result in the loss or conversion of Farm or Forest land. Therefore, there is no impact.

III. AIR QUALITY – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (AQ)			X	
2. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard? (AQ)			X	
3. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (AQ)			X	

4. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people? (AQ)			X	
---	--	--	---	--

Discussion Item III-1, 2:

The proposed project is located within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB) portion of Placer County and is under the jurisdiction of the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD). The PCAPCD is responsible for implementing emissions standards and other requirements of federal and state laws. Air quality concerns within the Sacramento Valley include the most common pollutants of ozone, carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, and particulate matter from dust and diesel exhaust.

The SVAB is designated non-attainment for the federal and state ozone standards (ROG and NOx), and nonattainment for the state particulate matter standard (PM10). The proposed project includes the construction of two 14,400 square foot warehouses. Associated on-site improvements include construction of a storage yard, an access drive, parking area for 30 parking spaces, utilities and stormwater improvements. The project proposes approximately 2.3 acres of disturbance. No onsite burning of vegetative material is proposed.

The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the regional air quality plan, referred to as the State Implementation Plan (SIP), and would not exceed the PCAPCD CEQA thresholds adopted October 13, 2016 as follows:

PCAPCD CEQA THRESHOLDS FOR CRITERIA POLLUTANT EMISSIONS

1. Construction Threshold of 82 pounds per day for Reactive Organic Gases (ROG), Oxides of Nitrogen (NOx), and particulate matter smaller than 10 microns (PM10);
2. Operational Threshold of 55 pounds per day for ROG, NOx and 82 pounds per day for PM10; and
3. Cumulative Threshold of 55 pounds per day for ROG, NOx and 82 pounds per day for PM10.

The daily maximum emission thresholds listed above represent an emission level below which the proposed project's contribution to criteria pollutant emissions would be deemed less than significant. The level of operational emissions to achieve or exceed the thresholds would be equivalent to a project size of approximately 617 single family dwelling units, or a 94,262 square feet general light industry building (with an average daily trip rate of 6,233 for the weekday), which is substantially larger than the proposed project.

During construction of the proposed project, various types of equipment and vehicles would temporarily operate. Construction exhaust emissions would be generated from construction equipment, vegetation clearing and earth movement activities, construction workers' commute, and construction material hauling. The project related long term operational emissions would result from vehicle exhaust, utility usage, and water/wastewater conveyance. Project construction and operational activities would generate air pollutant emissions of criteria pollutants, including ROG, NOx, and PM10.

The proposed project would result in an increase in regional and local emissions from construction of the project but would be below the PCAPCD's thresholds based on the limited area of disturbance. In order to reduce construction related emissions, the project would be conditioned to list the PCAPCD's Rules and Regulations on associated grading/improvement plans. During construction activity, the project shall comply with all applicable PCAPCD rules. Additionally, as a standard condition of approval, a Dust Control Plan is required to be submitted to the PCAPCD prior to the start of earth-disturbing activities and would be conditioned for the project.

Adherence with PCAPCD Rules and Regulations including submittal of a Dust Control Plan, impacts related to short-term construction-related emissions would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion Item III-3:

Certain air pollutants are classified by the California Air Resources Board (ARB) as toxic air contaminants, or TACs, which are known to increase the risk of cancer and/or other serious health effects. Localized concentrations of Carbon Monoxide (CO) can be a TAC and are typically generated by traffic congestion at intersections. The anticipated traffic resulting from the proposed project would not impact the nearby intersection's ability to operate acceptably and would therefore not result in substantial concentration of CO emissions at any intersection.

The construction of the proposed project would result in short-term diesel particulate matter (DPM) emissions from heavy-duty onsite equipment and off-road diesel equipment. The ARB has identified DPM from diesel exhaust as a

toxic air contaminant, with both chronic and carcinogenic public health risks.

The ARB, PCAPCD, and Placer County recognize the public health risk reductions that can be realized by idling limitations for on-road and off-road equipment. The proposed project would be required to comply with the following idling restriction (five-minute limitation) requirements from ARB and Placer County Code during construction activity, including the use of both on-road and off-road equipment:

- California Air Resources Board In-use Off-road Diesel regulation, Section 2449(d)(3): Off-road diesel equipment shall comply with the five-minute idling restriction. Available via the web: www.arb.ca.gov/regact/2007/ordiesl07/froal.pdf
- Placer County, Code Section 10.14. Available via the web: <http://qcode.us/codes/placercounty/>

Portable equipment and engines (i.e., back-up generators) 50 horsepower (hp) or greater, used during construction activities and operation require either a registration certificate issued by ARB, based on the California Statewide Portable Equipment Registration Program (PERP) or an Authority to Construct (ATC) permit issued by PCAPCD to operate. The proposed project would be conditioned to obtain all necessary permits from the ARB and PCAPCD prior to construction. With compliance of State and Local regulations, potential public health impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Sensitive receptors would not be exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations given the dispersive properties of DPM and the temporary nature of the mobilized equipment use. Additionally, the project would not result in substantial CO emissions at intersections. Short-term construction and operationally-generated Toxic Air Contaminant emissions would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and therefore would have a less than significant effect. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion Item III-4:

The proposed project would result in additional air pollutant emissions generated by diesel-powered construction equipment, as well as long-term operational emissions from vehicle exhaust that could create odors. During construction, odors will be temporary and intermittent in nature, and would consist of diesel exhaust that is typical of most construction sites. During operation, no specific occupants have been identified; however, all manufacturing and warehousing operations will be located indoors. Furthermore, the project would comply with PCAPCD Rule 205, which prohibits the discharge of air contaminants or other materials that could cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to a considerable number of people, causes damage to property, or endangers the health and safety of the public. Compliance with Rule 205 would keep objectionable odors to a less than significant level. No mitigation measures are required.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish & Wildlife, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service or National Marine Fisheries Service? (PLN)		X		
2. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community, identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or regulated by the California Department of Fish & Wildlife, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, or Regional Water Quality Control Board? (PLN)		X		
3. Have a substantial adverse effect on federal or state protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) or as defined by state statute, through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or				X

other means? (PLN)				
4. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? (PLN)				X
5. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (PLN)		X		
6. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (PLN)				X
7. Substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number of restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species? (PLN)		X		
8. Have a substantial adverse effect on the environment by converting oak woodlands? (PLN)		X		

Discussion Item IV-1, 2, 7:

Vegetation on the project site consists of non-native annual grassland, a former orchard, and a developed/ruderal area. The center of the project site mostly consists of the non-native grassland, with scattered trees lining the western and southern boundaries of the project site. The northeastern corner of the project site contains the majority of the remaining almond trees which make up the former orchard. There are also several oak trees scattered mainly along the eastern and southern boundaries of the project site. No aquatic habitat is present on the project site. The property includes perimeter fencing, and on its eastern portion there is a graveled driveway that leads to a storage area including construction equipment and materials.

A Biological Resources Report was prepared for the project by Analytical Environmental Services (AES) in July 2018. The assessment is the result of a field study and records searches obtained from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife Natural Diversity Database, (CNDDB), the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the California Native Plant Society. The field survey was conducted by AES biologists on October May 31, 2018 to characterize existing conditions and to assess the potential for sensitive plant and wildlife resources to occur. During the field assessment, plants and animals observed were documented, and habitat types were determined.

Special-Status Plants

There are no known potential special-status plant species with the potential to occur within the project site.

Special-Status Wildlife

The white-tailed Kite (*Elanus leucurus*) is the only special status species that has the potential to occur within the project site. Although the habitat within the project site is poor quality, there is the potential for this species to nest or forage within the project site. Migratory birds including passerines and raptors, such as the white-tailed kite, have the potential to nest in the trees and shrubs that line all sides of the project site.

However, with the following mitigation measure, potential impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure Item IV-1, 2, 7:MM IV.1

Avoid and reduce impacts to nesting raptors and other birds of prey, including the white-tailed Kite:

- A preconstruction survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist for nesting birds of prey and migratory birds, including white-tailed kite, within 7 days prior to commencement of construction activities that occur between February 1 and October 1. If no active raptor nests are identified within 500 feet of construction activities during the preconstruction survey, then no further mitigation is required. Similarly, if no active passerine nests are identified within 250 feet of construction activities during the preconstruction survey, then no further mitigation is required. The qualified biologist shall also document and submit the results of the preconstruction survey in a letter to the County immediately following the survey. The letter shall include: a

description of the methodology including dates of field visits, the names of survey personnel, and a list of references cited and persons contacted; and a map showing the location(s) of any bird nests observed on the project site.

- If any active raptor nests are identified during the preconstruction survey within 500 feet of the project site (or 250 feet for passerines), a buffer zone will be established around the nests until the juveniles have fledged from the nest. A qualified biologist will monitor nests weekly during construction to evaluate potential nesting disturbance by construction activities. The biologist will delimit the buffer zone with construction tape or pin flags within 500 feet of the active raptor nest (or 250 feet for passerines) and maintain the buffer zone until the end of the breeding season or until the young have fledged. Guidance from the CDFW will be requested for a reduced buffer zone if establishing a 500-foot buffer zone is impractical. Guidance from the CDFW will be requested if the nestlings within the active nest appear disturbed.

Discussion Item IV-3:

A Biological Resources Report was prepared for the project by Analytical Environmental Services (AES) in July 2018. The assessment included a field survey was conducted by AES biologists on October May 31, 2018. During the survey, no wetlands or aquatic features were identified on the project site. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item IV-4:

The proposed project would not interfere with the movement of any native or migratory fish or wildlife species, would not interfere with established native or migratory wildlife corridors, nor impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites because the site does not include streams, lakes, wetlands, wildlife movement corridors, or other habitat features. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item IV-5, 8:

An Arborist Report and Tree Inventory prepared by Sierra Nevada Arborists in April 2018 inventoried and evaluated protected trees on or immediately adjacent to the project site. Trees include 10 Valley Oak (*Quercus lobata*) and 1 Interior Live Oak (*Quercus wislizeni*), and 1 native willow (Goodding's Willow, *Salix gooddingii*). The project proposes to remove the 1 Willow tree and 7 of the Valley Oak. A total of 93 inches (dbh) of oak and 15 inches (dbh) of Willow trees will be removed (A total of 17 non-native Almond trees will be removed, but they are not considered protected). Three of the Valley Oak and the one Live Oak tree are to be preserved.

Placer County has identified the value of its native and landmark trees and has adopted measures for their preservation. The Tree Preservation Ordinance (Chapter 12, Article 12.16 of the County Code) provides protections for landmark trees and heritage trees. The County Code defines a landmark tree as "a tree or grove of trees designated by resolution of the Board of Supervisors to be of historical or cultural value, an outstanding specimen, an unusual species and/or of significant community benefit." The Tree Preservation Ordinance is applicable to all native, landmark trees, riparian zone trees, and certain commercial firewood operations, except as exempted. It should be noted that to be considered a tree, as opposed to a seedling or sapling, the tree must have a diameter at breast height (DBH) of at least 6 inches or, if it has multiple trunks of less than 6 inches each, a combined DBH of 10 inches.

The trees impacted by the development do not constitute "oak woodlands" as defined by the County as they do not account for an area of two acres or greater with at least ten percent of the canopy onsite nor do they signify any significant stand of oak trees. As such, the proposed project would not result in the conversion of oak woodlands and no mitigation for oak woodland loss is necessary.

Mitigation Measures Item IV-5, 8:

MM IV.2

The project would require the removal of, or impact to, 8 protected trees with a combined DBH of 108 inches. To mitigate for the loss of protected trees, the project applicant shall obtain a Tree Permit from Placer County's Planning Services Division prior to Improvement Plan approval. The Planning Services Division shall review the Tree Permit application as well as the final site improvement plans and determine the precise mitigation requirement at that time based on the number and size of trees verified for removal. The fee shall be paid into the Placer County Tree Preservation Fund at the rate of \$125 per inch removed or impacted.

MM IV.3

The Improvement Plans shall include a note and show placement of Temporary Construction Fencing around trees to be saved: The applicant shall install a four foot tall, brightly colored (typically orange), synthetic mesh material fence (or an equivalent approved by the Development Review Committee) at the following locations prior to any

construction equipment being moved on-site or any construction activities taking place:

- A. At the limits of construction, outside the critical root zone of all trees six (6) inches DBH (diameter at breast height), or 10 inches DBH aggregate for multi-trunk trees, within 50 feet of any grading, road improvements, underground utilities, or other development activity, or as otherwise shown on the Tentative Parcel Map(s).
- B. Around the landscape buffer area.

No development of the site, including grading, shall be allowed until this requirement is satisfied. Any encroachment within the critical root zones of trees to be saved must first be approved by the Development Review Committee. Temporary fencing shall not be altered during construction without written approval of the Development Review Committee. No grading, clearing, storage of equipment or machinery, etc., may occur until a representative of the Development Review Committee has inspected and approved all temporary construction fencing. This includes both on-site and off-site improvements. Efforts should be made to save trees where feasible. This may include the use of retaining walls, planter islands, pavers, or other techniques commonly associated with tree preservation.

Discussion Item IV-6:

Placer County does not have an active Habitat Conservation Plan; however, the County is currently preparing the Placer County Conservation Program, which is nearing completion. Nevertheless, as discussed above, habitat loss is not expected due to the disturbed nature of the project site. Therefore, this project will not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. If the PCCP is approved prior to the project's receipt of entitlements, the project would have the option to utilize the PCCP as a mechanism to mitigate its tree impacts. Therefore, there is no impact.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

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

Discussion Item V-1, 2, 4:

A records search through the North Central Information Center (NCIC) was conducted by Analytical Environmental Services on May 18, 2018. The results of the NCIC search indicated that no previously-documented cultural resources have been situated on the project site, but four sites have been identified within one-half mile of the project site. A records search through the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on May 22, 2018 by Analytical Environmental Services determined that no Sacred Lands were identified within or adjacent to the project site. The project would not cause substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource as defined by CEQA nor would the project cause substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item V-3:

No human remains are known to be buried at the project site nor were there any indications of human remains found during the field survey. However, there is always the possibility that subsurface construction activities associated with the proposed project, such as trenching and grading, could potentially damage or destroy previously undiscovered

human remains. Accordingly, this is a potentially significant impact. Implementation of the following standard mitigation measure would reduce this impact to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures Item V-3:

MM V.1

If human remains are encountered, these remains shall be treated in accordance with Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, PRC Section 5097.98, and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e).

The Grading Plans shall include a note stating that if any archaeological artifacts, exotic rock (non-native), or unusual amounts of shell or bone are uncovered during any onsite construction activities, all work must stop immediately in the area and a qualified archaeologist shall be retained to evaluate the deposit. The Placer County Planning Services Division and Department of Museums must also be contacted for review of the archaeological find(s).

If the discovery consists of human remains, the Placer County Coroner and Native American Heritage Commission must also be contacted. Work in the area may only proceed after authorization is granted by the Placer County Planning Services Division. Following a review of the new find and consultation with appropriate experts, if necessary, the authority to proceed may be accompanied by the addition of development requirements that provide protection of the site and/or additional mitigation measures necessary to address the unique or sensitive nature of the site.

Discussion Item V-5:

Development of the project site would not cause a physical change that would affect unique cultural values because no resources that would result in such an affect are located on or around the subject property. Therefore, there is no impact.

VI. ENERGY – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation? (PLN)			X	
2. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency? (PLN)				X

Discussion Item VI-1:

The main forms of available energy supply are electricity, natural gas, and oil. Energy would be used to construct the proposed project, and once constructed, energy would be used for the lifetime of the warehouse facility.

Construction of the proposed project is required to comply with the California Green Building Standards Code (CBSC, also known as the CALGreen Code) and the 2016 Building Energy Efficient Standards (which is a portion of the CBSC). All construction equipment and operation thereof would be regulated per the California Air Resources Board (CARB) In-Use Off-Road Diesel Vehicle Regulation. The purpose of the CBSC is to improve public health, safety, and general welfare by enhancing the design and construction of buildings through the use of building concepts having a reduced negative impact or positive environmental impact and encouraging sustainable construction practices. Building Energy Efficient Standards achieve energy reductions through requiring high-efficacy lighting, improved water heating system efficiency, and high-performance attics and walls. CARB standards for construction equipment include measures to reduce emissions from vehicles by subjecting fleet owners to retrofit or accelerated replacement/repower requirements and imposing idling limitations on owners, operators, renters, or lessees of off-road diesel vehicles. The proposed project construction would also be required to comply with all applicable Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) rules and regulations.

Energy use associated with operation of the proposed project would be typical of warehousing and storage uses, requiring electricity and natural gas for interior and exterior building lighting, HVAC, electronic equipment, machinery, refrigeration, appliances, and security systems. In addition, maintenance activities during operations, such as landscape maintenance, would involve the use of electric or gas-powered equipment.

While the proposed project would introduce new operational energy demands to the proposed project area, this demand does not necessarily mean that the proposed project would have an impact related to energy sources. The proposed project would result in an impact if a project would result in the inefficient use or waste of energy. The proposed project is required to comply with all applicable standards and regulations regarding energy conservation and fuel efficiency, which would ensure that the future uses would be designed to be energy efficient to the maximum extent practicable. Accordingly, the proposed project would not be considered to result in a wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary use of energy, and impacts related to construction and operational energy would be considered less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion Item VI-2:

Placer County does not currently have an adopted plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. The County is currently preparing the Placer County Sustainability Plan (PCSP) that would provide a strategy to reduce GHG (greenhouse gas) emissions. This plan would include goals and policies for energy efficiency. In the event the PCSP is adopted prior to the proposed project receiving its entitlements, the proposed project would be required to comply with the PCSP. Therefore, there is no impact.

VII. GEOLOGY & SOILS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (ESD)		X		
2. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? (ESD)			X	
3. Be located on expansive soils, as defined in Section 1802.3.2 of the California Building Code (2007), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property? (ESD)			X	
4. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? (EH)				X
5. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or unique geologic or physical feature? (PLN)		X		
6. Result in significant disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcrowding of the soil? (ESD)		X		
7. Result in substantial change in topography or ground surface relief features? (ESD)		X		
8. Result in exposure of people or property to geologic and geomorphological (i.e. Avalanches) hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, seismic-related ground failure, or similar hazards? (PLN, ESD)			X	

Discussion Item VII-1, 6, 7:

The project site is a 2.3-acre, relatively flat graded, rectangular parcel that is currently undeveloped except for an existing paved driveway off Booth Road and a gravel parking area. The proposed project is bounded by Booth Road to the south, residential parcels to the north and east, and an undeveloped industrial parcel to the west. The Natural Resource Conservation Service Web Soil Survey identifies the predominant soil type on the site as Ramona sandy loam. This is a very deep, well-drained soil that formed in alluvium from predominantly granitic sources. Permeability is moderate slow and surface runoff is slow or medium. The hazard of erosion is slight or moderate. The southeast corner of the site is identified as Xerofluvents, occasionally flooded. This soil consists of small areas of moderately well drained loamy alluvium adjacent to stream channels. Permeability is moderate to moderately slow and surface

runoff is slow. The hazard of erosion is slight.

The project proposal would result in the construction of two 14,400 square foot warehouse buildings with associated parking, drive aisles, and frontage improvements. To construct the improvements proposed, potentially significant disruption of soils onsite would occur, including excavation/compaction for the buildings, driveways, and various utilities. All 2.3 acres of the site would be disturbed by grading activities. Approximately 7,400 cubic yards of onsite material would be moved (6,700 cubic yards of material exported offsite) to level the site. The required grading of the northern hillside would require the installation of a series of two approximately 3-foot high retaining walls along the northern project site boundary.

The proposed project's impacts associated with unstable earth conditions, soil disruptions, displacements, and compaction of the soil, as well as impacts to topography can be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures:

Mitigation Measures Item VII-1,6, 7:

MM VII.1

The applicant shall prepare and submit Improvement Plans, specifications and cost estimates (per the requirements of Section II of the Land Development Manual (LDM) that are in effect at the time of submittal) to the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD) for review and approval. The plans shall show all physical improvements as required by the conditions for the project as well as pertinent topographical features both on and off site. All existing and proposed utilities and easements, on site and adjacent to the project, which may be affected by planned construction, shall be shown on the plans. All landscaping and irrigation facilities within the public right-of-way (or public easements), or landscaping within sight distance areas at intersections, shall be included in the Improvement Plans. The applicant shall pay plan check and inspection fees and, if applicable, Placer County Fire Department improvement plan review and inspection fees with the 1st Improvement Plan submittal. (NOTE: Prior to plan approval, all applicable recording and reproduction cost shall be paid). The cost of the above-noted landscape and irrigation facilities shall be included in the estimates used to determine these fees. It is the applicant's responsibility to obtain all required agency signatures on the plans and to secure department approvals. If the Design/Site Review process and/or Development Review Committee (DRC) review is required as a condition of approval for the project, said review process shall be completed prior to submittal of Improvement Plans.

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

Any Building Permits associated with this project shall not be issued until, at a minimum, the Improvement Plans are approved by the Engineering and Surveying Division.

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

MM VII.2

The Improvement Plans shall show all proposed grading, drainage improvements, vegetation and tree removal and all work shall conform to provisions of the County Grading Ordinance (Ref. Article 15.48, Placer County Code) and Stormwater Quality Ordinance (Ref. Article 8.28, Placer County Code) that are in effect at the time of submittal. No grading, clearing, or tree disturbance shall occur until the Improvement Plans are approved and all temporary construction fencing has been installed and inspected by a member of the Development Review Committee (DRC). All cut/fill slopes shall be at a maximum of 2:1 (horizontal: vertical) unless a soils report supports a steeper slope and the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD) concurs with said recommendation.

The applicant shall revegetate all disturbed areas. Revegetation, undertaken from April 1 to October 1, shall include regular watering to ensure adequate growth. A winterization plan shall be provided with project Improvement Plans. It is the applicant's responsibility to ensure proper installation and maintenance of erosion control/winterization before, during, and after project construction. Soil stockpiling or borrow areas, shall have proper erosion control measures applied for the duration of the construction as specified in the Improvement Plans. Provide for erosion control where roadside drainage is off of the pavement, to the satisfaction of the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD).

The applicant shall submit to the ESD a letter of credit or cash deposit in the amount of 110 percent of an approved engineer's estimate using the County's current Plan Check and Inspection Fee Spreadsheet for winterization and permanent erosion control work prior to Improvement Plan approval to guarantee protection against erosion and improper grading practices. For an improvement plan with a calculated security that exceeds \$100,000, a minimum of \$100,000 shall be provided as letter of credit or cash security and the remainder can be bonded. One year after the County's acceptance of improvements as complete, if there are no erosion or runoff issues to be corrected, unused portions of said deposit shall be refunded or released, as applicable, to the project applicant or authorized agent.

If, at any time during construction, a field review by County personnel indicates a significant deviation from the proposed grading shown on the Improvement Plans, specifically with regard to slope heights, slope ratios, erosion control, winterization, tree disturbance, and/or pad elevations and configurations, the plans shall be reviewed by the DRC/ESD for a determination of substantial conformance to the project approvals prior to any further work proceeding. Failure of the DRC/ESD to make a determination of substantial conformance may serve as grounds for the revocation/modification of the project approval by the appropriate hearing body. (ESD)

Discussion Item VII-2, 3, 8:

The proposed project is not located in a sensitive geologic area or in an area that typically experiences soil instability. The soil type in this area is not known to be expansive. The proposed buildings would be on grade and the soils would be properly compacted. The proposed project would comply with Placer County construction and improvement standards to reduce impacts related to soils, including on or offsite landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.

According to the Natural Resource Conservation Service, the location of the project within Placer County has a moderate earthquake risk. According to California Department of Conservation website the site is distant from known, active faults and would experience low levels of shaking. There is a potential that the site would experience a moderate horizontal ground acceleration in the project's lifetime. Although there is a potential for the site to be subject to moderate level earthquake shaking, the buildings will be constructed in compliance with the California Building Code, which includes seismic standards. Therefore, the impacts of unstable soil, expansive soil, and geologic/seismic hazards are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion Item VII-4:

The proposed project would be served by public sewer, and would not require or result in the construction of new on-site sewage disposal systems. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item VII-5:

A Paleontological Resources Report that was prepared for the project by Analytical Environmental Services (AES) on June 22, 2018 included a paleontological records search conducted by the University of California Museum of Paleontology (UCMP). The results of the paleontological records search indicated no recorded fossil sites within the immediate project area. The closest recorded fossils were found near the City of Rocklin approximately five miles east of the project site.

Since Pleistocene gravels are present throughout the project region and fossils have been found within the larger project region, the project site and surrounding area is considered somewhat sensitive for paleontological resources, suggesting the potential for uncovering fossil remains during construction-related earth-moving activities at the site. Construction activities could potentially disturb unknown subsurface paleontological resources. However, with the following mitigation measure, potential impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures Item XII-5:

MM XII.1

If paleontological resources are discovered during earthmoving activities, the construction crew shall immediately cease work that may affect the identified resource and notify the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, Planning Services Division. The applicant shall retain a qualified paleontologist to evaluate the resource and prepare a recovery plan in accordance with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP) guidelines (1996). The recovery plan may include a field survey, construction monitoring, sampling and data recovery procedures, coordination of museum storage for any specimen recovered, and a report of findings. Recommendations in the recovery plan that are determined by Placer County to be necessary and feasible shall be implemented before construction activities affecting the resource can resume at the site where paleontological resources were discovered.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:

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

Discussion Item VIII-1, 2:

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

The California Global Warming Solutions Act (AB32), signed into law in September 2006, requires statewide GHG emissions to be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020. AB32 established regulatory, reporting, and market mechanisms to achieve this goal and provides guidance to help attain quantifiable reductions in emissions efficiently, without limiting population and economic growth. In September of 2016, Senate Bill (SB) 32 was signed by the Governor to establish a California GHG reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030.

On October 13, 2016, the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) adopted CEQA significance thresholds for GHG emissions as shown below. The Bright-line Threshold of 10,000 metric tons (MT) CO₂e/yr threshold for construction and operational phases, and the De Minimis level of 1,100 MT CO₂e/yr for operational, were used to determine significance. GHG emissions from projects that exceed 10,000 MT CO₂e/yr would be deemed to have a cumulatively considerable contribution to global climate change. For a land use project, this level of emissions is equivalent to a project size of approximately 646 single-family dwelling units, or a 323,955 square foot commercial building.

The De Minimis Level for the operational phases of 1,100 MT CO₂e/yr represents an emissions level which can be considered less than cumulatively considerable and can be excluded from the further GHG impact analysis. This level of emissions is equivalent to a project size of approximately 71 single-family units, or a 35,635 square foot commercial building.

PCAPCD CEQA THRESHOLDS FOR GHG EMISSIONS

1. Bright-line Threshold of 10,000 metric tons of CO₂e per year for the construction and operational phases of land use projects as well as the stationary source projects
2. Efficiency Matrix for the operational phase of land use development projects when emissions exceed the De Minimis Level, and
3. De Minimis Level for the operational phases of 1,100 metric tons of CO₂e per year.

The GHG emissions resulting from the proposed project are not expected to exceed the PCAPCD Bright-line Threshold, or the De Minimis Level and therefore would not substantially hinder the State's ability to attain the goals identified in SB 32. Thus, the construction and operation of the proposed project would not generate substantial greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, which may be considered to have a significant impact on the environment, nor conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases and is therefore considered to have a less than significant impact. No mitigation measures are required.

IX. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? (EH)			X	
2. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (EH)			X	
3. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (AQ)			X	
4. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (EH)				X
5. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area? (PLN)				X
6. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (PLN)				X
7. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires? (PLN)			X	

Discussion Item IX-1:

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

Discussion Item IX-2:

The following standard condition will be required:

“Hazardous materials” as defined in Health and Safety Code Division 20, Chapter 6.95 shall not be allowed on any premises in regulated quantities (55 gallons, 200 cubic feet, 500 pounds) without notification to Environmental Health. If this is to be the case, the property owner/occupant who handles or stores regulated quantities of hazardous materials shall comply with the following within 30 days of commencing operations:

- Operator must complete an electronic submittal to California Environmental Reporting System (CERS) and pay required permit fees.
- If the business will generate hazardous waste from routine operations, obtain an EPA ID number from the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC).

Impacts are anticipated to be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion Item IX-3:

There are no existing or proposed school sites within one-quarter mile of the project site. Further, operation of the proposed project does not propose a use that involves activities that would emit hazardous substances or waste that would affect a substantial number of people and is therefore considered to have a less than significant impact. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion Item IX-4:

The project is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item IX-5:

The proposed project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport, public use airport, or private airstrip and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item IX-6:

The proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item IX-7:

The project site is located within the State Responsibility Area (SRA) and is designated Local Responsibility Area Urban Unzoned. Standard fire regulations and conditions shall apply to the proposed project, including fire sprinklers in the manufacturing and office buildings and standard fire safe setbacks. With the implementation of said regulations and fire safe practices, impacts related to wildland fires are considered less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

X. HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade ground water quality? (EH)			X	
2. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin? (EH)				X
3. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would: a) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite; b) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems? (ESD)		X		
4. Create or contribute runoff water which would include substantial additional sources of polluted runoff or otherwise substantially degrade surface water quality either during construction or in the post-construction condition? (ESD)		X		
5. Place housing or improvements within a 100-year flood hazard area either as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map which would: a) impede or redirect flood flows; or b) expose people or structures to risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding c) risk release of pollutants due to project inundation? (ESD)			X	

6. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan? (EH)				X
--	--	--	--	---

Discussion Item X-1:

This proposed project would not rely on groundwater wells as a potable water source but instead would connect to public treated water. The project would not violate water quality standards with respect to potable water. Proper permits would be required for the business related to hazardous materials, as well as routine inspections, therefore the impact is anticipated to be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion Item X-2, 6:

The proposed project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge since no water wells are proposed. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item X-3:

A preliminary drainage report was prepared by the applicant's engineer. The existing approximately 2.3-acre site is relatively flat with a gentle slope that drains the property from north to south to Booth Road. The existing drainage conveyance facilities in Booth Road are undersized for the existing hydrologic conditions, this project will upsize the pipe as discussed below. These facilities include a drainage swale along the north side of Booth Road and an existing 12-inch corrugated metal pipe storm drain located at a low spot along Booth Road which conveys water to the south to the City of Roseville Waste Water Treatment Plant. The proposed project includes the construction of 28,800 square feet of warehouse buildings with the associated parking; drive aisles; sewer, water, and storm drain improvements; and Booth Road frontage improvements. The proposed improvements would be at or near the existing grade and would not significantly modify the existing runoff patterns of the site.

The proposed project would create approximately 2.3 acres of new impervious surfaces on a property that is essentially undeveloped, including only an existing paved driveway access, potentially increasing the stormwater runoff peak flows and volume. The potential for increases in stormwater peak flows and volume has the potential to result in downstream impacts. A drainage report was prepared for the project which analyzed a drainage system that would convey runoff from the project site by way of a vegetated swale and underground onsite detention basin before discharging into the existing storm drain under Booth Road. Since the existing 12-inch storm drain does not meet the County's minimum inside diameter for circular pipes under roads, the drainage pipe would be replaced with a 24-inch storm drain. The drainage analysis concluded that the vegetated swale and detention basin would reduce the 100-year post-project peak flows to less than the pre-project peak flows. Flows from the project site would continue to be conveyed to the City of Roseville Waste Water Treatment Plant through the 24-inch storm drain under Booth Road. Prior to project construction, drainage sheet-flowed across Booth Road onto the Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP) property. Therefore, there would be no significant impact to the WWTP property. The post development volume of runoff would be slightly higher due to the increase in proposed impervious surfaces; however, this is considered to be less than significant because drainage facilities are generally designed to handle the peak flow runoff. A final drainage report would be prepared and submitted with the site Improvement Plans for County review and approval in order to monitor the preliminary drainage calculations and results.

The property proposed for development is within the Dry Creek Watershed Flood Control Plan area. Flooding along Dry Creek and its tributaries is well documented. This property is in the Main Stem tributary to Dry Creek. Cumulative downstream impacts were studied in the Dry Creek Watershed Flood Control Plan in order to plan for flood control projects and set flood control policies. Mitigation measures for development in this area include flood control development fees to fund regional detention basins to reduce flooding on major streams in the Dry Creek watershed. If fees are not collected on a project by project basis to fund regional detention facilities, these types of capital improvements may not be realized and flooding impacts to properties within the Dry Creek Watershed area would persist. Staff considers these cumulative flood control impacts to be potentially significant impacts.

The proposed project's impacts associated with altering the existing drainage pattern of the site and increases in stormwater peak flows and volume can be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures:

Mitigation Measures Item X-3:

MM VII.1, MM VII.2

MM X.1

As part of the Improvement Plan submittal process, the preliminary Drainage Report provided during environmental review shall be submitted in final format. The final Drainage Report may require more detail than that provided in the

preliminary report, and will be reviewed in concert with the Improvement Plans to confirm conformity between the two. The report shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and shall, at a minimum, include: A written text addressing existing conditions, the effects of the proposed improvements, all appropriate calculations, watershed maps, changes in flows and patterns, and proposed on- and off-site improvements and drainage easements to accommodate flows from this project. The report shall identify water quality protection features and methods to be used during construction, as well as long-term post-construction water quality measures. The final Drainage Report shall be prepared in conformance with the requirements of Section 5 of the Land Development Manual and the Placer County Stormwater Management Manual that are in effect at the time of Improvement Plan submittal. **(ESD)**

MM X.2

The Improvement Plan submittal and final Drainage Report shall provide details showing that storm water run-off peak flows shall be reduced to pre-project conditions through the installation of retention/detention facilities. Detention facilities shall be designed in accordance with the requirements of the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual that is in effect at the time of submittal, and to the satisfaction of the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD) and shall be shown on the Improvement Plans. The ESD may, after review of the project final drainage report, delete this requirement if it is determined that drainage conditions do not warrant installation of this type of facility. In the event on-site detention requirements are waived, this project may be subject to payment of any in-lieu fees payable prior to Improvement Plan approval as prescribed by County Ordinance. Maintenance of detention facilities by the homeowner's association, property owner's association, property owner, or entity responsible for project maintenance shall be required. No retention/detention facility construction shall be permitted within any identified wetlands area, floodplain, or right-of-way, except as authorized by project approvals. **(ESD)**

MM X.3

This project is subject to the one-time payment of drainage improvement and flood control fees pursuant to the "Dry Creek Watershed Interim Drainage Improvement Ordinance" (Ref. Chapter 15, Article 15.32, Placer County Code.) The current estimated development fee is \$3,952 (\$1,718 per acre for a 2.3 acre parcel) payable to the Engineering and Surveying Division prior to Building Permit issuance. The fees to be paid shall be based on the fee program in effect at the time that the application is deemed complete. **(ESD)**

MM X.4

This project is subject to payment of annual drainage improvement and flood control fees pursuant to the "Dry Creek Watershed Interim Drainage Improvement Ordinance" (Ref. Chapter 15, Article 15.32, Placer County Code). Prior to Building Permit issuance, the applicant shall cause the subject property to become a participant in the existing Dry Creek Watershed County Service Area for purposes of collecting these annual assessments. The current estimated annual fee is \$543 (\$236 per acre for a 2.3 acre parcel). **(ESD)**

Discussion Item X-4:

Discharge of concentrated runoff after construction could contribute to water quality impacts in the long-term. Stormwater runoff naturally contains numerous constituents; however, urbanization and urban activities including development and redevelopment typically increase constituent concentrations to levels that potentially impact water quality. Pollutants associated with stormwater include (but are not limited to) sediment, nutrients, oils/greases, etc. The proposed urban type development has the potential to result in the generation of new dry-weather runoff containing said pollutants.

The proposed project's impacts associated with water quality can be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures:

Mitigation Measures Item X-4:

MM VII.1, MM VII.2

MM X.5

The Improvement Plans shall show water quality treatment facilities/Best Management Practices (BMPs) designed according to the guidance of the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks for Construction, for New Development / Redevelopment, and for Industrial and Commercial (or other similar source as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD)).

Storm drainage from on- and off-site impervious surfaces (including roads) shall be collected and routed through specially designed catch basins, vegetated swales, vaults, infiltration basins, water quality basins, filters, etc. for entrapment of sediment, debris and oils/greases or other identified pollutants, as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD). BMPs shall be designed in accordance with the West Placer Storm Water Quality Design Manual for sizing of permanent post-construction Best Management Practices for stormwater quality protection. No water quality facility

construction shall be permitted within any identified wetlands area, floodplain, or right-of-way, except as authorized by project approvals.

All permanent BMPs shall be maintained as required to ensure effectiveness. The applicant shall provide for the establishment of vegetation, where specified, by means of proper irrigation. Proof of on-going maintenance, such as contractual evidence, shall be provided to ESD upon request. The project owners/permittees shall provide maintenance of these facilities and annually report a certification of completed maintenance to the County DPWF Stormwater Coordinator, unless, and until, a County Service Area is created and said facilities are accepted by the County for maintenance. Contractual evidence of a monthly parking lot sweeping and vacuuming, and catch basin cleaning program shall be provided to the ESD upon request. Failure to do so will be grounds for discretionary permit revocation. Prior to Improvement Plan approval, easements shall be created and offered for dedication to the County for maintenance and access to these facilities in anticipation of possible County maintenance. **(ESD)**

MM X.6

This project is located within the permit area covered by Placer County's Small Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit (State Water Resources Control Board National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)). Project-related storm water discharges are subject to all applicable requirements of said permit.

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

The project is also required to implement Low Impact Development (LID) standards designed to reduce runoff, treat storm water, and provide baseline hydromodification management as outlined in the West Placer Storm Water Quality Design Manual. **(ESD)**

MM X.7

Per the State of California NPDES Phase II MS4 Permit, this project is a Regulated Project that creates and/or replaces 5,000 square feet or more of impervious surface. A final Storm Water Quality Plan (SWQP) shall be submitted, either within the final Drainage Report or as a separate document that identifies how this project will meet the Phase II MS4 permit obligations. Site design measures, source control measures, and Low Impact Development (LID) standards, as necessary, shall be incorporated into the design and shown on the Improvement Plans. In addition, per the Phase II MS4 permit, projects creating and/or replacing one acre or more of impervious surface (excepting projects that do not increase impervious surface area over the pre-project condition) are also required to demonstrate hydromodification management of storm water such that post-project runoff is maintained to equal or below pre-project flow rates for the 2 year, 24-hour storm event, generally by way of infiltration, rooftop and impervious area disconnection, bioretention, and other LID measures that result in post-project flows that mimic pre-project conditions. **(ESD)**

MM X.8

The Improvement Plans shall include the message details, placement, and locations showing that all storm drain inlets and catch basins within the project area shall be permanently marked/embossed with prohibitive language such as "No Dumping! Flows to Creek." or other language /graphical icons to discourage illegal dumping as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD). The Property Owner is responsible for maintaining the legibility of stamped messages and signs. **(ESD)**

MM X.9

Prior to any construction commencing, the applicant shall provide evidence to the Engineering and Surveying Division of a WDID number generated from the State Regional Water Quality Control Board's Stormwater Multiple Application & Reports Tracking System (SMARTS). This serves as the Regional Water Quality Control Board approval or permit under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) construction storm water quality permit. **(ESD)**

MM X.10

The Improvement Plans shall show that all storm water runoff shall be diverted around trash storage areas to minimize contact with pollutants. Trash container areas shall be screened or walled to prevent off-site transport of trash by the forces of water or wind. Trash containers shall not be allowed to leak and must remain covered when not in use. **(ESD)**

MM X.11

The Improvement Plans shall show that materials with the potential to contaminate storm water that are to be stored

outdoors shall be placed in an enclosure such as, but not limited to, a cabinet, shed, or similar structure that prevents contact with runoff or spillage to the storm water conveyance system, or protected by secondary containment structures such as berms, dikes, or curbs. The storage area shall be paved to contain leaks and spills and shall have a roof or awning to minimize collection of storm water within the secondary containment area. (ESD)

Discussion Item X-5:

Project improvements are not located within a 100-year flood hazard area as defined and mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The ultimate project improvements are not proposed within a local 100-year flood hazard area and no flood flows would be impeded or redirected after construction of any improvements. The project does not include any housing. Therefore, the impacts of/to flood flows and exposing people or structures to flooding risk are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

XI. LAND USE & PLANNING – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Physically divide an established community? (PLN)				X
2. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (EH, ESD, PLN)			X	
3. Result in the development of incompatible uses and/or the creation of land use conflicts? (PLN)				X
4. Cause economic or social changes that would result in significant adverse physical changes to the environment such as urban decay or deterioration? (PLN)				X

Discussion Item XI-1, 3, 4:

The proposed project includes the construction of two 14,400 square feet warehouses, with a storage yard and parking area for 30 parking spaces on a 2.3-acre parcel. The parcel includes an existing graveled parking lot that is used to park vehicles and store construction materials and equipment. The parcel is zoned IN-UP-Dc-SP (Industrial combining Design Corridor, combining Special Purpose area), and the Dry Creek / West Placer Community Plan designation of Industrial. Although there are existing single family residential uses on properties to the north, south, and east, all surrounding properties are similar to the project site in that they are zoned IN-UP-Dc-SP (Industrial combining Design Corridor, combining Special Purpose area), and designated as Industrial by the Dry Creek / West Placer Community Plan. Furthermore, the proposed project would not divide an established community. For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in impacts related to land use and planning. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item XI-2:

The proposed project does not conflict with any Environmental Health land use plans, policies or regulations and does not significantly conflict with General Plan/Community Plan/Specific Plan policies related to grading, drainage, and transportation. No mitigation measures are required.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (PLN)				X

2. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? (PLN)				X
---	--	--	--	---

Discussion Item XII-1, 2:

The Mineral Land Classification of Placer County, California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology 1995, was prepared for the purpose of identifying and documenting the various mineral compounds found in the soils of Placer County. The Classification is comprised of five primary mineral deposits formed by hydrothermal processes (lode gold, silver, copper, zinc and tungsten); and construction aggregate resources, industrial mineral deposits and other deposits formed by magmatic segregation processes (sand, gravel, crushed stone, decomposed granite, clay, shale, quartz and chromite).

With respect to those deposits formed by mechanical concentration and hydrothermal processes, the site and immediate vicinity are classified as Mineral Resource Zone MRZ-4, meaning areas of unknown mineral resource significance.

The project site has never been mined and no valuable, locally important mineral resources have been identified on the project site. Therefore, there is no impact.

XIII. NOISE – Would the project result in:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (PLN)		X		
2. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? (PLN)			X	
3. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (PLN)				X

Discussion Item XIII-1:

The project proposes construction of two 14,400 square feet warehouses, with a storage yard and parking area on the project site. Although the majority of surrounding properties are developed with single-family residences which are considered sensitive receptors to noise, these properties are designated for future Industrial uses as well by the Zoning Ordinance and Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan. The warehouses would be used as a contractor's service warehouse and yard for the storage and maintenance of the contractor's private equipment and materials. Any maintenance activities would be performed during daytime construction hours and in compliance with the Placer County Noise Ordinance. The project would not result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the Placer County General Plan or the Placer County Noise Ordinance, such as impacts from roadway noise. Construction of the proposed project improvements would create a temporary increase in ambient noise levels, which could adversely affect adjacent properties. However, with the incorporation of the following mitigation measure which is consistent with the County's Noise Ordinance, impacts associated with temporary construction noise would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Mitigation Measure Item XIII-1:**MM XIII.1**

Construction noise emanating from any construction activities for which a Grading or Building Permit is required is prohibited on Sundays and Federal Holidays and shall only occur:

- Monday through Friday, 6:00am to 8:00pm (during daylight savings)
- Monday through Friday, 7:00am to 8:00pm (during standard time)

c. Saturdays, 8:00am to 6:00pm

Discussion Item XIII-2:

The proposed project includes the construction of two 14,400 square feet warehouses, with a storage yard and parking area for 30 parking spaces. Vehicle trips generated from the development would be periodic in nature and given the relatively low density of the surrounding area, would not be excessive. The proposed project would not create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the proposed project vicinity. Therefore, any impact is considered less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion Item XIII-3:

The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public airport and would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. Therefore, there is no impact.

XIV. POPULATION & HOUSING – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (i.e., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (PLN)				X
2. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (PLN)				X

Discussion Item XIV-1, 2:

The construction of two 14,400 square feet warehouses would not induce substantial population growth in the area either directly or indirectly in that the warehouses would provide jobs within the area where it is proposed to be located. The proposed project would not directly or indirectly induce population growth in the area nor would it displace housing or require construction of replacement housing. Therefore, there is no impact.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES – Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services?

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Fire protection? (ESD, PLN)			X	
2. Sheriff protection? (ESD, PLN)			X	
3. Schools? (ESD, PLN)			X	
4. Parks? (PLN)			X	
5. Other public facilities? (ESD, PLN)			X	
6. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads? (ESD, PLN)			X	

Discussion Item XV-1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6:

The California Department of Forestry & Fire Protection/Placer County Fire Department (CalFire) provides fire protection services to the project area (CSA 28 ZONE 165); the Placer County Sheriff's Department provides police protection services to the project area; the Placer County Department of Public Works is responsible for maintaining County roads, and the project is within the Roseville Joint Union High School District.

Construction of two new warehouse structures on the property would create a modest incremental increase in the need for fire protection and sheriff protections services. The proposed project does not propose any uses that would create a demand on school facilities, park facilities, or other governmental facilities or services. The incremental increase in demand for these services would not result in significant impacts to public services. Project-resulting impacts to public services would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

XVI. RECREATION:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? (PLN)				X
2. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? (PLN)				X

Discussion Item XVII-1:

The proposed project would not result in an increased need for neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. The project proposes two 14,400 square feet warehouses and does not include recreational facilities nor require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse effect on the environment. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item XVII-2:

The proposed project does not include recreational facilities nor require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse effect on the environment. Therefore, there is no impact.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system (i.e., transit, roadway, bicycle, pedestrian facilities, etc.)? (ESD)			X	
2. Substantially increase hazards to vehicle safety due to geometric design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (ESD)			X	
3. Result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses? (ESD)			X	
4. Result in insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site? (ESD, PLN)			X	

5. An increase in traffic which may be substantial in relation to the existing and/or planned future year traffic load and capacity of the roadway system (i.e. result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? (ESD)		X		
6. Exceeding, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County General Plan and/or Community Plan for roads affected by project traffic? (ESD)		X		

Discussion Item XVII-1:

The proposed project would not significantly conflict with any existing policies or preclude anticipated future policies, plans, or programs supporting the circulation system. The proposed design/improvements would not significantly impact the construction of bus turnouts, bicycle racks, planned roadway, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, etc. Therefore, this impact is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion Item XVII-2:

The proposed project access is from County maintained Booth Road. The driveway encroachments would be constructed to County standards. The project would be constructing frontage improvements along Booth Road consisting of approximately 350 feet of road widening to include 16 feet of road section from the centerline of the existing pavement plus sidewalk. Therefore, this impact is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion Item XVII-3:

The servicing fire district has reviewed the proposed project and has not identified any significant impacts to emergency access. No gated access is proposed. The proposed project would not significantly impact the access to any nearby use. Therefore, this is a less than significant impact. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion Item XVII-4:

The proposed project would provide 30 parking spaces to the satisfaction of the Placer County parking requirements. A total of 12 parking spaces would be located at the front of property adjacent to Booth Road, and the remaining 18 spaces would be located behind the warehouses at the rear of the property where the storage yard areas are proposed. Therefore, this is a less than significant impact. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion Item XVII-5, 6:

The project proposal would result in the construction of two 14,400 square foot warehouse buildings with associated parking, drive aisles, and frontage improvements on a 2.3-acre site. The proposed project would generate approximately nine additional PM peak hour trips and approximately 103 average daily trips.

The Placer County General Plan includes a fully funded Capital Improvement Program (CIP) that requires payment of traffic fees for the ultimate construction of the CIP improvements. A Condition of Approval on the project will be included requiring the payment of traffic fees (estimated to be \$7,257.60 based on 28,800 square feet of warehouse use) to the Placer County Department of Public Works prior to Building Permit issuance. The traffic fees represent the project's fair share towards cumulative roadway improvement projects.

In 2018, the Secretary of the Natural Resources Agency promulgated and certified CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 to implement Public Resources Code Section 21099(b)(2). Public Resources Code Section 21099(b)(2) states that, "upon certification of the guidelines by the Secretary of the Natural Resources Agency pursuant to this section, automobile delay, as described solely by level of service or similar measures of vehicular capacity or traffic congestion shall not be considered a significant impact on the environment pursuant to this division, except in locations specifically identified in the guidelines, if any."

In response to PRC 21099(b)(2), CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 notes that "Generally, vehicle miles traveled is the most appropriate measure of transportation impacts." The Guidelines section further states that although a lead agency may elect to be governed by this section immediately, lead agencies are not required to utilize VMT as the metric to determine transportation impact until July 1, 2020. The inconsistency between the implementation date of July 1, 2020 allowed by the Guidelines and the requirement of PRC 21099(b)(2) to no longer use congestion metrics creates a gap or "interim" period when use of traffic congestion metrics is no longer allowable; however, the lead agency may not yet have an established VMT threshold(s), as is currently the case for Placer County.

A recent court case (*Citizens for Positive Growth & Preservation v. City of Sacramento* (2019) 2019 WL 6888482) attempted to add clarity to the timing issue surrounding the transition between transportation impact metrics. The court ruled that although CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, requiring use of VMT as the transportation impact metric, does not apply until July 1, 2020, Public Resources Code Section 21099(b)(2) is already in effect. As a result of the ruling, although lead agencies are not yet required to analyze transportation impacts under the VMT metric, they can no longer draw a transportation impact significance conclusion using a metric that measures traffic congestion (e.g., level of service (LOS)).

Subsequent to the certification of the CEQA Guidelines, the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) published the Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA (December 2018). OPR's advisory document identifies a potential approach which an agency could utilize as the basis for determining significant transportation impacts. Specifically, the OPR technical guidance recommends consideration of whether the project is consistent with the applicable Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). The guidance aligns with CEQA Guidelines Section 15125(d), which requires that an EIR should discuss inconsistencies between the proposed project and the regional transportation plan. For the SACOG region, this consists of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan/SCS (MTP/SCS).

The proposed project is located within an area designated as an Established Community in both the 2016 and 2020 MTP/SCS. The MTP/SCS is aimed at reducing greenhouse gas emissions through VMT reduction, and these efforts are primarily focused on urban areas, where investments in the roadway system and transit, bike, pedestrian infrastructure are built into the MTP/SCS to achieve identified air quality targets. In this "interim" period, the following qualitative discussion of VMT has been provided for the proposed project.

According to the MTP/SCS, Established Community areas are typically the areas adjacent to, or surrounding, Center and Corridor communities. Many are characterized as "first tier", "inner ring" or mature suburban communities. Local land use patterns aim to maintain the existing character and land use pattern in these areas. Land uses in Established Communities are typically made up of existing low- to medium-density residential neighborhoods, office and industrial parks, or commercial strip centers. Depending on the density of existing land uses, some Established Communities have bus service; others may have commuter bus service or very little service. For unincorporated Placer County, the 2020 MTP/SCS assumes an additional 15,080 jobs and 3,160 housing units would be developed in Established Communities by 2040 (see Appendix C of the 2020 MTP/SCS). Note this represents an increase in the forecasts provided in the 2016 MTP/SCS for Year 2035 (12,090 jobs and 2,760 housing units).

Figures 3-10 and 3-11 of the 2020 MTP/SCS show the 2016 and projected 2040 vehicle miles traveled per capita for the six-County SACOG region. The sub-region in which the project is located is shown as having both now, and in the future, ≤ 85 -100% of the regional average VMT per capita. The MTP/SCS anticipates some increased activity/growth within Established Communities. Additionally, these areas are recognized as having high VMT per capita both now and in the future (2040 MTP/SCS Planning Period). Thus, it can be concluded that the potential increased activity associated with the proposed project would not conflict with the MTP/SCS' strategy for reducing VMT through investments in roadway and multi-modal infrastructure primarily in urban areas and therefore the project's impact associated with VMT increases are considered less than significant.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or (PLN)		X		
2. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set		X		

forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe. (PLN)				
---	--	--	--	--

Discussion Item XIX-1, 2:

Pursuant to Assembly Bill 52 (Chapter 532, Statutes of 2014), consultation requests were sent to tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the proposed project area on January 9, 2019. Placer County received a request from the United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC) to receive copies of any archaeological reports or cultural resource assessments that were completed for the proposed project, which were provided. The UAIC recommended inclusion of mitigation measures to address inadvertent discoveries. No other tribes contacted the County.

Mitigation Measures Item XIX-1, 2:**MM XIX.1**

If potential tribal cultural resources (TCRs), archaeological resources, other cultural resources, articulated, or disarticulated human remains are discovered during construction activities, all work shall cease within 100 feet of the find (based on the apparent distribution of cultural resources). Examples of potential cultural materials include midden soil, artifacts, chipped stone, exotic (non-native) rock, or unusual amounts of baked clay, shell, or bone.

A qualified cultural resources specialist and Native American Representative from the traditionally and culturally affiliated Native American Tribe(s) will assess the significance of the find and make recommendations for further evaluation and treatment as necessary. Culturally appropriate treatment that preserves or restores the cultural character and integrity of a Tribal Cultural Resource may be, but is not limited to, processing materials for reburial, minimizing handling of cultural objects, leaving objects in place within the landscape, construction monitoring of further construction activities by Tribal representatives of the traditionally and culturally affiliated Native American Tribe, and/or returning objects to a location within the project area where they will not be subject to future impacts. The UAIC does not consider curation of TCRs to be appropriate or respectful and requests that materials not be permanently curated, unless specifically requested by the Tribe.

If articulated or disarticulated human remains are discovered during construction activities, the County Coroner and Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted immediately. Upon determination by the County Coroner that the find is Native American in origin, the Native American Heritage Commission will assign the Most Likely Descendant(s) who will work with the project proponent to define appropriate treatment and disposition of the burials.

Following a review of the find and consultation with appropriate experts, the authority to proceed may be accompanied by the addition of development requirements which provide for protection of the site and/or additional measures necessary to address the unique or sensitive nature of the site. The treatment recommendations made by the cultural resource specialist and the Native American Representative will be documented in the project record. Any recommendations made by these experts that are not implemented, must be documented and explained in the project record. Work in the area(s) of the cultural resource discovery may only proceed after authorization is granted by the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency following coordination with cultural resources experts and tribal representatives as appropriate.

XIX. UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects? (EH, ESD, PLN)			X	
2. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years? (EH)			X	
3. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand			X	

in addition to the provider's existing commitments? (EH, ESD)				
4. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals? (EH)			X	
5. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (EH)			X	

Discussion Item XIX-1, 3:

This project proposes to connect to the City of Roseville's domestic water from an existing waterline within Booth Road. The project site is located in the non-exclusive franchise area of California American Water Company. However, the City of Roseville has agreed to provide domestic water to the site since existing City water facilities are located within Booth Road directly in front on the project property and other properties in the vicinity receive water service from the City.

The project proposes to obtain sewer service from an existing 21-inch sewer main fronting the project in Booth Road that is owned by the City of Roseville since gravity service to County sewer facilities is not available to the project site. The project includes the construction of public sewer service to the proposed project from an existing public sewer line within Booth Road and a metering manhole. The project would increase wastewater flows to the City's treatment plant and would be metered by the metering manhole prior to entering the City system. The applicant prepared a Sewer Analysis (Booth Road Area Sewer Analysis, Morton & Pitalo, November 19, 2019) that concluded the increase would not require any additional expansion of the treatment plant and is within the current capacity of the treatment plant. No prohibitions or restrictions on wastewater treatment service for the proposed project currently exist. If it is determined during Improvement Plan preparation that gravity service could be obtained by connecting to the County's existing metering manhole located on Bedell Road east of the project site, then the project would include construction of public sewer service to the proposed project from the County's manhole. The new sewer line would be constructed within existing roadways and would ultimately flow to the City's treatment plant as currently proposed so there would be no new impacts associated with the alternative service connection location.

A drainage report was prepared for the project which analyzed a drainage system that would convey runoff from the project site by way of a vegetated swale and underground onsite detention basin before discharging into the existing storm drain under Booth Road. The drainage analysis concluded that the vegetate swale and detention basin would reduce the 100-year post-project peak flows to less than the pre-project peak flows.

This project would not create significant environmental effects and would not result in the construction of existing new or expanded facilities. Thus, it would not cause significant effects to the environment and the construction and connection of this project to the existing public water service and sewer is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion Item XIX-2:

The agencies charged with providing treated water and sewer services have indicated their requirements to serve the proposed project. These requirements are routine in nature and do not represent significant impacts. The proposed project would not result in the construction of new treatment facilities or create an expansion of an existing facility. Typical project conditions of approval require submission of "will-serve" letters from each agency. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion Item XIX-4, 5:

The proposed project would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. Therefore, impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

XX. WILDFIRE – If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (PLN)				X
2. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire? (PLN)			X	
3. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) the construction or operation of which may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment? (PLN)			X	
4. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding, mudslides, or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes? (PLN)				X

Discussion Item XX-1:

Placer County adopted a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) in 2013 in order to provide guidance to reduce the threat of wildfire-related damages to people, property, ecological elements, and other important values identified by residents. The two 14,400 square foot warehouses proposed by the project would be required to adhere to California Public Resources Code (PRC) 4290 and 4291 regulations which are aligned with the Goals and Objectives of the Placer County CWPP. The proposed project would not impair any existing emergency response plan or evacuation plan. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion Item XX-2, 3:

The proposed project is within the State Responsibility Area (SRA), is designated Local Responsibility Area Urban Unzoned, and is surrounded by properties with the same designation. PRC 4290 and 4291 create minimum fire safety standards for structures and buildings in the State Responsibility Area (SRA) and in Hazardous Fire Areas. These standards include, but are not limited to, defensible space, fire access, fuel breaks, and building standards. With full compliance of the state regulations, the impact would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion Item XX-4:

The proposed project is located in relatively flat grassland which would not cause slope failure and would not subsequently expose people to downslope or downstream flooding as the result of a fire event. No fires have occurred on the site that would create a condition of post-fire slope instability. Therefore, there is no impact.

F. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

Environmental Issue	Yes	No
1. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

3. Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

☐☒

G. OTHER RESPONSIBLE AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES whose approval is required:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> California Department of Fish and Wildlife	<input type="checkbox"/> Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Forestry	<input type="checkbox"/> National Marine Fisheries Service
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Health Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Toxic Substances	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
<input type="checkbox"/> California Integrated Waste Management Board	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> California Regional Water Quality Control Board	<input type="checkbox"/>

H. DETERMINATION – The Environmental Review Committee finds that:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
-------------------------------------	---

I. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE (Persons/Departments consulted):

Planning Services Division, Nick Trifiro, Chairperson
 Planning Services Division-Air Quality, Angel Green
 Engineering and Surveying Division, Michelle Lewis, P.E.
 Department of Public Works-Transportation, Stephanie Holloway
 DPW-Environmental Engineering Division, Huey Nham
 Flood Control and Water Conservation District, Brad Brewer
 DPW- Parks Division, Ted Rel
 HHS-Environmental Health Services, Joseph Scarbrough
 Placer County Fire Planning/CDF, Brian Skehan

Signature



Date 02/14/20

Leigh Chavez, Environmental Coordinator

J. SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES: The following public documents were utilized and site-specific studies prepared to evaluate in detail the effects or impacts associated with the project. This information is available for public review, Monday through Friday, 8am to 5pm, at the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, Environmental Coordination Services, 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603.

County Documents	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Pollution Control District Rules & Regulations
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community Plan
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environmental Review Ordinance
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Plan
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grading Ordinance
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Development Manual
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Division Ordinance
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stormwater Management Manual
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tree Ordinance
	<input type="checkbox"/>
Trustee Agency Documents	<input type="checkbox"/> Department of Toxic Substances Control
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Study

Site-Specific Studies	Planning Services Division	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources Pedestrian Survey
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources Records Search
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lighting & Photometric Plan
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Paleontological Survey
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tree Survey & Arborist Report
		<input type="checkbox"/> Visual Impact Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Wetland Delineation
		<input type="checkbox"/> Acoustical Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/>
	Engineering & Surveying Division, Flood Control District	<input type="checkbox"/> Phasing Plan
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Grading Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Geotechnical Report
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Drainage Report
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stormwater & Surface Water Quality BMP Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Traffic Study
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sewer Pipeline Capacity Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Placer County Commercial/Industrial Waste Survey (where public sewer is available)
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sewer Master Plan
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Utility Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Tentative Map
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Vehicle Sight Distance Exhibits
	Environmental Health Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Contamination Report
		<input type="checkbox"/> Hydro-Geological Study
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
		<input type="checkbox"/> Soils Screening
		<input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Endangerment Assessment
		<input type="checkbox"/>
	Planning Services Division, Air Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> CALINE4 Carbon Monoxide Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Construction Emission & Dust Control Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Geotechnical Report (for naturally occurring asbestos)
		<input type="checkbox"/> Health Risk Assessment
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CalEEMod Model Output
		<input type="checkbox"/>
	Fire Department	<input type="checkbox"/> Emergency Response and/or Evacuation Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Traffic & Circulation Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/>

Exhibit A: Mitigation Monitoring Program

EXHIBIT A

MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM

Mitigated Negative Declaration – PLN18-00484

TPA Warehouse Design Review and Minor Use Permit

Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code requires all public agencies to establish monitoring or reporting procedures for mitigation measures adopted as a condition of project approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment. Monitoring of such mitigation measures may extend through project permitting, construction, and project operations, as necessary.

Said monitoring shall be accomplished by the county's standard mitigation monitoring program and/or a project specific mitigation reporting program as defined in Placer County Code Chapter 18.28, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

Standard Mitigation Monitoring Program (pre-project implementation):

The following mitigation monitoring program (and following project specific reporting plan, when required) shall be utilized by Placer County to implement Public Resources Code Section 21081.6. Mitigation measures adopted for discretionary projects must be included as conditions of approval for that project. Compliance with conditions of approval is monitored by the county through a variety of permit processes as described below. The issuance of any of these permits or County actions which must be preceded by a verification that certain conditions of approval/mitigation measures have been met, shall serve as the required monitoring of those condition of approval/mitigation measures. These actions include design review approval, improvement plan approval, improvement construction inspection, encroachment permit, recordation of a final map, acceptance of subdivision improvements as complete, building permit approval, and/or certification of occupancy.

The following mitigation measures, identified in the TPA Warehouse Negative Declaration, have been adopted as conditions of approval on the project's discretionary permit and will be monitored according to the above Standard Mitigation Monitoring Program verification process:

Mitigation Measure #'s:

MM IV.1

MM IV.2

MM IV.3

MM V.1

MM VII.1

MM VII.2

MM X.1

MM X.2

MM X.3

MM X.4

MM X.5

MM X.6

MM X.7

MM X.8

MM X.9

MM X.10

MM X.11

MM XIII.1

MM XIX.1

Project-Specific Reporting Plan (post-project implementation):

The reporting plan component is intended to provide for on-going monitoring after project construction to ensure mitigation measures shall remain effective for a designated period of time. Said reporting plans shall contain all components identified in Chapter 18.28.050 of the County Code, Environmental Review Ordinance – "Contents of Project-Specific Reporting Plan."