



FINAL

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

(SCH # 2025020411)

FOR THE

2050 PLACER COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

OCTOBER 2025

Prepared for:

Placer County Transportation Planning Agency
2260 Douglas Blvd, Suite 130
Roseville, CA 95661
(530) 823-4030

Prepared by:

De Novo Planning Group
1020 Suncoast Lane, Suite 106
El Dorado Hills CA 95762
(916) 580-9818

D e N o v o P l a n n i n g G r o u p

A Land Use Planning, Design, and Environmental Firm



FINAL
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
(SCH # 2025020411)
FOR THE
2050 PLACER COUNTY
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

OCTOBER 2025

Prepared for:

Placer County Transportation Planning Agency
2260 Douglas Blvd, Suite 130
Roseville, CA 95661
(530) 823-4030

Prepared by:

De Novo Planning Group
1020 Suncoast Lane, Suite 106
El Dorado Hills CA 95762
(916) 580-9818

Chapter	Page Number
ES: Executive Summary.....	ES-1
Introduction	ES-1
Project Description.....	ES-1
Alternatives to the Proposed Project.....	ES-2
Comments Received.....	ES-4
1.0: Introduction	1.0-1
1.1 Purpose and Intended Uses of the EIR.....	1.0-1
1.2 Environmental Review Process	1.0-2
1.3 Organization of the Final EIR.....	1.0-3
2.0: Agency DEIR Comments and Responses.....	2.0-1
2.1 Introduction	2.0-1
2.2 List of Commenters	2.0-1
2.3 Comments and Responses	2.0-1
3.0: Errata.....	3.0-1
3.1 Revisions to the DEIR	3.0-1
4.0: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.....	4.0-1
4.1 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program	4.0-1

This page left intentionally blank.

INTRODUCTION

The Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA) has determined that the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (2050 RTP or proposed project) is a "Project" within the definition of CEQA. CEQA requires the preparation of an environmental impact report (EIR) prior to approving any project, which may have a significant impact on the environment. For the purposes of CEQA, the term "Project" refers to the whole of an action, which has the potential for resulting in a direct physical change or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (CEQA Guidelines Section 15378[a]).

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The following provides a summary and overview of the proposed Project. Chapter 2.0 of the Draft EIR includes a detailed description of the proposed Project, including maps and graphics. The reader is referred to Chapter 2.0 for a more complete and thorough description of the components of the proposed Project.

The proposed project is the adoption and implementation of the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The RTP has been prepared to fulfill the state requirements of Assembly Bill (AB) 402 (Government Code Title 7, Chapter 2.5, Sections 65080-65082) using specific guidance from the California Transportation Commission Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines. More specifically, the RTP is a twenty-year, comprehensive transportation plan for all modes including: highways, local streets and roads, transit, bicycle, aviation, rail, and goods movement. PCTPA is required to adopt and submit an updated RTP to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) and the Department of Transportation (Caltrans) every five years. In addition, the RTP documents PCTPA's priorities for transportation funding in the region.

The RTP contains three primary elements: Policy Element, Action Element, and Financial Element.

The **Policy Element** presents guidance to decision-makers of the implications, impacts, opportunities, and foreclosed options that will result from implementation of the RTP. California law (Government Code Section 65080 (b)) states that each RTP shall include a Policy Element that:

1. Describes the transportation issues in the region;
2. Identifies and quantifies regional needs expressed within both short- and long-range planning horizons; and,
3. Maintains internal consistency with the Financial Element and fund estimates.

The **Action Element** identifies programs and actions to implement the RTP in accordance with the goals, objectives, and policies set forth in the Policy Element. It includes regionally significant multimodal projects that currently have funding in place or that are projected to have funding in

the future (Fiscally Constrained), while it also identifies other improvement projects that are needed but do not have funding (Fiscally Unconstrained).

The **Financial Element** identifies the current and anticipated revenue sources and financing techniques available to fund the fiscally constrained transportation investments described in the Action Element. It also identifies potential funding shortfalls and sources for the unconstrained project list.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The CEQA Guidelines require an EIR to describe a reasonable range of alternatives to the project or to the location of the project which would reduce or avoid significant impacts, and which could feasibly accomplish the basic objectives of the proposed project. Since the primary objective of the 2050 RTP is to guide short- and long-term transportation improvements countywide, a discussion of alternative sites is not appropriate. The alternatives analyzed in this EIR include the following four alternatives in addition to the proposed project (Fiscally Constrained):

- **No Project Alternative:** The No Project Alternative represents the existing conditions, as well as what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved.
- **Road Emphasis:** The Road Emphasis Alternative focuses on investment and implements projects based on a road emphasis that are included in the Financially Constrained Alternative and would require shifting funds from the Financially Unconstrained Alternative to fund roadway improvements, operation, and maintenance.
- **Transit Enhanced:** The Transit Enhanced Alternative focuses investment into transit modes, while also funding the locally-funded transportation improvements included in the Financially Constrained Alternative. This alternative would require shifting funds from the Financially Unconstrained Alternative to fund transit capital, operational, and maintenance.
- **Financially Unconstrained:** The Financially Unconstrained Alternative includes all the individual projects identified under the Financially Constrained Alternative plus numerous additional projects that are needed but not yet funded over the planning horizon.

Alternatives are described in detail in Chapter 5. Table ES-1 provides a comparison of the alternatives using a qualitative matrix that quantifies the impacts of each alternative relative to the other alternatives. The Financially Constrained Alternative has the lowest overall impact (score of 20) and is deemed the environmentally superior alternative because it provides the greatest reduction of potential impacts in comparison to the other alternatives.

TABLE ES-1: COMPARISON SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE	FINANCIALLY UNCONSTRAINED	NO PROJECT	FINANCIALLY CONSTRAINED (PROPOSED PROJECT)	ROAD EMPHASIS	TRANSIT ENHANCEMENT
Aesthetics	3 (Medium)	1 (Best)	2 (Equal)	4 (Worst)	2 (Equal)
	The No Project Alternative would result in the lowest potential for adverse impacts on aesthetics. As roadway infrastructure improvement projects would decrease under this				

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE	FINANCIALLY UNCONSTRAINED	NO PROJECT	FINANCIALLY CONSTRAINED (PROPOSED PROJECT)	ROAD EMPHASIS	TRANSIT ENHANCEMENT
	alternative, the potential for development of roadway infrastructure to degrade scenic views, remove scenic resources, change visual character, and result in increased light and glare would be less under the No Project Alternative when compared to the other alternatives.				
Agricultural and Forest Resources	3 (Medium)	1 (Best)	2 (Equal)	4 (Worst)	2 (Equal)
	The No Project Alternative would result in the lowest potential for adverse impacts on agricultural and forest resources. As roadway infrastructure improvement projects would decrease under this alternative, the potential for development of roadway infrastructure to convert agricultural and forest lands to non-agricultural and non-forest uses as well as the potential for conflicts with agricultural lands would be less under the No Project Alternative when compared to the other alternatives.				
Air Quality	2 (Medium)	3 (Equal)	1 (Equal)	3 (Equal)	1 (Equal)
	The Financially Constrained Alternative and Transit Enhanced Alternative would equally result in the lowest potential for adverse impacts on air quality. As roadway infrastructure improvement projects would increase to alleviate LOS deficiencies and transit service and bike/pedestrian use would increase under these alternatives, the total VMT per capita would decrease, which would result in a corresponding decrease of vehicle related air quality emissions.				
Cultural Resources	3 (Medium)	1 (Best)	2 (Equal)	4 (Worst)	2 (Equal)
	The No Project Alternative would result in the lowest potential for adverse impacts on cultural resources. As roadway infrastructure improvement projects would decrease under this alternative, there would be fewer construction and infrastructure development projects that would have the potential to degrade or destroy cultural resources, including archaeological, historic, and human remains, under the No Project Alternative when compared to the other alternatives.				
Greenhouse Gases, Climate Change and Energy	2 (Better)	4 (High)	3 (Medium)	5 (Worst)	1 (Best)
	The Transit Enhanced Alternative would result in the lowest potential for adverse impacts from Greenhouse Gases, Climate Change, and Energy. As roadway infrastructure improvement projects would increase to alleviate LOS deficiencies and transit service and bike/pedestrian use would increase under this alternative, the total VMT per capita would decrease, which would result in a corresponding decrease of vehicle-related energy usage and greenhouse gas emissions.				
Land Use and Population	1 (Best)	4 (High)	2 (Better)	5 (Worst)	3 (Medium)
	The Financially Unconstrained Alternative would result in the lowest potential for adverse impacts associated with land use and population because this alternative is most consistent with the needs of the local General Plans, specifically including the Land Use and Circulation Elements. This alternative would be the most consistent with land use planning activities in the County and its jurisdictions as this alternative would implement the transportation projects necessary to serve planned development as well as provide transportation services at adequate levels. Therefore, the Financially Unconstrained Alternative would have less of an impact on land use and population than other alternatives.				
Transportation and Circulation	2 (Better)	5 (Worst)	3 (Medium)	1 (Best)	4 (High)
	The Road Emphasis Alternative would reduce greater impacts associated with congestion and roadway safety in comparison to the other alternatives. As this alternative would				

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE	FINANCIALLY UNCONSTRAINED	NO PROJECT	FINANCIALLY CONSTRAINED (PROPOSED PROJECT)	ROAD EMPHASIS	TRANSIT ENHANCEMENT
	involve additional improvements to the roadway system to increase capacity and roadway safety, this alternative would result in improved roadway safety, a reduction in miles traveled, and a reduction in congestion in comparison with the proposed project and other alternatives.				
Tribal Cultural Resources	3 (Medium)	1 (Best)	2 (Equal)	4 (Worst)	2 (Equal)
	The No Project Alternative would result in the lowest potential for adverse impacts on tribal cultural resources. As roadway infrastructure improvement projects would decrease under this alternative, there would be fewer construction and infrastructure development projects that would have the potential to degrade or destroy tribal cultural resources under the No Project Alternative when compared to the other alternatives.				
Wildlife	2 (Better)	5 (Worst)	3 (Medium)	1 (Best)	4 (High)
	The Road Emphasis Alternative would reduce greater impacts associated with congestion and roadway safety in comparison to the other alternatives, which is beneficial for evacuation during wildfires, and for fire personnel to access fires for suppression efforts.				
Summary	21 (Medium)	25 (High)	20 (Low)	31 (Worst)	21 (Medium)

In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, this EIR focuses on the significant effects on the environment. The CEQA Guidelines defines a significant effect as a substantial adverse change in the physical conditions which exist in the area affected by the proposed project. A less than significant effect is one in which there is no long- or short-term significant adverse change in environmental conditions. Some impacts are reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of mitigation measures and/or compliance with regulations. The definition of "beneficial" effect is not defined in the CEQA Guidelines, but for purposes of this EIR a beneficial effect is one in which an environmental condition is enhanced or improved.

The environmental impacts of the proposed project, the impact level of significance prior to mitigation, the proposed mitigation measures and/or adopted policies and standard measures that are already in place to mitigate an impact, and the impact level of significance after mitigation are summarized in Table ES-2.

COMMENTS RECEIVED

The Draft EIR addressed environmental impacts associated with the proposed Project that are known to PCTPA, were identified during the Notice of Preparation (NOP) process or identified during preparation of the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR discusses impacts associated with aesthetics, agricultural and forest resources, air quality, cultural resources, energy, greenhouse gas/climate, land use and population, transportation and circulation, tribal cultural resources, wildfire and other CEQA required topics.

During the NOP process, three (3) comments were received related to the analyses that were included in the Draft EIR. These comments are included as Appendix A of the Draft EIR and were considered during preparation of the Draft EIR.

The PCTPA received no comments on the DEIR during the 45-day comment period. However, comments were received on the Draft 2050 RTP. Refer to Appendix K of the 2050 RTP document to view the comments and PCTPA's responses regarding the Draft EIR 45-day comment period.

This page intentionally left blank.

This Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15132). The Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA) is the lead agency for the environmental review of the proposed Project and has the principal responsibility for approving the proposed Project. This Final EIR assesses the expected environmental impacts resulting from approval of the proposed Project and associated impacts from subsequent development and operation of the proposed Project, as well as responds to significant environmental issues raised in timely comments received on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR).

1.1 PURPOSE AND INTENDED USES OF THE EIR

CEQA REQUIREMENTS FOR A FINAL EIR

This Final EIR for the proposed Project has been prepared in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines. CEQA Guidelines Section 15132 requires that a Final EIR consists of the following:

- the Draft EIR or a revision of the draft;
- comments and recommendations received on the Draft EIR, either verbatim or in summary;
- a list of persons, organizations and public agencies commenting on the Draft EIR;
- the responses of the lead agency to significant environmental points raised in the review and consultation process; and
- any other information added by the lead agency.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15132, subdivision (a), the Draft EIR (August 2025) is incorporated by reference into this Final EIR.

An EIR must disclose the expected environmental impacts, including impacts that cannot be avoided, growth-inducing effects, impacts found not to be significant, and significant cumulative impacts, as well as identify mitigation measures and alternatives to the proposed Project that could reduce or avoid its significant adverse environmental impacts. CEQA requires government agencies to consider and, where feasible, minimize significant environmental impacts of proposed development, and an obligation to balance a variety of public objectives, including economic, environmental, and social factors.

PURPOSE AND USE

The PCTPA, as the lead agency, has prepared this Final EIR to provide the public and responsible and trustee agencies with an objective analysis of the potential environmental impacts resulting from approval, construction, and operation of the proposed Project. Responsible and trustee agencies that may use the EIR are identified in Chapters 1.0 and 2.0 of the Draft EIR.

The environmental review process enables interested parties to evaluate the proposed Project in terms of its environmental consequences, to examine and recommend methods to eliminate or reduce potential adverse impacts, and to consider a reasonable range of alternatives to the

1.0 INTRODUCTION

proposed Project. While CEQA requires that consideration be given to avoiding adverse environmental effects, the lead agency must balance significant adverse environmental effects against other public objectives, including the economic and social benefits of a project, in determining whether a project should be approved.

This EIR will be used as the primary environmental document to evaluate all aspects of construction and operation of the proposed Project. The details and operational characteristics of the proposed Project are identified in Chapter 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR.

1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

The review and certification process for the EIR has involved, or will involve, the following general procedural steps:

NOTICE OF PREPARATION AND INITIAL STUDY

PCTPA circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR for the proposed project and an Initial Study on February 12, 2025, to trustee and responsible agencies, the State Clearinghouse (SCH# 2024220411), and the public. A hybrid in-person and virtual scoping meeting was held on March 4, 2025, at 5:00 PM. The NOP and Initial Study are presented in Appendix A of the Draft EIR.

NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY AND DRAFT EIR

PCTPA published a Notice of Availability (NOA) for the Draft EIR on July 30, 2025, inviting comment from the public, agencies, organizations, and other interested parties. The NOA was filed with the State Clearinghouse (SCH # 2024110413) and the County Clerk and was published in a local newspaper pursuant to the public noticing requirements under CEQA. The published a recirculated Draft EIR for public review and comment on August 18, 2025 and extended public review. The public review of the DEIR occurred from July 30, 2025, through September 25, 2025.

Additionally, the Draft EIR was made available at the PCTPA and was posted on the PCTPA website at: www.pctpa.net/rtp2050

The Draft EIR contains the Project Description, Environmental Setting, identification of Project impacts, and mitigation measures for impacts found to be significant, as well as an analysis of Project alternatives, identification of significant irreversible environmental changes, growth-inducing impacts, and cumulative impacts. The Draft EIR identifies issues determined to have no impact or a less-than-significant impact and provides detailed analysis of potentially significant and significant impacts. Comments received in response to the NOP were considered in preparing the analysis in the Draft EIR.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS/FINAL EIR

The PCTPA received no comments on the DEIR during the 45-day comment period. However, comments were received on the Draft 2050 RTP. Refer to Appendix K of the 2050 RTP document to view the comments and PCTPA's responses regarding the Draft EIR 45-day comment period.

PCTPA BOARD HEARING

The PCTPA Board will review and consider the Draft Supplemental EIR together with the Final Supplemental EIR. If the PCTPA Board finds that the Final EIR is "adequate and complete", the PCTPA Board may certify the Final Supplemental EIR in accordance with CEQA. The rule of adequacy generally holds that an EIR can be certified if:

- 1) The EIR shows a good faith effort at full disclosure of environmental information; and
- 2) The EIR provides sufficient analysis to allow decisions to be made regarding the proposed project in contemplation of environmental considerations.

Upon review and consideration of the Final Supplemental EIR, the PCTPA Board may take action to approve, revise, or reject the project. A decision to approve the proposed project, for which this EIR identifies significant environmental effects, must be accompanied by written findings in accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091 and 15093. A Mitigation Monitoring Program, as described below, would also be adopted in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21081.6(a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15097 for mitigation measures that have been incorporated into or imposed upon the project to reduce or avoid significant effects on the environment. This Mitigation Monitoring Program will be designed to ensure that these measures are carried out during project implementation, in a manner that is consistent with the Supplemental EIR.

1.3 ORGANIZATION OF THE FINAL EIR

This Final EIR is organized with the following four chapters. All comments and responses are included Chapter 2.0.

CHAPTER 1.0 – INTRODUCTION

Chapter 1.0 briefly describes the purpose of the environmental evaluation, identifies the lead agency, summarizes the process associated with preparation and certification of an EIR, and identifies the content requirements and organization of the Final EIR.

CHAPTER 2.0 – COMMENTS ON DRAFT EIR AND RESPONSES

Chapter 2.0 provides a list of commenters, copies of written and electronic comments made on the Draft EIR (coded for reference), and responses to those written comments.

CHAPTER 3.0 – ERRATA

Chapter 3.0 consists of minor revisions to the Draft EIR in response to comments received on the Draft EIR.

CHAPTER 4.0 – FINAL MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP)

Chapter 4.0 consists of a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP). The MMRP is presented in a tabular format that presents the impacts, mitigation measures, responsibility, timing, and verification of monitoring.

2.1 INTRODUCTION

No new significant environmental impacts or issues, beyond those already covered in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR or DEIR) for the proposed Project, were raised during the comment period. Responses to comments received during the comment period do not involve or reveal any new significant impacts or add any “significant new information” that would require recirculation of the DEIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5(a) states that: New information added to an EIR is not “significant” unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project’s proponents have declined to implement. “Significant new information” requiring recirculation includes, for example, a disclosure showing that: (1) A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented. (2) A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance. (3) A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the project, but the project’s proponents decline to adopt it. (4) The draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded. (*Mountain Lion Coalition v. Fish and Game Com.* (1989) 214 Cal.App.3d 1043)

2.2 LIST OF COMMENTERS

The PCTPA received no comments on the DEIR during the 45-day comment period. However, comments were received on the Draft 2050 RTP. Refer to Appendix K of the 2050 RTP document to view the comments and PCTPA’s responses regarding the Draft EIR 45-day comment period.

2.3 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

None

This Page Intentionally Left Blank.

This chapter is intended to include minor edits, or errata, to the EIR that are warranted based on responses to comments received during the Draft EIR public review period or other minor modifications and clarifications to text which are more editorial in nature. As previously noted, the PCTPA received no comments on the DEIR during the 45-day comment period. As such, there are not errata changes warranted.

It is noted that comments were received on the Draft 2050 RTP, and any responses/edits warranted to the RTP can be found in Appendix K of the 2050 RTP document.

3.1 REVISIONS TO THE DRAFT EIR

COVER PAGE

The following edits to the PCTPA's contact information is made to the cover page.

Placer County Transportation Planning ~~Commission~~Agency
~~2260 Douglas Blvd, Suite 130299 Nevada St.~~
~~Roseville, CA 95661~~Auburn, CA 95603
~~(530) 823-4030~~(530) 823-4032

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The following edits to the PCTPA's contact information is made to the page ES-2 of the Draft EIR.

AREAS OF CONTROVERSY AND ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

This Draft EIR addresses environmental impacts associated with the 2050 RTP that are known to PCTPA, were raised during the Notice of Preparation (NOP) process, or raised during preparation of the Draft EIR. This Draft EIR discusses potentially significant impacts associated with aesthetics, agricultural resources, air quality, cultural ~~and tribal~~resources, greenhouse gas emissions, climate change, and energy, land use and population, transportation and circulation, tribal cultural resources, and wildfire. During the NOP process, comments were received from the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB), Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans).

The following edits to the PCTPA's contact information is made to the page ES-9 of the Draft EIR.

CULTURAL ~~AND TRIBAL~~ RESOURCES

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The following edits to the PCTPA's contact information is made to the page 1.0-6 of the Draft EIR.

3.0 ERRATA

Cory Peterson, Senior Transportation Planner
 Placer County Transportation Planning Agency
 2260 Douglas Blvd, Suite 130
 Roseville, CA 95661
~~(530) 823-4032~~ (530) 823-4030

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The following edits have been made to Objective 1.3 on page 2.0-2 to reflect a change made in the RTP:

Objective 1.3: Promote an active transportation network that is appropriately integrated into the overall multi-modal network and surrounding land use developments, has good access to public transportation routes and facilities, emphasizes the safety of low-speed bicyclists, pedestrians, and property, includes support facilities like bicycle parking, and provides a viable alternative to driving.

The following edits were made to Tables 2.3-1 and 2.3-2 on pages 2.0-6 through 2.0-32 in Section 2.3 of the DEIR. These revisions serve to reconcile the Fiscally Constrained Project List (Table 2.3-1) and Fiscally Unconstrained Project List (Table 2.3-2) with the final Project lists as represented in the RTP. The revisions in Tables 2.3-1 and 2.3-2 are reflected by green text for new text, and red text with strike through as deleted text.

Table 2.3-1 Edits

Project ID	Category	Lead Agency	Project Title	Description	Cost (2025 Dollars)	Cost (YOE Dollars)
BP_34	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	Caltrans-D3	Roseville 80 CAPM	IN SACRAMENTO COUNTY AND PLACER COUNTY FROM APPROXIMATELY 0.6 MILES EAST OF ANTELOPE ROAD OVERCROSSING (24 0129) TO APPROXIMATELY 0.3 MILES WEST OF SIERRA COLLEGE BOULEVARD OVERCROSSING (19 0095). Pavement and Drainage System Upgrades. (EA 21170) SHOPP ID 20566	76,100,000	\$102,272,036
BP_37	A-Bike & Ped	Caltrans-D3	SR-28 Complete Streets	In Placer County on Route 28 from Onyx Street to approximately 0.01 miles past Chipmunk Street. Complete Streets, Crosswalks, Sidewalks, Bike Lanes. SHOPP ID 23217	5,040,000	\$6,773,339
CAL21045	C- Maintenance	Caltrans-D3	SR-267 Pavement Rehabilitation	In Placer County on Route 267 from approx. 0.4 mile	8,905,000	\$11,967,575

Project ID	Category	Lead Agency	Project Title	Description	Cost (2025 Dollars)	Cost (YOE Dollars)
	& Rehabilitation			east of Northstar Dr to Jet St-28.		
BP_41	B- Road & Highway Capacity	PCTPA	SR 65 Managed Lanes Project: HOV	On SR 65 from I-80 to north of Blue Oaks: HOV; this project is being evaluated to explore separated, tolled express lane in the median, including tolling operations equipment.	32,000,000	\$43,005,324
BP_41_a	B- Road & Highway Capacity	PCTPA	SR 65 Managed Lanes Project: Convert HOV	On SR 65 from I-80 to Blue Oaks: Convert HOV to Priced Managed Lanes without adding Capacity; this project is being evaluated to explore separated, tolled express lane in the median, including tolling operations equipment.	10,000,000	\$20,937,779
BP_800	B- Road & Highway Capacity	PCTPA	SR 65 Express Lanes Phase 1	SR 65 Southbound from Blue Oaks Blvd to I-80; construct separated, tolled express lane in the median, including tolling operations equipment.	\$32,000,000	37,096,770
BP_801	B- Road & Highway Capacity	PCTPA	SR 65 Express Lanes Phase 2	SR 65 Northbound from I-80 to Blue Oaks Blvd; construct separated, tolled express lane in the median, including tolling operations equipment.	\$32,000,000	43,005,324
BP_802	B- Road & Highway Capacity	PCTPA	SR 65 Express Lanes Phase 3	SR 65 Southbound from Lincoln Blvd to Blue Oaks Blvd; construct separated, tolled express lane in the median, including tolling operations equipment.	\$32,000,000	49,854,957
BP_803	B- Road & Highway Capacity	PCTPA	SR 65 Express Lanes Phase 4	SR 65 Northbound from Blue Oaks Blvd to Lincoln Blvd; construct separated, tolled express lane in the median, including tolling operations equipment.	\$32,000,000	49,854,957
PLA25529	B- Road & Highway Capacity	PCTPA	SR 65 Capacity & Operational Improvements Phase 1 to I-80: Improving Mobility, Safety,	SR 65, from Galleria Blvd. to Lincoln Blvd., make capacity and operational improvements. Phase 1: From Blue Oaks Blvd. to Galleria Blvd., construct	\$ 32,000,000	\$ 32,000,000

3.0

ERRATA

Project ID	Category	Lead Agency	Project Title	Description	Cost (2025 Dollars)	Cost (YOE Dollars)
			<u>and Economic Development Project</u>	third lane on southbound SR 65, and an auxiliary lane from Pleasant Grove Blvd. to Galleria Blvd. on southbound SR 65, including widening Galleria Blvd. southbound off-ramp to two lanes.. Toll Credits for ENG		
PLA25631	F - Transit Operations and Maintenance C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	PCTPA	Placer County Transit Operating & Maintenance	Lump-sum annual Operating & Maintenance costs for fiscal years 2031-2050; does not account for expansion of service	\$ 428,962,108	\$ 899,777,010
<u>PLA25719</u>	<u>B- Road & Highway Capacity</u>	<u>PCTPA</u>	<u>SR 65 Capacity & Operational Improvements Phase 4</u>	<u>SR 65, from Galleria Blvd. to Lincoln Blvd., make capacity and operational improvements. Phase 4: From Lincoln Blvd to Blue Oaks Blvd, widen southbound in median to add managed lane; and from north of Galleria Blvd (end of the I-80/SR 65 Interchange project) to Lincoln Blvd, widen northbound in median to add managed lane. Future environmental document will be completed to determine operational characteristic of managed lane.</u>	<u>60,000,000</u>	<u>\$125,626,676</u>
PLA25826	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	PCTPA	Street & Road Maintenance, PCTPA	Lump-sum estimated street and road maintenance costs including signals, safety devices, & street lights, storm drains, storm damage, patching, overlay and sealing, snow removal, other street purpose maintenance. Excludes major rehabilitation and reconstruction projects. <u>(\$13,750,000 annually)</u> (\$15,000,000 annually)	<u>275000000</u> 300000000	<u>397922048</u> 628133379
BP_408	B- Road & Highway Capacity	Placer County	Campus <u>Park</u> Placer One	Campus Park Boulevard, from Foothills Boulevard	\$ 1,600,000	\$ 2,150,266

ERRATA 3.0

Project ID	Category	Lead Agency	Project Title	Description	Cost (2025 Dollars)	Cost (YOE Dollars)
			Boulevard (Phase 1A)	to University Village Drive: Construct 2 lane road		
BP_409	B- Road & Highway Capacity	Placer County	Campus Park Placer One Boulevard (Phase 1B)	Campus Park Boulevard, from Foothills Boulevard to University Village Drive: Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	\$ 1,900,000	\$ 3,978,178
BP_410	B- Road & Highway Capacity	Placer County	Campus Park Placer One Boulevard (Phase 2)	Campus Park Boulevard, from University Village Drive to Fiddymment Road: Construct 4 lane road	\$ 2,800,000	\$ 5,862,578
BP_412	B- Road & Highway Capacity	Placer County	College Park Momentum Drive	College Park Drive, from Foothills Boulevard to Woodcreek Oaks: Construct 4 lane road	\$ 2,700,000	\$ 5,653,200
BP_413	B- Road & Highway Capacity	Placer County	College Park Momentum Drive (Phase 2)	College Park Drive, from Woodcreek Oaks to Sunset Boulevard: Construct 4 lane road	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 1,612,700
BP_414	C- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	Placer County	Dalby Road Bridge Replacement	Dalby Road bridge over Yankee Slough. Replace existing 2 lane bridge with new 2 lane bridge	6,000,000	\$8,063,498
BP_422	B- Road & Highway Capacity	Placer County	Foothills Boulevard Widening (Phase 2)	Foothills Boulevard, from Sunset Boulevard to Placer Parkway: Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	2,600,000	\$5,443,823
BP_423	B- Road & Highway Capacity	Placer County	Foothills Boulevard Widening (Phase 2)	Foothills Boulevard, from Placer Parkway to Athens Avenue: Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	3,250,000	\$4,367,728
BP_424	B- Road & Highway Capacity	Placer County	Industrial Avenue Widening	Industrial Avenue, from the City of Roseville to the City of Lincoln: Widen from 2 to 4 lanes (includes the Grade Separation at Athens Avenue)	6,800,000 <u>10,309,000</u>	\$ 142,376,899
BP_433	B- Road & Highway Capacity	Placer County	Placer Creek Drive (Phase 1)	Placer Creek Drive, from Baseline Road to Town Center Avenue: Construct 2 lane road	1,400,000	\$1,881,483
BP_439	E - Transit Capital	Placer County	SR 267 Outside Transit-Only Lanes	Widen SR 267 to add outside transit only lanes in each direction adjacent to existing lanes and also include a paved shoulder on both sides from Schaffer Mill Road to Northstar Drive <u>construct</u>	\$ 47,718,000	\$ 99,910,895

3.0

ERRATA

Project ID	Category	Lead Agency	Project Title	Description	Cost (2025 Dollars)	Cost (YOE Dollars)
				transit priority lanes from Truckee to Highland View Drive.		
BP_441	E - Transit Capital	Placer County	SR 267 TSP & Queue Jump Lanes	SR 267, upgrade intersections to include transit signal priority and queue jump lanes from the Town of Truckee to Highland View Drive	2,500,000	\$3,359,791
BP_789	A- Bike & Ped	Placer County	Meadow Vista Walkway	sidewalk and bike lane project along Placer Hills Road from Meadow Vista Road to Combie Rd	12000000 3500000	25125335.1558506 3990000
PLA15270	B- Road & Highway Capacity	Placer County	Antelope Road	North Antelope Road, from Sacramento County line to PFE Road: Widen from 2 lanes to 4 lanes.	1892300 3835000	\$ 3,962,056
PLA15390	B - Road & Highway Capacity	Placer County	Sierra College Boulevard (Phase 1)	Sierra College Boulevard, in vicinity of Bickford Ranch Road: widen from 2 to 4 lanes (and signalization).	2,280,000	\$2,280,000
PLA20690	B- Road & Highway Capacity	Placer County	PFE Rd.	Widen: 4 lanes from North Antelope Rd. to Roseville City Limits.	2434000 8500000	5096255.48077836 14110000
PLA25044	B- Road & Highway Capacity	Placer County	Sunset Boulevard Widening (Phase 1)	Widen Sunset Boulevard from State Route 65 to Cincinnati Avenue from 2 to 6 lanes. Project includes widening Industrial Blvd / UPRR overcrossing from 2 to 6 lanes.	51250000 78000000	51250000 78000000
PLA25759	F - Transit Operations and Maintenance Maintenance & Rehabilitation	Placer County	Placer County Transit	Operations and Preventive Maintenance in Urbanized Area	\$ 6,000,000	\$ 8,681,936
PLA25760	F - Transit Operations and Maintenance Maintenance & Rehabilitation	Placer County	Placer County Transit/Tahoe Truckee Area Regional Transit, Non Urbanized Ops	Operations in Non-Urbanized areas of Placer County	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 5,787,957
PLA25858	B- Road & Highway Capacity	Placer County	Foothills Boulevard	In Placer County, Foothills Boulevard: from Sunset Boulevard to Placer	2600000 17700000	2600000 17700000

Project ID	Category	Lead Agency	Project Title	Description	Cost (2025 Dollars)	Cost (YOE Dollars)
			Widening (Phase 2)	Parkway widen from 2 to 6 lanes, from Placer Parkway to Athens Avenue widen from 2 to 4		
PLA25865	A- Bike & Ped	Placer County	Pedestrian and Bicycle Gap Closure - Folsom Lake Recreation Area	In Placer County, on the north side of Douglas Boulevard, between Melwood Lane and Oak Knoll Drive: construct pedestrian and bicycle facilities to complete the multi-modal connection from Auburn Folsom Road to the Folsom Lake State Recreation Area (SRA). (Toll credits for PE, ROW, & CON).. Toll Credits for ENG, ROW, CON	900000 3000000	3000000 3,420,000
PLA25593	F - Transit Operations and Maintenance G- Maintenance & Rehabilitation	Western Placer Consolidated Transportation Service Agency	Placer County - CTSA O&M	Annual operation & maintenance (O&M) costs for Article 4.5 Community Transit Services & complimentary Transit Services & complimentary ADA dial-a-ride services for designated CTSA of Placer County servicing Placer County & Cities	\$ 46,627,405	\$ 67,469,354

Table 2.3-2 Edits

Project ID	Category	Lead Agency	Project Title	Description	Cost (2025 Dollars)	Cost (YOE Dollars)
BP_442	E - Transit Capital	Placer County	SR 89 Outside Transit-Only Lanes	Widen SR 89 to add a transit-only lanes in each direction adjacent to existing lanes and also include a paved shoulder/emergency pullouts on both sides except for extremely constrained areas from West River Street to Tahoe City	246800000 278000000	NA

The following edits have been made to page 2.0-32 to reflect the total cost of Tier I projects following changes to the RTP fiscally constrained project list:

The total cost for Tier I projects identified in the 2050 RTP is ~~\$6.0~~ ~~\$5.5~~ billion (in 2025~~4~~ dollars) or ~~\$8.9~~ ~~\$8.5~~ billion in Year of Expenditure (YOE) dollars. The total cost for Tier II projects identified in the 2050 RTP is \$2.2 billion.

3.1 AESTHETICS AND VISUAL RESOURCES

No changes were made to Section 3.1 of the DEIR.

3.2 AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES

No changes were made to Section 3.2 of the DEIR.

3.3 AIR QUALITY

No changes were made to Section 3.3 of the DEIR.

3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

No changes were made to Section 3.4 of the DEIR.

3.5 CULTURAL AND TRIBAL RESOURCES

No changes were made to Section 3.5 of the DEIR.

3.6 GEOLOGY

No changes were made to Section 3.6 of the DEIR.

3.7 GREENHOUSE GAS, CLIMATE CHANGE AND ENERGY

No changes were made to Section 3.7 of the DEIR.

3.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

No changes were made to Section 3.8 of the DEIR.

3.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

No changes were made to Section 3.9 of the DEIR.

3.10 LAND USE PLANNING, POPULATION, AND HOUSING

No changes were made to Section 3.10 of the DEIR.

3.11 NOISE

No changes were made to Section 3.11 of the DEIR.

3.12 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

Changes were made on pages 3.7-26 and 3.7-26 to reflect updated Maintenance Funding Per Lane Mile costs.

Placer County’s roadway maintenance funding is projected to increase substantially by 2050, as shown in Table 3.7-7. Total maintenance funding is expected to grow from \$2.94 billion to \$3.42 billion, a 4542 percent increase. Over the same period, total lane miles increased by 15 percent, resulting in a rise in maintenance funding per lane mile from approximately \$1.5429 million to \$1.9559 million, a 2624 percent increase. This growth reflects the need to support an expanding roadway network and maintain system performance as infrastructure ages and travel demand increases.

TABLE 3.7-7: MAINTENANCE FUNDING PER LANE MILE

MEASURE	BASELINE 2020	2050	PERCENT CHANGE
Maintenance Funding (\$)	2,900,400,000,000	4,2003,400,000,000	4542%
Lane Miles	1,861.63	2,134.75	15%
Maintenance Funding (\$) Per Mile	1,557,774,289.192	1,967,448,592.692	2624%

SOURCE: FEHR & PEERS, PCTPA PERFORMANCE METRICS, SACSIM23 TRAVEL DEMAND MODEL, 2025.

NOTES: MAINTENANCE FUNDING IS FROM PCTPA, JUNE 20, 2025.

3.13 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

No changes were made to Section 3.13 of the DEIR.

3.14 WILDFIRE

A change was made on page 3.9-1 to add the Mosquito Fire as a recent fire that burned over 20,000 acres:

Approximately half of Placer County is forested (Placer County, 2014). The PCTPA Planning Area has experienced devastating fire events (20,000 acres or more burned) such as the [Mosquito](#), King, Volcano, Deadwood, American, and Mckenzie Mill Fires over the past two decades (Placer County, June 2021).

Text was added to page 3.9-5 to describe the Placer County Evacuation & Transportation Resiliency Study, led by PCTPA and the Placer County Office of Emergency Services.

[Placer County Evacuation & Transportation Resiliency Study](#)

[PCTPA is collaborating with the Placer County Office of Emergency Services on the Evacuation and Transportation Resiliency Study \(ETRS\) to strengthen community safety during wildfires, floods, and other natural hazards or events. ETRS will identify vulnerable locations in the transportation network and develop projects that can help increase the network’s resiliency to a mass evacuation event or other climate events. The study is in progress and expected to wrap up by early 2027.](#)

A clarification was added to page 3.9-5 that Placer County is in the process of updating its Local Hazard Mitigation Plan.

Placer County developed this Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP) to reduce or eliminate long-term risk to people and property from hazards including wildfire. Placer County, five incorporated communities, and 20 special districts prepared this LHMP Update to the FEMA approved 2016 Placer County LHMP, in order to make the County and its residents less vulnerable to future hazard events. The LHMP Update was also developed, among other things, to ensure Placer County and participating jurisdictions' continued eligibility for certain federal disaster assistance: specifically, the FEMA Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP), Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program (PDM), and the Flood Mitigation Assistance Program (FMA). [The County is currently in the process of updating its LHMP.](#)

4.0 OTHER CEQA-REQUIRED TOPICS

No changes were made to Section 4.0 of the DEIR.

5.0 ALTERNATIVES

A change was made to page 5.0-2 to clarify the total cost of Tier I projects following changes to the RTP project list as detailed in Chapter 2.0.

These elements are described in detail in Section 2.0 Project Description along with the individual improvements and funding sources. The total cost for the Tier I projects is approximately ~~\$5.56.0~~ billion (in 2024 dollars).

Another change was made on page 5-0.3 to clarify total project costs of Tier I projects.

Therefore, under this alternative PCTPA would not be able to carry out all the transportation projects in the current 2044 RTP, and some or all the ~~\$5.56.0~~ billion in funding would be in jeopardy.

A change was made on page 5-0.4 to clarify total project costs of Tier II projects.

Under this alternative, total spending would need to increase by approximately ~~\$1.642.2~~ billion dollars.

6.0 EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

No changes were made to Section 6.0 of the DEIR.

7.0 REPORT PREPARERS

No changes were made to Section 7.0 of the DEIR.

8.0 REFERENCES

No changes were made to Section 8.0 of the DEIR.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank.

This document is the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the 2050 Placer County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) (Project). This MMRP has been prepared pursuant to Section 21081.6 of the California Public Resources Code, which requires public agencies to “adopt a reporting and monitoring program for the changes made to the project or conditions of project approval, adopted in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment.” A MMRP is required for the proposed Project because the EIR has identified significant adverse impacts, and measures have been identified to mitigate those impacts.

The numbering of the individual mitigation measures follows the numbering sequence as found in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

4.1 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

The MMRP, as outlined in Table 4.0-1, *Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program*, describes mitigation timing, monitoring responsibilities, and compliance verification responsibility for all mitigation measures identified in this Final EIR.

The Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA) will be the primary agency responsible for implementing the mitigation measures and will continue to monitor mitigation measures that are required to be implemented during the operation of the proposed Project.

The MMRP is presented in tabular form on the following pages. The components of the MMRP are described briefly below:

- **Environmental Impact:** The environmental impacts in the Draft EIR which require mitigation to reduce impacts are listed.
- **Mitigation Measures:** The mitigation measures are taken from the Draft EIR in the same order they appear in that document.
- **Mitigation Timing:** Identifies at which stage of the project mitigation must be completed.
- **Monitoring Responsibility:** Identifies the agency that is responsible for mitigation monitoring.
- **Compliance Verification:** This is a space that is available for the monitor to date and initial when the monitoring or mitigation implementation took place.

TABLE 4.0-1: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY	TIMING	VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)
AESTHETICS				
Impact 3.1-2: Substantial adverse effects on scenic resources or substantial degradation of visual character	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.1-1: <i>The implementing agency shall, to the extent feasible, implement the following measures in the design of RTP projects:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Design transportation systems in a manner where the surrounding landscape dominates.</i> • <i>Design transportation systems to be compatible with the surrounding environment (e.g., colors and materials of construction material).</i> • <i>Design transportation systems such that landscape vegetation blends in and complements the natural landscape.</i> • <i>Design transportation systems such that trees are maintained intact, or if removal is necessary, incorporate new trees into the design.</i> • <i>Design grades to blend with the adjacent landforms and topography.</i> <p>Mitigation Measure 3.1.2: <i>Prior to the design approval of RTP projects, the implementing agency shall assess whether the project would remove any significant visual resources in the project area, which may include trees, rock outcroppings, and historical buildings, and shall also assess whether the project would significantly obstruct views of scenic resources including historic buildings, trees, rocks, or scenic water features.</i></p> <p><i>If it is determined that the RTP project would remove significant visual resources, the implementing agency shall consider alternative designs that seek to avoid and/or minimize impacts from removal of significant visual resources to the extent feasible. Project-specific design measures may include revisions to the plans to retain trees, rocks, and historic buildings, or replanting of trees, and/or the relocation of scenic features.</i></p> <p><i>If it is determined that the RTP project would significantly obstruct scenic views, the implementing agency shall consider alternative designs that seek to avoid and/or minimize obstruction of scenic views to the extent feasible. Project-specific design measures may include reduction in height of improvements or width of improvements to reduce obstruction of views, or</i></p>	Appropriate implementing agency and/or PCTPA where applicable	Prior to project design and approval	

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY	TIMING	VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)
	<i>relocation of improvements to reduce obstruction of views.</i>			
Impact 3.1-3: Creation of new sources of light and glare	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.1-3: <i>The RTP projects shall be designed to meet minimum safety and security standards and to avoid spillover lighting to sensitive uses. Design measures shall include the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Luminaries will be cutoff-type fixtures that cast low-angle illumination to minimize incidental spillover of light onto adjacent private properties and undeveloped open space. Fixtures that project light upward or horizontally will not be used.</i> • <i>Luminaries will be directed away from habitat and open space areas adjacent to the project site.</i> • <i>Luminaries will provide good color rendering and natural light qualities. Low-pressure sodium and high-pressure sodium fixtures that are not color corrected will not be used. Light intensity at roadway intersections and crosswalks will be at approximately 'low average-maintained illumination,' as classified by the Recommended Practices for Roadway Lighting of the Illuminating Engineering Society of North American (IESNA). Low average-maintained illumination is 1.8 foot-candle for major/major roadways, 1.5 foot-candle at major/collector roadways, 1.3 foot-candle at major/local roadways, 1.2 foot-candle at collector/collector roadways, 1.0 foot-candle at collector/local roadways, and 0.8 foot-candle at local/local roadways.</i> • <i>Luminary mountings will be downcast and the height of the poles minimized to reduce potential for back scatter into the nighttime sky and incidental spillover of light onto adjacent private properties and undeveloped open space. Luminary mountings will have non-glare finishes.</i> • <i>Exterior lighting features shall be directed downward and shielded to confine light to the boundaries of the subject project. Where more intense lighting is necessary for safety purposes, the design shall include landscaping to block light from sensitive land uses, such as residences.</i> 	Appropriate implementing agency and/or PCTPA where applicable	Prior to project design and approval	

4.0

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY	TIMING	VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)
AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES				
<p>Impact 3.2-1: Conversion of farmlands, including prime farmland, unique farmland, and farmland of statewide importance, to non-agricultural uses, or conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.2-1: Prior to the design approval of individual RTP improvement projects, the implementing agency shall assess the potential for agricultural impacts. For federally funded projects, the implementing agency shall complete form AD-1006 to determine the Farmland Conversion Impact Rating in compliance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act. The AD-1006 shall be submitted to the NRCS for approval. For non-federally funded projects, the implementing agency shall assess the project for the presence of important farmlands (prime farmland, unique farmland, farmland of statewide importance).</p> <p>If significant agricultural resources are identified within the limits of an individual RTP improvement project, the implementing agency shall consider alternative designs that seek to avoid and/or minimize impacts to the agricultural resources. Design measures may include, but are not limited to, reducing the proposed roadway width or relocating/realigning the improvement to avoid important and significant farmlands to the extent feasible. If the improvement cannot be designed without complete avoidance of important or significant farmlands, the implementing agency shall compensate for unavoidable conversion impacts at a 1:1 ratio.</p>	<p>Appropriate implementing agency and/or PCTPA where applicable</p>	<p>Prior to project design and approval</p>	
<p>Impact 3.2-2: Potential to conflict with forest or timber zoning or result in the conversion of forest lands or timber lands</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.2-2: Prior to the design approval of individual RTP improvement projects that could impact forest or timber resources, the implementing agency shall retain a qualified arborist, forester, and, or biologist to assess the potential impacts of tree removal and encroachment activities and provide recommendations to the implementing agency.</p>	<p>Appropriate implementing agency and/or PCTPA where applicable</p>	<p>Prior to project design and approval</p>	
AIR QUALITY				
<p>Impact 3.3-2: Short-term - conflict with, or obstruct, the applicable air quality plan, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of a criteria pollutant in a non-attainment area.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.3-1: The implementing agency for any construction activities, including dismantling/demolition of structures, processing/moving materials (sand, gravel, rock, dirt, etc.), or operation of machines/equipment, shall prepare a dust control plan in accordance with Placer County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) Rule 228 (Fugitive Dust Emissions). The dust control plan shall use reasonable precautions to prevent dust emissions, which may include: cessation of operations at times, cleanup, sweeping, sprinkling, compacting, enclosure, chemical or asphalt sealing, or other recommended actions by the APCD.</p>	<p>Placer County Air Pollution Control District, Appropriate implementing agency and/or PCTPA where applicable</p>	<p>Prior to construction permitting</p>	

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY	TIMING	VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)
<p>Impact 3.3-3: Occasional localized carbon monoxide concentrations from traffic conditions at some individual locations.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.3-2: The implementing agency shall screen individual RTP projects at the time of design for localized carbon monoxide (CO) hotspot concentrations and, if necessary, incorporate project-specific measures into the project design to reduce or alleviate CO hotspot concentrations.</p>	<p>Placer County Air Pollution Control District, Appropriate implementing agency and/or PCTPA where applicable</p>	<p>During project design</p>	
<p>Impact 3.3-5: Potential to release asbestos from earth movement or structural asbestos from demolition/ renovation of existing structures.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.3-3: Prior to construction of RTP projects, the implementing agency should assess the site for the presence of asbestos including asbestos from structures such as road base, bridges, and other structures. If asbestos is present, the implementing agency should comply with applicable state and local regulations regarding asbestos, including the California Air Resources Board’s (ARB’s) asbestos airborne toxic control measure (ATCM) (Title 17, CCR § 93105 and 93106), and Placer County APCD Rule 228 – Fugitive Dust, to ensure that exposure to construction workers and the public is reduced to an acceptable level. This may include the preparation of an Asbestos Hazard Dust Mitigation Plan to be implemented during construction activities, or other recommended actions by the APCD.</p>	<p>Appropriate implementing agency and/or PCTPA where applicable</p>	<p>Prior to construction permitting</p>	
CULTURAL RESOURCES				
<p>Impact 3.4-1: Potential to cause a substantial adverse change to a significant historical resource, as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-1: Conduct Project-Specific Historic Built Environment Resource Studies and Identify and Implement Project-Specific Mitigation: Measures that shall be implemented to address site-specific impacts, include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As part of the project/environmental review of individual projects, a records search at the appropriate Information Center of the CHRIS and a review of literature and historic maps shall be conducted to determine whether the project area has been previously surveyed and whether historic built environment resources were identified. • In the event the records indicate that no previous survey has been conducted within the last 5 years, a qualified architectural historian (36 CFR Section 61) shall conduct a study of the project area for the presence of historic built environment resources. The study shall include conducting a field survey, necessary background, archival and historic research, 	<p>Appropriate implementing agency and/or PCTPA where applicable Qualified Archaeologist</p>	<p>During environmental review</p>	

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY	TIMING	VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)
	<p><i>consultation with local historical societies, museums, or other interested parties as relevant, and preparation of a historic resource assessment report. The report shall document the results of the survey and the historic context, evaluate the federal, state, or local significance of built environment resources greater than 45 years in age that may potentially be directly or indirectly impacted by project activities, recommend appropriate protection or mitigative treatment, if any, and include recordation of identified built environment resources on appropriate California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) series 523 forms. The final report and DPR forms shall be filed by the architectural historian with the CHRIS. Recommended treatment for historical built environment resources identified in the report shall be implemented.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>If no significant historic built environment resources are identified in the Historic Resource Assessment Report or prior survey of the project study area that may be directly or indirectly impacted by project activities, then mitigation for built environment resources is complete, and there is no adverse change to documented historical built environment resources for the project.</i> • <i>If significant historic built environment resources are identified in the Historic Resource Assessment Report or prior survey of the project study area, the project sponsor and/or implementing agency should consider avoidance as the primary mitigation measure. If avoidance is possible, mitigation to documented historical built environment resources is complete.</i> • <i>If avoidance of a significant built environment resource is not feasible, then the maintenance, repair, stabilization, rehabilitation, restoration, preservation, conservation, or reconstruction of the historical resource, as recommended by a qualified architectural historian or historic architect (36 CFR Section 61) and conducted in a manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitation, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings or Historic Landscapes shall generally reduce impacts (Birnbaum and Peters 1996; Grimmer 2017). If adherence to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards cannot avoid materially altering in an adverse manner the physical characteristics or historic character of the surrounding environmental setting that contribute to a</i> 			

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY	TIMING	VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)
	<p><i>resource’s historic significance, additional mitigation may be required.</i></p> <p><i>If avoidance or minimization of substantial adverse effects to a significant built environment resource is not feasible through project design or by adherence to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, the project sponsor and/or implementing agency should ensure that Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS), Historic American Engineering Record (HAER), or Historic American Landscapes Survey (HALS) documentation is completed prior to demolition or significant material alteration of the resource’s physical characteristics or setting. The HABS, HAER, and HALS programs formally document historical resources using large-format photography, measured drawings, written architectural descriptions, and historical narratives. The level of documentation required as mitigation and preparation of the HABS, HAER, or HALS shall be determined and prepared by a qualified architectural historian or historic architect (36 CFR Section 61). The documentation packages shall be archived in appropriate public and secure repositories. Such documentation would not reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.</i></p>			
<p>Impact 3.4-2: Potential to cause a substantial adverse change to a significant unique archaeological resource, as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-2: Conduct Project-Specific Archaeological Resource Studies and Identify and Implement Project-Specific Mitigation: Measures that shall be implemented to address site-specific impacts, include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>A records search at the appropriate Information Center of the CHRIS shall be conducted by a qualified archaeologist (36 CFR Section 61) as part of the appropriate project/environmental review of individual projects to determine whether the project area has been previously surveyed and whether archaeological resources were identified.</i> • <i>In the event the records indicate that no previous survey has been conducted or the survey did not meet current professional standards or regulatory guidelines, the qualified archaeologist (36 CFR Section 61) or the Information Center shall make a recommendation on whether a survey is warranted based on the sensitivity of the project area for archaeological resources and current professional standards or regulatory guidelines.</i> • <i>If a survey is considered warranted, the archaeological study of the</i> 	<p>Appropriate implementing agency and/or PCTPA where applicable</p> <p>Qualified Archaeologist/</p> <p>Construction Monitor</p>	<p>During environmental review and/or during project grading and construction activities</p>	

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY	TIMING	VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)
	<p><i>project area by a qualified archaeologist shall include conducting a field survey, necessary background research, a Sacred Lands search by the NAHC and outreach to local Native Americans identified by the NAHC, consultation with local historical societies, museums or other interested parties as relevant, and an archaeological survey report. The confidential report shall document the results of the survey and the cultural context, assess the federal, state, or local significance of precontact or historic-era archaeological resources that may potentially be directly or indirectly impacted by project activities, provide appropriate management recommendations, and include recordation of identified archaeological resources on appropriate California DPR series 523 forms. Management recommendations may include additional studies to evaluate identified sites, treatment for documented historical resources, or archaeological monitoring during ground-disturbing construction activities at locations determined by the archaeologist to be sensitive for subsurface cultural resource deposits, including local Native American monitors if sensitive for precontact resources. The final confidential report and DPR forms would be filed by the archaeologist with the CHRIS. Recommended treatment for resources identified in the report should be implemented.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>If no archeological resources are identified in the Archeological Survey Report that may be directly or indirectly impacted by project activities, mitigation is complete as there would be no adverse change to documented archeological resources.</i> • <i>When a project would impact a known archaeological site, the project sponsor and/or implementing agency shall determine whether the site is a historical resource or an archaeological nature (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(c)(1)) or unique archaeological resource (PRC Section 21083.2(g)). If archaeological sites identified in the project area are considered potentially significant, the project sponsor and/or responsible implementing agency shall undertake additional studies overseen by a qualified archaeologist (36 CFR Section 61) to evaluate the resources eligibility for listing in the CRHR, NRHP, local register, or as a unique archaeological resource and to recommend further mitigative treatment. Evaluations shall be based on, but not limited to, surface remains, subsurface testing, or archival and ethnographic resources, on the framework of the historic context and important research questions of the project area, and on the integrity of the resource. If a site to be tested is</i> 			

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY	TIMING	VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)
	<p><i>precontact, local tribal representatives should be afforded the opportunity to monitor the ground-disturbing activities. Appropriate mitigation may include curation of artifacts removed during subsurface testing.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>If significant archaeological resources that meet the definition of historical resources of an archaeological nature or unique archaeological resources are identified in the project area, the preferred mitigation of impacts is preservation in place (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b); PRC Section 21083.2). Preservation in place may be accomplished by, but is not limited to, avoidance by project design, incorporation within parks, open space or conservation easements, covering with a layer of sterile soil, or similar measures. If preservation in place is feasible, mitigation is complete. Additionally, where the implementing agency determines that an alternative mitigation method is superior to in-place preservation, the project sponsor and/or implementing agency may implement such alternative measures.</i> • <i>When preservation in place or avoidance of historical resources of an archaeological nature or unique archaeological resources are infeasible, data recovery through excavation shall be required (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b)). Data recovery would consist of approval of a Data Recovery Plan and archaeological excavation of an adequate sample of site contents so that research questions applicable to the site can be addressed. For precontact sites, local tribal representatives should be afforded the opportunity to monitor the ground-disturbing activities. If only part of a site would be impacted by a project, data recovery shall only be necessary for that portion of the site. Data recovery shall not be required if the implementing agency determines prior testing and studies have adequately recovered the scientifically consequential information from the resources. Confidential studies and reports resulting from the data recovery shall be deposited with the appropriate CHRIS Information Center. Archaeological sites known to contain human remains shall be treated in accordance with the provisions of Section 7050.5 Health and Safety Code. Mitigation may include curation for artifacts removed during data recovery excavation.</i> • <i>If archaeological sites are discovered during construction, all work near the find shall be halted and the project sponsor and/or implementing agency shall follow the steps described under State CEQA Guidelines</i> 			

4.0

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY	TIMING	VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)
	<p><i>Section 15064.5(f), including an immediate evaluation of the find by a qualified archaeologist (36 CFR Section 61) and implementation of avoidance measures or appropriate mitigation if the find is determined to be a historical resource of an archaeological nature or unique archaeological resource. Consultation with or affording local tribal representatives the opportunity to monitor mitigative treatment may be appropriate. Should the find include human remains, the remains shall be treated in accordance with the provisions of Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code. During evaluation or mitigative treatment, ground disturbance and construction work could continue other parts of the project area.</i></p> <p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-3: Reduce Visibility or Accessibility of Archaeological Resources: The project sponsor and/or implementing agency shall determine whether implementation of a project would indirectly impact historical or unique archaeological resources by increasing public visibility and ease of access. If so, the project sponsor and/or implementing agency shall take measures to reduce the visibility or accessibility of the archaeological resource to the public. Visibility of the resource can be reduced using decorative walls or vegetation screening. Accessibility can be reduced by installing fencing or vegetation barriers, particularly noxious vegetation such as poison oak or blackberry bushes. It is important to avoid creating an attractive nuisance when protecting significant archaeological sites. Conspicuous walls or signs indicating that an area is restricted may result in more attempts to access the excluded area.</p>			
GREENHOUSE GASES, CLIMATE CHANGE AND ENERGY				
<p>Impact 3.5-1: Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.5-1: PCTPA should continue to explore the feasibility of a transportation pricing policy for the transit system and selected portions of the road network to encourage people to drive less and increase use of transit, walking and bicycling modes. PCTPA should continue to participate and host programs that are deemed feasible by PCTPA for the region to incentivize alternative transportation modes (e.g. Spare the Air program, Commuter Club, Bikes for Bucks program, \$10 Youth Summer Pass program, Walk to School Program, and Emergency Ride Home Services).</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 3.5-2: PCTPA should consider incorporating a complete</p>	<p>Placer County Air Pollution Control District</p> <p>Appropriate implementing agency and/or PCTPA where applicable</p>	<p>During project design</p> <p>Ongoing</p>	

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY	TIMING	VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)
	<p>streets policy with a strong focus on identifying opportunities to create more active transportation within the region (i.e. bike and pedestrian facilities).</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 3.5-3: Consistent with Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines, the agencies implementing RTP projects should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote measures to reduce wasteful, inefficient and unnecessary consumption of energy during construction, operation, maintenance and/or removal. As the individual RTP projects are designed there should be an explanation as to why certain measures were incorporated in the RTP project and why other measures were dismissed. • Site, orient, and design projects to minimize energy consumption, increase water conservation and reduce solid-waste. • Promote efforts to reduce peak energy demand in the design and operation of RTP projects. • Promote the use of alternate fuels (particularly renewable ones) or energy systems for RTP projects. • Promote efforts to recycle materials used in the construction (including demolition phase) of RTP projects. <p>Mitigation Measure 3.5-4: PCTPA should coordinate with local and regional agencies to assist in efforts to develop local and regional Climate Action Plans (CAPs) and/or General Plan policy that address climate change and greenhouse gas emissions. Some local agencies in Placer County have adopted a local CAP (Roseville, 2009 and Rocklin 2012), or are in the process of preparing a local CAP to address climate change and greenhouse gas emissions. Local and regional CAPs should include the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline inventory of GHG emissions from community and municipal sources. • A target reduction goal consistent with Assembly Bill (AB) 32 and Senate Bill (SB) 32. • Policies and measures to reduce GHG emissions. • Quantification of the effectiveness of the proposed policies and 			

4.0

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY	TIMING	VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)
	<p><i>measures.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>A monitoring program to track the effectiveness and implementation of the CAP(s).</i> <p><i>PCTPA’s role in the development of local and regional CAPs should include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Assistance in seeking and securing funding for the development of local and regional CAPs.</i> • <i>Collaboration with local and regional agencies throughout their respective planning processes.</i> 			
LAND USE AND POPULATION				
<p>Impact 3.6-1: Physical division of an established community.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.6-1: <i>Prior to approval of RTP projects, the implementing agency shall consult with local planning staff to ensure that the project will not physically divide the community. The consultation should include a more detailed project-level analysis of land uses adjacent to proposed improvements to identify specific impacts. The analysis should consider new road widths and specific project locations in relation to existing roads. If it is determined that a project could physically divide a community, the implementing agency shall redesign the project to avoid the impact, if feasible. The measures could include realignment of the improvements to avoid the affected community. Where avoidance is not feasible, the implementing agency shall incorporate minimization measures to reduce the impact. The measures could include: alignment modifications, right-of-way reductions, provisions for bicycle, pedestrian, and vehicle facilities, and enhanced landscaping and architecture.</i></p>	<p>Appropriate implementing agency and/or PCTPA where applicable</p>	<p>Prior to project approval</p>	
TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION				
<p>Impact 3.7-2: Substantially interfere with achievement of the VMT reductions set forth in the California Air Resources Board’s (CARB’s) Scoping Plan.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.7-1: <i>The state recognized that additional state policy actions and funding would be required to close the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) gap between what the metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) could achieve through implementation of their Sustainable Communities Strategies (SCS), and reductions needed to meet state goals. Though the state must initiate these additional actions and funding programs, the exact form of the policies and funding programs must be collaboratively developed with</i></p>	<p>Appropriate implementing agency and/or PCTPA where applicable</p>	<p>During project design Ongoing</p>	

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY	TIMING	VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)
	<p><i>input from MPOs, local agencies, and other organizations to ensure they provide the tools and incentives necessary to go beyond the SCSs in reducing VMT.</i></p> <p><i>Consequently, PCTPA shall work collaboratively with the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), Placer County, and cities of Auburn, Colfax, Lincoln, Loomis, and Rocklin) and Town of Loomis to support implementation of regional and local-level strategies and measures to achieve further VMT reductions. Implementing agencies shall implement the following strategies to reduce VMT.</i></p> <p><u>Local-Level:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Implementing agencies shall require implementation of VMT reduction strategies through transportation demand management (TDM) programs, impact fee programs, mitigation banks or exchange programs, in-lieu fee programs, or other land use project conditions that reduce VMT. Programs should be designed to reduce VMT from existing land uses, where feasible, and from new discretionary residential or employment land use projects. The following strategies from Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measure, California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA), August 2010, were identified in the Placer County and City of Roseville Senate Bill 743 Implementation Plan, July 2019, as strategies most suited to Placer County and the City of Roseville given the rural and suburban land use context:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Increase diversity of land uses</u> – <i>This strategy focuses on the inclusion of mixed uses within projects or in consideration of the surrounding area to minimize vehicle travel in terms of both the number of trips and the length of those trips.</i> 2. <u>Provide pedestrian network improvements</u> – <i>This strategy focuses on creating a pedestrian network</i> 			

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY	TIMING	VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)
	<p><i>within the project and connecting to nearby destinations. Projects in Placer County tend to be smaller, so the emphasis of this strategy would likely be the construction of network improvements that connect the project site directly to nearby destinations. Alternatively, implementation could occur through an impact fee program or benefit/assessment district based on local or regional plans such as the Active Transportation Plan.</i></p> <p>3. <u>Provide traffic calming measures and low-stress bicycle network improvements</u> – This strategy combines the CAPCOA research focused on traffic calming with new research on providing a low-stress bicycle network. Traffic calming creates networks with low vehicle speeds and volumes that are more conducive to walking and bicycling. Building a low-stress bicycle network produces a similar outcome. Implementation options are like strategy 2 above. One potential change in this strategy over time is that e- bikes (and e-scooters) could extend the effective range of travel on the bicycle network, which could enhance the effectiveness of this strategy.</p> <p>4. <u>Implement car-sharing program</u> – This strategy reduces the need to own a vehicle or reduces the number of vehicles owned by a household by making it convenient to access a shared vehicle for those trips where vehicle use is essential. Note that implementation of this strategy would require regional or local agency implementation and coordination and would not likely be applicable for individual development projects.</p>			

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY	TIMING	VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)
	<p>5. <u>Increase transit service frequency and speed</u> – This strategy focuses on improving transit service convenience and travel time competitiveness with driving. Given land use density in Placer County, this strategy may be limited to traditional commuter transit where trips can be pooled at the start and end locations or require new forms of demand-responsive transit service. The demand-responsive service could be provided as subsidized trips by contracting to private TNCs or Taxi companies. Alternatively, a public transit operator could provide the subsidized service but would need to improve on traditional cost effectiveness by relying on TNC ride-hailing technology, using smaller vehicles sized to demand, and flexible driver employment terms where drivers are paid by trip versus by hour. Note that implementation of this strategy would require regional or local agency implementation, substantial changes to current transit practices, and would not likely be applicable for individual development projects.</p> <p>6. <u>Encourage telecommuting and alternative work schedules</u> – This strategy relies on effective internet access and speeds to individual project sites/buildings to provide the opportunity for telecommuting. The effectiveness of the strategy depends on the ultimate building tenants and this should be a factor in considering the potential VMT reduction.</p> <p>7. <u>Provide ride-sharing programs</u> – This strategy focuses on encouraging carpooling and vanpooling by project site/building tenants and has similar</p>			

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY	TIMING	VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)
	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>limitations as strategy 6 above.</i></p> <p><u>Regional:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Implementing agencies shall consider project modifications during the project design and environmental review stage of project development to reduce VMT. For roadway capacity expansion projects, this would include but is not limited to demand management through transportation systems management and operations (TSMO) including the use of pricing.</i> • <i>Implementing agencies shall participate in SACOG’s Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)/SCS programs that are intended to provide infill incentives and support for transit and innovative mobility as key elements of filling that VMT gap.</i> 			
TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES				
<p>Impact 3.8-1: Potential to cause a substantial adverse change to a significant tribal cultural resource, as defined in Public Resources Code §21074</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.8-1: <i>Prepare and Implement a Worker Awareness Training Program for Tribal Cultural Resources: Prior to project-specific ground-disturbing activities, a tribal cultural resources awareness training program will be provided to all construction personnel active on the project site. A representative or representatives from culturally affiliated Native American Tribe(s) will be invited to participate in the development and delivery of the training program in coordination with a professional archaeologist meeting the United States Secretary of Interior’s qualification standards for archaeology. The program will include relevant information regarding tribal cultural resources, including applicable laws and regulations, the consequences of violating said laws and regulations, protocols for resource avoidance, and protocols for discoveries, including who to contact in the event of a discovery and what to do upon the discovery of human remains. The program will also underscore the requirement for confidentiality and culturally appropriate treatment of any find of significance to Native Americans and protocols, consistent with Native American Tribal values.</i></p> <p>Mitigation Measure 3.8-2: <i>Halt Ground Disturbance Upon Discovery of Subsurface Tribal Cultural Resources and Evaluate Discovered Resource: During subsequent project-specific ground disturbing construction activities, if any</i></p>	<p>Appropriate implementing agency and/or PCTPA where applicable</p> <p><i>Culturally affiliated Native American Tribe(s)</i></p>	<p>During project design</p>	

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY	TIMING	VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)
	<p><i>suspected tribal cultural resources are discovered, all work shall cease within 100 feet of the find, and a tribal monitor from culturally affiliated Native American Tribe(s) shall be retained, if one is not currently on site. The tribal monitor shall determine if the find is a tribal cultural resource. The consulting THPO, or tribal monitor if the consulting tribe has no THPO, will make recommendations for further evaluation and culturally appropriate treatment of discovered Tribal cultural resources as necessary. Consultation with an archaeologist who meets the secretary of the Interior's professional qualifications for archaeology may also occur.</i></p> <p><u>Treatment and Documentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The culturally affiliated Tribe shall consult with the Lead Agency to (1) identify the boundaries of the tribal cultural resource and (2) if feasible, identify appropriate preservation in place and avoidance measures, including redesign or adjustments to the existing construction process, and long-term management, or 3) if avoidance is infeasible, a reburial location in proximity of the find where no future disturbance is anticipated. Permanent curation of tribal cultural resources will not take place unless approved in writing by the culturally affiliated Tribe.</i> • <i>The construction contractor(s) shall provide secure, on-site storage for culturally sensitive soils or objects that are components of tribal cultural resources that are found or recovered during construction. Only Tribal Representatives shall have access to the storage. Storage size shall be determined by the nature of the TCR and can range from a small lock box to a conex box (shipping container). A secure (locked), fenced area can also provide adequate on-site storage if larger amounts of material must be stored.</i> • <i>The construction contractor(s) and Lead Agency shall facilitate the respectful reburial of the culturally sensitive soils or objects. This includes providing a reburial location that is consistent with the Tribe's preferences, excavation of the reburial location, and assisting with the reburial, upon request.</i> • <i>Any discoveries shall be documented on a Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 form within 4 weeks of the discovery and submitted to the appropriate CHRIS center in a timely manner.</i> • <i>If articulated or disarticulated human remains, or human remains in any</i> 			

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY	TIMING	VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)
	<p><i>state of decomposition or skeletal completeness are discovered during construction activities, the County Coroner and the culturally affiliated Tribe 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 Descendent who will work with the project proponent to define appropriate treatment and disposition of the burials.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Work at the discovery location cannot resume until all necessary investigation, evaluation, and treatment of the discovery under the requirements of the CEQA, specifically PRC Section 21084.3[b], have been satisfied. Implement</i> <p>Mitigation Measure 3.8-3: <i>Reduce Visibility or Accessibility of Tribal Cultural Resources: The culturally affiliated Tribe shall consult with the Lead Agency to determine whether implementation of a project would indirectly impact tribal cultural resources by increasing public visibility and ease of access. If so, the project sponsor and/or implementing agency shall take measures to reduce the visibility or accessibility of the tribal cultural resource to the public. Visibility of the resource can be reduced using decorative walls or vegetation screening. Accessibility can be reduced by installing fencing or vegetation barriers, particularly noxious vegetation such as poison oak or blackberry bushes. It is important to avoid creating an attractive nuisance when protecting significant sites. Conspicuous walls or signs indicating that an area is restricted may result in more attempts to access the excluded area.</i></p>			

This page left intentionally blank.