

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.1 PROJECT UNDER REVIEW

The proposed project is the development and in some cases the annexation of 18 project sites. The 18 rezone sites comprise an area totaling approximately 149 acres, scattered throughout three general areas of unincorporated Nevada County; Grass Valley SOI, Penn Valley, and Lake of the Pines. The 18 sites are irregular-shaped areas with varying dimensions. The majority of the rezoning areas are undeveloped and surrounded by a variety of existing development including, single-family residential, rural residential, commercial agricultural, recreational, and utility uses. The natural features within the 18 pre-selected sites include a variety of distinct plant communities and several creeks.

To meet state housing requirements identified in the County's Housing Element, high density residential zoning (R3) for an additional 1,270 low and very low income housing units are required to meet the County's unmet housing needs. The project proposes to implement rezoning through the Zoning Map Amendment process to rezone sufficient acreage to higher density residential, or the equivalent of higher density residential, to meet the minimum low and very low income requirements. The specific rezoning process is proposed through the implementation of Housing Element Programs HD-8.1.3 and HD-8.1.4, including adding the "RH" Zoning Combining District to those sites included in Program HD-8.1.5. Additionally, the project sites will require General Plan Map Amendments for each of the 18 sites, with the exception of site 6. The General Plan Map Amendment will change each land use designation to a proposed Urban High Density designation, which will accommodate a proposed density of 16-20 du/acre. The land use designation of site 6 is already Urban High Density; therefore, this site will not require a General Plan Map Amendment. Table 3-2, *General Plan (GP) Land Use Designations*, shows the existing and proposed General Plan designation for each site and the proposed allowable density for each site.

The projects within the Grass Valley SOI would require annexation into the City of Grass Valley prior to developing those sites in accordance with increased density associated with the Regional Housing Need (RH) Combining District. Accordingly, the Nevada County LAFCO would be a responsible agency. In addition to annexing these properties into the City, LAFCO would also need to detach the area from the Nevada County Consolidated Fire District service area and add the area to the City Fire Department's service area.

The proposed project anticipates development as market conditions allow, therefore this EIR attempts to identify and mitigate future impacts associated with potential development so that the project sites will be developable by-right and will not require further discretionary approval by the County, with the exception of Design Review. Development proposals shall undergo a Design Review process and public hearing at the Planning Commission limited to design issues only, pursuant to Section L-II 2.7.11.C.5: 5 of the Nevada County Zoning Code. No discretionary permit would be necessary for the density or use of the proposed project sites.

The theoretical or maximum yield of each proposed site is used in the evaluation of this EIR as a conservative approach to evaluating the potential environmental impacts associated with future development on the properties. The maximum yield of all the proposed sites is 2,675 units over 148.99 acres.

This is a conservative approach because assuming a maximum yield assumes the highest number possible of units would be built, and does not take into consideration any development constraints such as sensitive biological resources, cultural resources, ground slope, wetlands, or regulatory constraints such as existing easements, driveways, frontage improvements, or roadway or intersection improvements. The presence of any one of these constraints could limit the amount of development that is permitted on a given site.

It is anticipated that very few of the sites will be able to achieve their maximum yield. However, the maximum yield is assumed for purposes of this EIR to evaluate the greatest number of units possible to provide future development the opportunity to utilize the analysis in this environmental document for future development applications.

As outlined in the “RH” Zoning Combining District Ordinance (Section L-II 2.7.11.C.3 of the Nevada County Land Use and Development Code), the project will result in the development of a Regional Housing Need Implementation Plan. This Plan will outline site-specific development standards and any CEQA mitigation measures adopted for each site that must be adhered to in order for the site to develop consistent with the purpose of the rezone and to ensure that the development of the site does not result in a significant environmental impact.

The project has the following objectives:

- Identify private properties that can be feasibly rezoned to meet the County’s obligation to provide high-density housing opportunities as required by state law;
- Increase high-density housing opportunities in different areas of unincorporated Nevada County;
- Identify properties with property owners that consent to participating in the County’s program and agreed to have the RH Combining District on their properties;
- Identify properties that are large enough to support enough units to make developing affordable high-density financially feasible;
- Identify participating properties that have reasonable access to existing infrastructure (e.g., public roads and utilities);
- Identify properties that have reasonable access to community services (e.g., public transportation, retail/grocery stores, employment opportunities);
- Protect the natural environment; and,
- Establish clear and effective site-specific development standards/mitigation measures for each rezoned property to ensure that the future development of high-density housing on that site meets County development standards and does not result in significant and avoidable environmental impacts.

2.2 SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS

2.2.1 LAND USE AND PLANNING

The proposed project would not physically divide an established community or conflict with an established habitat conservation or natural community plan. Both the Nevada County General Plan and City of Grass Valley 2020 General Plan designate the project area for future development. Therefore, with approval of the proposed rezoning and General Plan Map Amendment, the proposed project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulations for the County of Nevada. However, the proposed change in land use

density to high density residential (20 dwelling units per acre) within the City of Grass Valley's Sphere of Influence would conflict with the City's existing medium density (4-8 dwelling units per acre) and mixed use density land use designations because the proposed density is higher. The potential conflicts would be addressed through policy agreements between the two jurisdictions. Potential impacts are considered significant.

2.2.2 AESTHETICS

The proposed project areas are not within a state designated scenic highway. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway. However, sites within the "SC" Scenic Corridor Combining District (site 14) will have the potential to impact scenic vistas. These impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of mitigation measures that require design review and construction equipment staging areas to use appropriate screening and buffer views of construction equipment.

The project would result in short-term aesthetic impacts as a result of construction debris and construction-related activities. These impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of mitigation measures that require buffering of construction equipment. Future development associated with the proposed project would permanently alter the nature and appearance of the project area. However, this impact would be less than significant given that the majority of proposed development would be located adjacent to existing uses where disturbance to the natural environment has already occurred. The proposed project would result in new sources of light and glare. Implementation of mitigation measures would reduce this impact to less than significant.

2.2.3 AIR QUALITY

Future development within the proposed project area would result in significant and unavoidable increases in air pollutants during construction and operation of the project due to the exceedance of established air quality standards. The proposed project would not be consistent with air quality attainment plan criteria, which would result in a significant and unavoidable impact.

2.2.4 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Cumulatively considerable increases in air pollutants during operation of future development of the project would result in a significant and unavoidable cumulative contribution of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions to global climate change.

2.2.5 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The proposed project would result in potentially significant impacts due to the loss of wildlife habitat, direct loss of wildlife, wildlife disturbance from increase human presence, and removal of habitat for special-status species. Potentially significant impacts to wetland and riparian areas due to vegetation removal, disruption of wetland hydrology from potential increases and/or decreases in hydrologic input during project operation, and wetland habitat degradation from sedimentation and/or contaminated stormwater runoff during the life of the project have also been identified. Finally, future development associated with the proposed project could result in the direct loss of special-status plants during construction and direct loss of terrestrial plant communities. All these impacts would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures.

2.2.6 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Future development within the proposed project area could potentially damage or destroy prehistoric, historic, archaeological or paleontological resources during project construction resulting in potentially significant impacts. Implementation of mitigation measures would reduce these impacts to less than significant.

2.2.7 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

The proposed project areas are not located within or near an Alquist-Priolo special study zone and, therefore, impacts associated with rupture of a known earthquake fault are not anticipated. The proposed project could result in potentially significant impacts due to structural damage and safety risks from seismic hazards (ground shaking and seismically induced settlement, liquefaction, and dam failure) and potentially unstable soils (landslides, subsidence, or expansive soil). In addition, potential soil erosion during construction of future development could result in a potentially significant impact. Implementation of mitigation measures would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.

2.2.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The proposed project could result in a hazard to the public or environment from accidental exposure to hazardous materials during the construction and operation of future development. Given the location of Sites 3 through 9 in the Nevada County Airport Influence Area, future development could also result in safety hazards to people living or working in the area. Future development on sites 3 through 9 would require adherence to all policies established by the Nevada County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan to reduce safety hazards related to aviation accidents. Finally, the project could put people and structures at risk due to potential wildland fires. All these impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of mitigation measures.

2.2.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Construction and operation of the proposed project could result in water quality degradation of surface waters within the project area. Protective and enhancement measures to minimize impacts would be required for future development of the sites. Vegetation removal, grading and construction would alter existing drainage patterns and could result in potential erosion and/or siltation. The project would increase the amount of impervious surface on-site, which would change existing absorption rates, drainage patterns and the amount of stormwater runoff and could result in potential flooding on- and off-site. BMPs and green building design features, which would be required by Mitigation Measure 4.10-1b, would help reduce the velocity of flows and encourage infiltration before runoff enters the stormwater drainage system. Only Sites 10 and 13 in the Penn Valley Area were identified to be within the 100-year floodplain. None of the other sites were at risk of being within a 100-year flood hazard area. Implementation of mitigation measures described in this EIR would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

2.2.10 NOISE

Temporary increases in noise and groundbourne vibration during construction of the proposed project would result in potentially significant impacts. However, none of the roadway segments would experience a 3 dB increase or more between the No Project and Plus Project conditions. Thus, implementation of the proposed project would not result in a

significant increase in traffic noise levels. Construction noise impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of mitigation measures.

2.2.11 POPULATION AND HOUSING

No housing or people would be displaced by the proposed project requiring construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The project would induce population growth within the County and City of Grass Valley. Population growth was anticipated County General Plan and no impacts have been identified. However, the proposed densities for the project sites within the City's Sphere of Influence area are higher than what is considered in the City's current General Plan. As such, the project would induce growth within the City upon annexation of the properties into the City of Grass Valley.

2.2.12 PUBLIC SERVICES, UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

The proposed project would result in increased demand for fire and police protection services, libraries, hospitals, and public schools. Payment of development impact fees and increased revenue from property and sales taxes would help offset the increased cost of services, personnel, equipment and infrastructure. Mitigation requiring the replacement of some sections of the County and City's sewer pipeline would address this impact. Increases in potable water demand and wastewater flows from future development within the proposed project areas would also result in potential impacts. Mitigation measures are proposed to ensure that adequate water supplies and sewer capacity are available prior to future development receiving service. However it is unknown what the capacity of the water or wastewater facilities will be at the time of construction, Furthermore, the County does not have jurisdiction over the timing of when wastewater improvements would occur within the City of Grass Valley. Thus, potential impacts on water and wastewater service would remain significant and unavoidable.

2.2.13 RECREATION

Future development within the proposed project areas could result in the physical deterioration of community and regional parks due to increased use from additional population generated by the proposed project. In addition, increases in air emissions, dust, noise and erosion during construction of future park and open space amenities could result in potentially significant impacts. Implementation of mitigation measures described in this EIR would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

2.2.14 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

The proposed project would add traffic to the following intersections causing each intersection to operate at an unacceptable level of service (LOS) in the PM peak hour: Idaho-Maryland Road and Brunswick Road; La Barr Meadows Drive and McKnight Way; and, Brunswick Road and Ranchview Court. Mitigation measures identified in the EIR could reduce potentially significant traffic impacts at these intersections to a less than significant level.

In addition to adding traffic to existing intersections, the project would construct new project driveways along the project area street network. Restricted sight distance and close spacing of these intersections would result in impacts to safety and traffic operations. Mitigation measures identified in the EIR would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. However, the mitigation measures involve substantial intersection improvements including

the construction of roundabouts. It is unknown when the intersection improvements would occur as part of the Grass Valley Capital Improvement Program. It is also unknown if the construction of the complete intersection would be feasible for a single project developer. Furthermore, the County of Nevada does not have jurisdiction over the approval of construction or timing of when the improvement would occur within the City of Grass Valley. As such, potential impacts on these intersections would remain significant and unavoidable.

Cumulative traffic to the following intersections would cause each intersection to operate at an unacceptable LOS: Nevada City Highway and Brunswick Road; Brunswick Road and Town Talk Road; SR 49 Northbound Ramps and McKnight Way; and SR 49 and Combie Road. Implementation of mitigation measures would reduce cumulative traffic impacts to less than significant however, the County of Nevada does not have jurisdiction over the approval of funding or construction timing of when the improvement would occur within the City of Grass Valley. For this reason, these cumulative traffic impacts remain significant and unavoidable.

2.3 GROWTH INDUCING AND CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Chapter 5 of this Draft EIR evaluates the cumulative and growth-inducing impacts of the proposed project. In general, with implementation of the specified mitigation measures, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts would not be significant. However, the proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable cumulatively considerable contributions of criteria air pollutants in the Mountain Counties Air Basin during the next twenty years, as well as significant and unavoidable contributions of GHG emissions to global climate change. The project would result in significant and unavoidable cumulatively considerable contributions to public services (water and wastewater services) and to identified intersections within the City of Grass Valley Sphere of Influence. The project is not expected to induce unplanned growth or development in the vicinity of the project with the County, but would induce growth within the City of Grass Valley based on existing land patterns identified in the City's General Plan.

2.4 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

2.4.1 LAND USE AND PLANNING

As described in Section 4.2 (Land Use and Planning), future development within the proposed project sites would result in the following significant and unavoidable impacts:

- Conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project site.

As the proposed project proposes densities of multi-family high-density residential developments of 16 to 20 units per acre, the proposed project is inconsistent with the current City of Grass Valley 2020 General Plan Land Use Map designation for the Sites 1 through 9. Conflicts with the existing Grass Valley General Plan would be considered significant. Although mitigation is included that would require the County and City of Grass Valley to develop an agreement to address proposed density changes, the conflicts would remain until there was a change in the Grass Valley General Plan. Acceptance of an agreement by the City of Grass Valley or a change in the City's General Plan is outside the jurisdiction of the County and potential conflicts would remain significant and unavoidable.

2.4.2 AIR QUALITY

As described in Section 4.5 (Air Quality), future development within the proposed project sites would result in the following significant and unavoidable impacts:

- Exceedance of standards for fugitive dust, reactive organic gases (ROG) and exhaust during construction activities.

Despite compliance with mitigation measures, emissions associated with fugitive dust, ROG and exhaust during construction of the proposed project would exceed Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District (NSAQMD) thresholds. Thus, the project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact.

- Total operational air emissions.

Mobile source emissions generated by vehicle traffic associated with the proposed project and area source emissions would exceed established NSAQMD thresholds. Although mitigation is included that incorporates appropriate NSAQMD recommendations to reduce emissions, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

- Inconsistent with Air Quality Management Plan.

The proposed project would result in significant air quality impacts and would, therefore, conflict with the applicable air quality management plan. The significant air quality impacts could contribute to a pollutant for which the area is in non-attainment. Despite mitigation, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

It should be noted that the Grass Valley City Council adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations (Resolution No. 99-64) regarding mobile source air quality impacts for the 2020 General Plan. The resolution stated that even after incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures, regional mobile source emissions impacts from implementation of the 2020 General Plan would remain significant and unavoidable.

2.4.3 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

As described in Section 4.6 (Greenhouse Gas Emissions), future development within the proposed project sites would result in the following significant and unavoidable impacts:

- Cumulative contribution of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions to global climate change.

Currently, there are no specific development proposals associated with the proposed Housing Element Rezone. Therefore, the degree and extent of future project compliance with the General Plan policies and implementation measures is not yet known and the project details necessary to calculate emission reductions are not available at this time. Future development associated with implementation of the Housing Element Rezone would need to be analyzed on a project-by-project basis to determine the extent of each project's potential contribution to global climate change and appropriate mitigation measures specific to each project. Thus, at this stage of analysis, GHG impacts associated with implementation of the Housing Element Rezone would be significant and unavoidable.

2.4.4 POPULATION AND HOUSING

As described in Section 4.12 (Population and Housing), future development within the proposed project sites would result in the following significant and unavoidable impacts:

- Would directly induce population growth in the City of Grass Valley.

The proposed project's estimated contribution of 2,960 residents located within the City's SOI would represent approximately 28 percent of the City's anticipated population growth and would occur over a 10- to 20-year timeframe. However, the proposed densities for the project sites within the City's SOI area are higher than what is considered in the City's current General Plan. As such, the project would induce growth within the City upon annexation of the properties into the City of Grass Valley. No feasible mitigation measures have been identified. The County of Nevada does not have land use authority over the City of Grass Valley to amend or alter the City's existing planning policies or the existing General Plan. Potential impacts are a result of population growth would be significant and unavoidable.

2.4.5 PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

As described in Section 4.13 (Public Services and Utilities), future development within the proposed project sites would result in the following direct and cumulative significant and unavoidable impacts:

- The Proposed Project could result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that it has inadequate capacity to provide for the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.

The County has established sewer capacity service requirements for development within its jurisdiction. Without proposed improvements to existing WWTPs there would not be sewer service available for the proposed project Sites 10 through 18 and the proposed project would result in potentially significant impact.

The City's WWTP will need to be enlarged to handle future flows from throughout the City's system to meet the City's project population in the Year 2020. The City has established sewer capacity service requirements for development within their jurisdiction. Without proposed improvements to existing the City's existing WWTP there would not be sewer service available for the proposed project sites and the proposed project would result in potentially significant impact.

Mitigation has been identified that would reduce potential impacts to less than significant, however, this impact remains significant and unavoidable because it is unknown what the capacity of the wastewater treatment facilities would be at the time of project construction. It is also unknown if completion of the required wastewater facility improvements would be feasible for a single project developer. Furthermore, the County does not have jurisdiction over the timing of when wastewater improvements would occur within the City of Grass Valley.

- Sufficient water supplies are available to serve the Proposed Project from existing entitlements and resources; no new or expanded entitlements would be required.

Development of Sites 2, and 10 through 18 would require new water infrastructure improvements to bring potable water to these sites. Water line extensions would be within existing roadways or right of ways. These improvements would have to be in place prior to construction on each of these sites. With unknown timing or enforcement mechanism for these improvements, a potentially significant impact would occur as a result of insufficient infrastructure.

Mitigation has been identified that would reduce potential impacts to less than significant; however, this impact remains significant and unavoidable because it is unknown what the capacity of the potable water facilities would be at the time of project construction. It is also

unknown if completion of the required water infrastructure improvements would be feasible for a single project developer. Furthermore, the County does not have jurisdiction over the timing of when wastewater improvements would occur within the City of Grass Valley.

2.4.6 TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION

As described in Section 4.15 (Traffic and Circulation), future development within the proposed project sites would result in the following direct and cumulative significant and unavoidable impacts:

- Project would add traffic to the intersection of Idaho-Maryland Road and Brunswick Road. This intersection is projected to operate at LOS F (unacceptable) in the PM peak hour.

To mitigate direct traffic impacts on the Idaho-Maryland Road and Brunswick Road intersection, a new roundabout is required at this intersection. However, the County of Nevada does not control the timing or implementation of construction because the intersection is within the jurisdiction of the City of Grass Valley. Additionally, it is not known whether it is feasible for one project applicant to construct the roundabout in its entirety as part of a single development project. Therefore, the developer shall pay a fair share contribution to the City of Grass Valley Development Impact Fee Capital Improvement Program towards the construction cost of this future intersection improvement. Therefore, the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- Project would add traffic to the intersection of La Barr Meadows Drive and McKnight Way. This intersection is projected to operate at LOS F on the worst approach (unacceptable) in the PM peak hour.

To mitigate direct impacts at the La Barr Meadows and McKnight Way intersection, dual roundabouts would be required to be constructed. However, the County of Nevada does not control the timing or implementation of construction because the intersection is within the jurisdiction of the City of Grass Valley. Additionally, it is not known whether it is feasible for one project applicant to construct the required dual roundabouts in their entirety as part of a single development project. Therefore, the developer shall pay a fair share contribution to the City of Grass Valley Development Impact Fee Capital Improvement Program towards the construction cost of this future intersection improvement. The impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- Project would add traffic to the intersection of Brunswick Road and Triple Crown Road (Sites 3-6, and 9 access road). This intersection is projected to operate at an overall LOS E and LOS F on the worst approach (unacceptable) in the PM peak hour.

The project developer shall install or fund the realignment of Triple Crown Road with Town Talk Road into one intersection and the installation of a traffic signal will improve intersections of Brunswick Road and Triple Crown Drive and Brunswick Road and Town Talk Road / Bubbling Wells Road to LOS B during the PM peak hour. While the proposed improvement is expected to mitigate the potential impacts to less than significant, this impact remains significant and unavoidable because the County of Nevada does not have jurisdiction over the approval of construction or timing of when the improvement would occur within the City of Grass Valley.

- Cumulative Impact - The Proposed Project would add traffic to the signalized intersection of Nevada City Highway and Brunswick Road. This intersection is projected to operate at LOS E (unacceptable) in the PM peak hour.

The project developer shall pay a fair share contribution to the City of Grass Valley Development Impact Fee Capital Improvement Program towards the installation of signal timing at the intersection of Nevada City Highway and Brunswick Road to improve operations and meet future traffic volume demand. While the proposed fair share contribution is expected to reduce cumulative impacts to less than significant, this impact remains significant and unavoidable because the County of Nevada does not have jurisdiction over the approval of funding or construction of the improvement within the City of Grass Valley.

- Cumulative Impact - The proposed project would add traffic to the intersection of Brunswick road and Town Talk Road (Sites 7 and 8 access road). This intersection is projected to operate at an overall LOS E and LOS F at the worst approach (unacceptable) in the PM peak hour.

The realignment of Triple Crown Road with Town Talk Road (Sites 7 and 8 access) into one intersection and the installation of a traffic signal will improve intersections of Brunswick Road / Triple Crown Drive and Brunswick Road / Town Talk Road / Bubbling Wells Road to LOS C during the PM peak hour. The intersection does meet Caltrans peak hour signal warrant for the installation of a traffic signal. The proposed mitigation includes one additional southbound right turn lane, one southbound left turn lane, one northbound left turn lane and one northbound right turn lane. While the proposed improvement is expected to mitigate the potential impacts to less than significant, this impact remains significant and unavoidable because the County of Nevada does not have jurisdiction over the approval of construction or timing of when the improvement would occur within the City of Grass Valley.

- Cumulative Impact –Project would add traffic to the intersection of SR 49 northbound ramps and McKnight Way. This intersection is projected to operate at overall LOS E (unacceptable) in the PM Peak Hour.

Prior to the development of the project site, the Project Developer shall pay a fair share contribution to the City of Grass Valley Development Impact Fee Capital Improvement Program for the provision of the dual roundabouts on McKnight Way at the SR 49 interchange. While the proposed fair share contribution is expected to reduce cumulative impacts to less than significant, this impact remains significant and unavoidable because the County of Nevada does not have jurisdiction over the approval of funding or construction of the improvement within the City of Grass Valley.

2.5 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES EVALUATED

Chapter 6 of this EIR evaluates alternatives to the Proposed Project in accordance with the *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6. These alternatives include:

- Alternative 1: No Project/Future Development Under Existing Nevada County General Plan
- Alternative 2: East Bennett Road Sites
- Alternative 3: Berriman Ranch Alternative
- Alternative 4: Reduced Development

2.5.1 NO PROJECT/FUTURE DEVELOPMENT UNDER EXISTING NEVADA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN

Under the No Project/Future Development Under Existing Nevada County General Plan Alternative (Alternative 1), the project area would remain under the jurisdiction of Nevada County (County). Since the project site consists of 19 separate parcels (Site 8 consists of two parcels), there is a potential to develop 17 homes (assuming the two existing homes on Sites 8 and 9 remain) under County regulations. However, there would be no environmental review of the potential impacts associated with the construction of the eight homes, as their construction would require approval of a building permit only (a ministerial action) and would be exempt from the requirements of CEQA. It should be noted, that although some of the sites are zoned as Office Professional, Business Park, and Medium Density Residential Development, future developments of that nature would require a site plan, discretionary approval, and subsequently CEQA review. In addition, given the options of site design (e.g. densities), it is speculative to determine and compare the type of land use on the sites. Therefore, under the No Project Alternative it is assumed the sites would be developed with single-family residential developments.

With the exception of the potential construction of 17 homes, the existing conditions within the project area would remain primarily unchanged. The majority of the undeveloped areas on the properties (woodlands, chaparral, riparian corridors and grasslands) would continue to function in their current capacity.

None of the sites within the Grass Valley Sphere of Influence would annex into the City. The County would not be in compliance with state law with regards to providing enough property with high density residential zoning. This alternative would not satisfy the project objectives stated in Chapter 3 (Project Description), which are re-stated above.

2.5.2 EAST BENNETT ROAD SITES ALTERNATIVE

The East Bennett Road Sites Alternative (Alternative 2) would relocate approximately half of the proposed units that are located on Brunswick Road (on Sites 3 through 9) and place them on property on undeveloped land on East Bennett Road, in an area zoned for business park west of Lava Rock Road. The purpose of this alternative is to reduce the number of proposed units along Brunswick Road. The proposed project has a total of 7 sites totaling 61.52 acres and a total maximum number of 1,231 units clustered together in Sites 3 through 9. This alternative proposes to move approximately half of the units to properties off of East Bennett Road to disperse the additional demand on existing traffic facilities, sewer and water facilities, and other City of Grass Valley infrastructure. The East Bennett Road sites would be within the Grass Valley Sphere of Influence (Near Term Annexation), the same as the proposed project.

Because Sites 3, 4, 5, and 9 are under a single ownership and represent approximately half of the total acreage within the cluster of sites along Brunswick Road, those sites would remain part of the project as they are in the proposed project. Sites 3, 4, 5, and 9 represent approximately 31.49 acres and 630 units. Sites 6, 7, and 8, which total 30.03 acres and 601 units, would be dropped from the program and no development under the RH Combining District would occur on those sites. Three new sites would be selected on the north side of East Bennett Road. The new site numbers would be 6, 7, and 8 to replace those sites from the proposed project. The three sites are approximately 29.74 acres and would have a maximum yield of 595 units. Alternative 2 would generate the same number of units as the proposed project.

Alternative 2 could meet all of the project objectives with the exception of the objective requiring consenting property owners to participate in the program. Property owner agreement to the RH Combining District was a critical objective of the County Board of Supervisors from the very beginning of the implementation program. Only sites with property owner consent were considered for inclusion in the project.

2.5.3 BERRIMAN RANCH SITES ALTERNATIVE

As shown in Figure 6-1, the Berriman Ranch Sites Alternative (Alternative 3) includes two separate sites. The larger of the two sites includes a 25.2 acre site (portions of APNs 22-160-03 and 22-160-02) within the proposed 129-acre Berriman Ranch Project. The smaller of the two parcels is located across SR 49 to the west adjacent to Site 2. Only a portion, of this 19 site (APN 09-620-12) adjacent to Site 2 would be used for this Alternative. Approximately 8 acres of this site, the area adjacent to Site 2, would be used for development associated with the implementation of the RH Combining District. The 121-acre Berriman Ranch Property is located adjacent to the city boundary of Grass Valley. Currently, there is no improved access to the 25.2 acre site. An access road would have to be extended from an existing public road or through a private road easement. The eight acre site would be accessed off of La Barre Meadows Road which runs along the property frontage or through a connection to Site 2.

For Alternative 3, the new site numbers would be 6 and 7 to replace those sites removed from the proposed project. The two new sites included in this alternative are approximately 33.2 acres and would have a maximum yield of 595 units. The proposed project would have a maximum yield of 2,680 units, and Alternative 3 would yield a maximum of 2,744 units, an increase of 69 units. Alternative 3 could meet all of the project objectives with the exception of the objective requiring consenting property owners to participate in the program. Property owner agreement to the RH Combining District was a critical objective of the County Board of Supervisors from the very beginning of the implementation program. Only sites with property owner consent were considered for inclusion in the proposed project.

2.5.4 REDUCED DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE

The Reduced Development Alternative (Alternative 4) removes four of the most environmentally sensitive sites from the program to minimize the environmental effects of implementing the Housing Element Rezone. The purpose of this alternative is to remove the sites with the most physical constraints to development such that the overall environmental impact of the implementing the program is reduced, yet still leaving enough opportunity to for the County to meet the required Regional Housing needs and state law. The sites that have the most physical constraints were removed to decrease impacts on biological resources, cultural resources, traffic, aesthetics, and other issues that would be adversely affected by development.

The following sites would be removed from the project under this alternative:

Site 7: This site is removed because of physical constraints associated with the property. A tributary to Wolf Creek traverses the southeast portion of the site as well as intermittent streams riparian vegetation on other places throughout the site. Potential historic resources were identified at this site. Additionally, as one of the three largest parcels in the cluster of sites along Brunswick Road, it has one of the highest maximum yield of units at 198 units. Removal of these units would reduce the amount of traffic from this cluster of development. Additionally, this site is located adjacent to the recently approved Loma Rica Ranch Project.

By removing this site from the program it would provide an additional visual and physical buffer from the future development on the Loma Rica Ranch site.

Site 8: This site has similar physical constraints as those described for Site 7 and has been removed from the program for the same reasons. A tributary to Wolf Creek traverses the site near the center of the property which substantially restricts the amount of area available for development due to wetland protection requirements. Intermittent wetlands also are located along the property frontage of Brunswick Road which would result in potential wetland impacts associated with roadway improvements.

Site 14: This site is removed because of physical constraints on the property. This site contains a well-developed blue oak woodland over approximately 80% of the site which makes avoidance difficult. The project site is located on a hillside which would require grading with manufactured slopes that would be visible from SR 49.

Site 17: This site is removed because of the physical constraints associated with developing the property. The site is bisected by Ragsdale Creek and has a wide riparian zone associated with the creek that would make avoidance difficult. The site also contains sensitive black oak dominated woodland outside the riparian zone. Ragsdale Creek is potential habitat for sensitive aquatic species.

This alternative would reduce the total acreage of properties in the program by 37.36 acres or 25%. The maximum number of units would be reduced by 637 units or 24%.

The Reduced Development Alternative would be able to satisfy a majority of the project objectives as well as provide the County with enough area to meeting the Regional Housing Needs requirements and satisfy state law for providing adequate multi-family housing development opportunities.

2.5.5 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA requires the identification of the environmentally superior alternative in an EIR, which is an alternative that would result in the fewest or least significant environmental impacts. If the "No Project" Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6 (e)(2) requires that another alternative that could feasibly attain most of the project's basic objectives be chosen as the environmentally superior alternative. Based on the above analysis, summarized in Table 6-1, the environmentally superior alternative is the Reduced Development Alternative. The majority of impacts would be the reduced compared to those identified for the proposed project. Specifically, impacts associated with land use and planning; aesthetics; air quality; biological resources; cultural resources; hydrology and water quality; noise; public services, utilities and service systems; and transportation/traffic would be reduced under the Reduced Development Alternative.

2.6 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY AND ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

CEQA Guidelines Section 15123 requires that EIRs summarize areas of controversy known to the lead agency and issues to be resolved. Issues were identified during both the Notice of Preparation (NOP) review period and the public scoping meeting.

Two areas of controversy were identified during the NOP comment period:

1. A letter from the City of Grass Valley questioned whether a large concentration of proposed high density housing should be located in one area (Brunswick Road)

adjacent to the City of Grass Valley; forcing the City to accommodate the increased demand on infrastructure and increased traffic volumes.

2. A resident from the Broken Oak Court neighborhood in the Penn Valley area questioned whether more high density housing was needed or appropriate in that area.

Comment letters received from organizations and agencies in response to the NOP are presented in Appendix A.

2.7 MITIGATION MONITORING

CEQA requires public agencies to set up monitoring and reporting programs to ensure compliance with those mitigation measures adopted or made as a condition of project approval to mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects identified in an EIR. A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program incorporating the mitigation measures set forth in this document will be considered and acted upon by County decision-makers for adoption concurrent with adoption of the findings of this EIR and prior to a determination on whether or not to approve the proposed project.

2.8 SUMMARY TABLE

Table 2-1, *Summary of Impacts and Mitigation*, which begins on the following page, provides a summary of the potentially significant impacts identified in this EIR for the proposed project, the level of significance before mitigation, proposed mitigation measures, and the level of significance after mitigation.

The following mitigation measures are intended to outline the anticipated responsible agency that has jurisdictional oversight of the regulations, specifications and design standards that apply to the required improvement. Sites 1-9 are located within the City of Grass Valley Sphere of Influence, and it is anticipated that they will require annexation prior to development, and therefore, the City is listed as the implementing/monitoring agency for the mitigation measures that apply to those sites. In the event that these sites do not annex into the City and do not require City services, the implementing/monitoring agency shall automatically default to the County of Nevada. In the event that the mitigation measure requires improvements to a City facility, such as an intersection already within the City limits, the City of Grass Valley shall remain as the implementing and monitoring agency regardless of whether or not the site is eventually annexed into the City.

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation**

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Land Use and Planning			
4.2-1 - The Proposed Project could conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project.	Potentially Significant Impact	4.2-1 The County of Nevada shall develop a policy agreement with the City of Grass Valley regarding exchange density calculations between the jurisdictions. The purpose of this agreement is to obtain parity among the jurisdictions regarding the provision of urban high density residential housing to satisfy state mandated housing requirements and other housing or density needs as appropriate. The County shall develop this agreement and submit to the City prior to the issuance of development permits for this first project site. Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: County of Nevada	Significant and Unavoidable Impact. While the mitigation would address the density conflicts with the City of Grass Valley, the conflicts would remain until there was a change in the Grass Valley General Plan. Acceptance of an agreement by the City of Grass Valley or a change in the City's General Plan is outside the jurisdiction of the County and potential conflicts would remain significant.
Aesthetics			
4.3-1 - Grading and construction associated with implementation of the Proposed Project would alter the visual appearance of the project area.	Potentially Significant Impact	The following mitigation measure applies to all sites. 4.3-1 - Construction equipment staging areas shall use appropriate screening (i.e., temporary fencing with opaque material) to buffer views of construction equipment and material, when feasible. Staging locations shall be approved by the County or City Engineer prior to the commencement of construction of each phase of the project. Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 1-9, City of Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed. County of Nevada for Sites 10-18.	Less Than Significant Impact
4.3-2 - Implementation of the Proposed Project may have an adverse effect on a scenic vista.	Less Than Significant Impact	No mitigation required	Less Than Significant Impact
4.3-3 - Project implementation may permanently degrade the existing visual character/quality of the project area.	Potentially Significant Impact	The following mitigation measure applies to all sites. 4.3-3 - Prior to approval of a development proposal for a property within the RH Combining District (or as part of the annexation request for Sites 1-9), the project shall require design review approval by the Planning Commission to ensure landscaping, lighting, parking, layout and building design are compatible with the surrounding development, natural resources, and/or historic features within the project area. However, since the density of development is determined at the time the site is rezoned to add the RH	Less Than Significant Impact

Table 2-1, continued

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Combining District, design review will not include a review of the density of the project. The density shall be based on the State mandated 16-units minimum per acre but will allow for a maximum of 20-units per acre on sites within the Grass Valley Sphere of Influence.</p> <p>All future developments associated with the proposed project would be required to follow the specific design principles and standards that respect the goals, objectives, and policies of the Nevada County General Plan and the City of Grass Valley 2020 General Plan, as well as any area plan design guidelines that each site may be located within. Such design guidelines will ensure each development is providing a balance between development and the natural environment.</p> <p>Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 1-9, City of Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed. County of Nevada for Sites 10-18.</p>	
<p>4.3-4 - The Proposed Project may generate additional sources of light and glare beyond existing conditions from urban lighting and vehicular traffic.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>	<p>The following mitigation measure applies to all sites.</p> <p>4.3-4 - For all future projects in the in the proposed project area, all potentially reflective building materials and surfaces shall be painted or otherwise treated to minimize reflectivity, except as necessary to achieve desired green building objectives. All glass used on external building walls shall be low-reflectivity.</p> <p>Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 1-9, City of Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed. County of Nevada for Sites 10-18.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>
<p>Cumulative Impact - Project implementation may permanently degrade the existing visual character/quality of the project area.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>	<p>The following mitigation measure applies to all sites.</p> <p>Implement Mitigation Measures 4.3-1, 4.3-3 and 4.3-4.</p> <p>Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 1-9, City of Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed. County of Nevada for Sites 10-18.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>
Biological Resources			
<p>4.4-1 - The Proposed Project has the potential to adversely affect special-status plant species.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>	<p>The following mitigation measure applies to Sites 2, 3, 7 through 13, 17, and 18.</p> <p>4.4-1a - Prior to approval of a Site Plan, grading plan, or any permit authorizing construction for a property within the RH Combining District, the project developer shall to the satisfaction of the Director of the County Planning</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>

Table 2-1, continued

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Department (or City of Grass Valley Planning Department for Sites 2, 3, 7, 8 and 9):</p> <p>Designate wetland and riparian habitat areas an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) consistent with the ESA exhibits shown in Section 3.0 of this EIR on all Site Plans, grading plans, or any permit authorizing construction for a property within the RH Combining District. No construction shall be permitted within the ESAs, unless as part of a management plan consistent with Nevada County Land Use and Development Code Section L-II 4.3.17, is approved by the County Planning Department. For projects located within the Grass Valley SOI, a Wetland and Riparian Mitigation Monitoring Program shall be approved by the City Planning Department. The boundaries of the ESAs shall be clearly shown on all final plans and specifications.4.4-1b - During ground disturbance activities associated with the Grass Valley sites, the construction contractor shall comply with CARB’s Airborne Toxic Control Measures (ATCM) addressing NOA (Section 93105 and 93106 of Title 17 of the California Code of Regulations). These ATCMs regulate construction, grading, quarrying, and surface mining operations, as well as surfacing applications.</p> <p>Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 2, 3, 7-9, City of Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed. County of Nevada for Sites 10-13, 17, and 18.</p> <p>The following mitigation measure applies to all sites:</p> <p>4.4-1b Prior to approval of a Site Plan, grading plan, or any permit authorizing construction for a property within the RH Combining District, the project developer shall to the satisfaction of the Director of the County Planning Department (or City of Grass Valley Planning Department for Sites 1-9):</p> <p>i) Conduct focused special status plant surveys within and adjacent to (within 100 feet, where appropriate) the proposed impact area, which will include impacts from project construction (temporary construction zone and staging areas) or by post-construction fuel management. Surveys shall be conducted during the appropriate time of year to determine the presence of special-status plant</p>	

Table 2-1, continued

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>species that have been identified as potentially occurring on the project site. Surveys shall be conducted in accordance with the Guidelines for Assessing the Effects of Proposed Projects on Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Plants and Natural Communities (CDFG 2000). Field surveys shall be scheduled to coincide with known flowering periods (for the specific species) and/or during periods of physiological development that are necessary to identify the plant species of concern. According to the known blooming periods, surveys would need to be conducted in May or June and again in July or August; however, unusual weather may affect blooming periods so reference sites should be checked.</p> <p>It is important for the required plant survey to be scheduled in time to allow for salvage and transplantation, if required, prior to initiation of project grading. Specifically, if construction is to be initiated during or prior to September in any year, the survey will need to be completed during the previous calendar year in order to satisfy the mitigation measure requirements. Project approval conditions should include language that alerts project proponents to this circumstance to avoid costly construction delays.</p> <p>The survey report, including a description of methods, map of area surveyed, results, and a complete list of all plant taxa found during the survey, shall be provided to County staff prior to initiation of any grading or equipment operation. If no occurrences of special-status species are found, no further mitigation is required.</p> <p>ii) If any federally or state-listed, CNPS Rare Plant Rank 1 or 2 plant species are found within or adjacent to (within 100 feet) the proposed impact area during the surveys, the CDFW (in the case of state-only listed plants) and/or USFWS (in the case of federally listed plants), as applicable, shall be notified regarding the status and location of the plant and the necessary approval and/or permits obtained. These plant species shall be avoided to the extent feasible. Avoidance measures shall include fencing of the population(s) before construction, exclusion of project activities from the fenced-off areas (no ingress of personnel or equipment), and construction monitoring</p>	

Table 2-1, continued

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>by a qualified biologist. Avoidance areas shall be identified on project plans. If these plants cannot be avoided completely, the following mitigation measures shall be applied:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Before the approval of grading plans or any groundbreaking activity within the project site, the project developer shall submit a mitigation plan concurrently to the CDFW (in the case of state-only listed plants) and/or USFWS (in the case of federally listed plants) for review and comment, and the developer may consult with these entities before approval of the plan. The plan shall include mitigation measures for the population(s) to be directly affected. Possible mitigation for the population(s) that would be removed during construction of the project includes implementation of a program to transplant, salvage, cultivate, or re-establish the species at suitable sites. The mitigation ratio for directly impacted plant species shall be at a minimum ratio of 2:1. The actual level of mitigation may vary depending on the sensitivity of the species (its rarity or endangerment status), its prevalence in the area, and the current state of knowledge about overall population trends and threats to its survival. Alternatively, replacement credits may be purchased by the project developer at an approved mitigation bank should such credits be available. • Transplantation of existing special-status plants could be undertaken to move the plant(s) to a suitable habitat location, either within the project site or at an off-site preserve to be protected in perpetuity. The off-site preserve shall include similar soil, climate, and associated plant species as are currently present at the project site. This location will be protected in perpetuity under a conservation easement and managed appropriately to ensure the transplantation is a success. Please note, however, that for some species transplantation may not be a successful or effective method for conservation, as requirements for some species are highly specialized and not clearly understood. Thus, transplantation shall only be used where success can be assured. Avoidance shall be required for special-status plant species that cannot 	

Table 2-1, continued

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>be transplanted, salvaged or cultivated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If on-site preservation is determined to be feasible, a conservation easement shall be placed over project open space areas to preserve the mitigation areas in perpetuity. <p>Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 1-9, City of Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed. County of Nevada for Sites 10-18.</p> <p>The following mitigation measure applies to all sites.</p> <p>4.4-1c Appropriate Permits: Prior to approval of a Site Plan, grading plan, or any permit authorizing construction for a property within the RH Combining District, the project developer shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Director of the County Planning Department, that the project developer has obtained all permits and authorizations required by federal, state, regional and local jurisdictions to proceed with their development proposals. These could include incidental take permits that set forth specific measures to minimize, avoid, or fully mitigate impacts to listed species. This should also include, for sites with mapped ESAs, a demonstration of how the development footprint will avoid all ESAs on the project site. Measures could also include limiting operating periods such as prohibiting grading during the wet season (October to May), requiring 100 foot buffers to disturbance and fencing for sensitive areas, design revisions, and species relocation by soil salvage, seed collection, or other means approved by the agencies with jurisdiction. Prior to development of any individual site, additional species could be listed or designated as special-status, and the future developers of the Housing Element Rezone Implementation Program project sites shall comply with any new requirements of the USFWS or CDFW for such species, as may be imposed through subsequent consultation, if necessary.</p> <p>Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 1-9, City of Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed. County of Nevada for Sites 10-18.</p>	
4.4-2 - The Proposed Project has the potential to adversely affect special-	Potentially Significant Impact	The following mitigation measure applies to Sites 2 through 18:	Less Than Significant Impact

Table 2-1, continued

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
status wildlife species.		<p>Valley Elderberry Long Beetle</p> <p>4.4-2a Prior to approval of a Site Plan, grading plan, or any permit authorizing construction for a property within the RH Combining District, the project developer shall to the satisfaction of the Director of the County Planning Department (or City of Grass Valley Planning Department for Sites 3-9):</p> <p>Conduct surveys for the elderberry shrub VELB host plant prior to site disturbance within riparian or wetland areas depicted in the ESA figures in Section 3.0: Project Description. Prior to development, any elderberry shrubs measuring 1.0 inch or greater in diameter shall be mapped and clearly marked in the field. At all times during development of the project, developers shall comply with the conservation guidelines set forth in USFWS's Conservation Guidelines for the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle (July 9, 1999), which guidelines generally require a buffer of 100 feet around each elderberry shrub with stems measuring 1.0 inch or greater in diameter at ground level. If encroachments into the ESA are required, consultation with USFWS shall be required as contemplated by USFWS 1999 Guidelines. Mitigation for impacts on VELB habitat shall be determined via consultation with USFWS pursuant to Section 7, Section 10, or USFWS 1999 Guidelines, as applicable, and may include onsite mitigation planting or the purchase of mitigation credits from an approved conservation bank. To avoid adverse effects on VELB, Mitigation Measures 4.4-1a, and 4.4-1c shall be implemented to ensure avoidance of elderberry shrubs and appropriate protection for this species. If necessary, agency-approved mitigation developed through the permitting process would establish the appropriate and required mitigation for impacts to this species. Note: If VELB is de-listed by the USFWS or if there is any change in the listing status of this species, the USFWS guidance in effect at the time of site development shall be followed for impacts to VELB and elderberry shrubs. Additionally, if development does not occur within 5 years on any of the proposed project sites, additional surveys would be required upon development to reassess the location of the elderberry shrub VELB.</p> <p>Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 2-9, City of</p>	

Table 2-1, continued

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed. County of Nevada for Sites 10-18.</p> <p>The following mitigation measure applies to all sites:</p> <p>4.4 -2b Prior to approval of a Site Plan, grading plan, or any permit authorizing construction for a property within the RH Combining District, the project developer shall to the satisfaction of the Director of the County Planning Department (or City of Grass Valley Planning Department for Sites 1-9):</p> <p>Conduct Pre-construction Surveys for Nesting Birds. The future developers within the RH Combining District shall avoid disturbance to active nests within or near disturbance areas. To avoid take of any active raptor nest or disturbance of other protected native birds, to the extent feasible, site disturbance shall be avoided from March 1 through August 31, which coincides with the typical nesting season for most common bird species in the region.</p> <p>If construction, grading or other project-related activities will occur during the typical nesting season, a pre-construction nesting survey shall be conducted by a qualified wildlife biologist to determine if any raptors or protected native birds are nesting in or in the immediate vicinity of vegetation that will be removed. The survey shall be conducted within 15 days prior to the start of work from March through May (since there is higher potential for birds to initiate nesting during this period), and within 30 days prior to the start of work from June through August. If active nests are found in the work area, the biologist shall determine an appropriately sized buffer around the nest in which no work shall be allowed until the young have successfully fledged. The size of the nest buffer shall be determined by the biologist, and if necessary, in consultation with the CDFW (and USFWS as appropriate). Buffer widths shall be determined based on the nesting species and its sensitivity to disturbance. The no-work buffer zone shall be delineated by highly visible temporary construction fencing.</p> <p>Monitoring of nest activity by a qualified biologist may be required if the project-related construction activity has potential to adversely affect the nest or nesting behavior of</p>	

Table 2-1, continued

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>the bird. No project-related construction activity shall commence within the no-work buffer area until a qualified biologist confirms that the nest is no longer active.</p> <p>Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 1-9, City of Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed. County of Nevada for Sites 10-18.</p> <p>The following mitigation measure applies to all sites:</p> <p>4.4-2c Protect Special-Status Wildlife Species: Where construction of future development projects within RH Combining District would occur within or near known or potential habitat for special-status species, as defined the following measures shall be implemented:</p> <p>Employ Approved Biological Monitors: Prior to commencement of grading for any phase of the project or portion thereof, a project biologist should be designated as an environmental monitor. The qualified biologist should be approved by the County and shall be present at clearing and grubbing stage or as mandated through the regulatory permitting process. Qualified biologists shall be responsible for pre-construction surveys, staking sensitive resources, onsite monitoring, documentation of violations and compliance, coordination with contract compliance inspectors, and post-construction documentation.</p> <p>Foothill Yellow-legged Frog. Suitable breeding, aestivation, and dispersal habitat for the foothill yellow-legged frog is present along perennial waterways within several of the proposed rezone sites. If disturbance would occur within 100 feet of known or potential habitat for foothill yellow-legged frog (i.e., perennial streams), pre-construction surveys shall be conducted to determine if this species is present in the disturbance area. If surveys determine that foothill yellow-legged frogs are present, a determination shall be made in consultation with CDFW as to whether or not construction would adversely impact this species and what measures shall be implemented. Measures could include limited operating periods, BMPs to avoid habitat impacts, disturbance exclusion zones, or other measures approved by CDFW.</p> <p>Western Pond Turtle. Potential basking, foraging, and</p>	

Table 2-1, continued

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>dispersal habitat for the western pond turtle is present along perennial waterways within some of the RH Combining District. Where disturbance would occur within 200 feet of potential habitat for western pond turtle (i.e., near perennial streams), pre-construction surveys shall be conducted to determine whether the proposed disturbance would adversely affect this species. This determination shall be made by a qualified biologist based on the suitability of the affected habitat for this species and/or the presence or absence of this species in the affected area as determined by surveys of suitable habitat. If pond turtles are observed, a determination shall be made in consultation with CDFW as to whether or not construction will adversely impact this species and what measures shall be implemented. Measures could include limited operating periods, BMPs to avoid habitat impacts, disturbance exclusion zones, relocation, or other measures approved by CDFW.</p> <p>Other Special-Status Wildlife Species. Prior to approval of a Site Plan, grading plan, or any permit authorizing construction for a property within the RH Combining District, the project developer shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Director of the County Planning Department, that the site has been assessed for habitat suitability for special-status species of wildlife and that appropriate surveys have been carried out, as necessary, and according to the protocol of State or federal agencies with jurisdiction over the special-status species under review. Should any special-status species be identified, the developer shall retain a qualified biologist to develop and oversee implementation of a management plan. Depending on the species identified, appropriate measures could include avoidance, impact minimization, relocation or other measures and must incorporate measures to satisfy regulatory requirements of agencies with jurisdiction over the species at issue (Mitigation Measure 4.4-1b). Where onsite avoidance is feasible, barrier fencing, stakes, flagging or other measures shall be implemented prior to site disturbance to ensure impacts are avoided.</p> <p>Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 1-9, City of Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed. County of Nevada for Sites 10-18.</p>	

Table 2-1, continued

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.4-3 The Proposed Project has the potential to directly impact wetlands and riparian areas due to vegetation removal and to indirectly affect wetlands by altering hydrology, increasing erosion and sedimentation, and/or adversely affecting water quality.</p>	<p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	<p>The following mitigation measure applies to Sites 2, 3, 7, 8 within the Grass Valley SOI.</p> <p>4.4-3a Prior to approval of a Site Plan, grading plan, or any permit authorizing construction for a property within the RH Combining District, the project developer shall to the satisfaction of the Director of the Grass Valley Planning Department:</p> <p>Develop and implement a Wetland and Riparian Mitigation Monitoring Program that provides measures that avoid, minimize, and compensate for damages and/or losses of wetland and riparian vegetation resulting from the future development proposals by completing the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoidance of wetlands and riparian areas through project design. • Maximum avoidance of wetlands and riparian areas by including fencing and using appropriate buffer zones during construction activities. Unless otherwise required through consultation with state and federal agencies, the minimum development-free setback from the top of creek bank for linear water features shall be 50 feet. For non-linear wetlands or Waters of the U.S., the minimum development-free setback shall be 25 feet. Development-free shall mean building construction and grading. • Provide measures for creek enhancement and added habitat value. • If wetlands cannot be avoided, a minimum 1:1 replacement ratio to compensate for lost extent and functioning of wetland areas. • Supervision and verification of the implementation of adopted measures, including provisions for an onsite Environmental Monitor (a qualified biologist approved by the City, USFWS and CDFW) during construction activities. <p>Unavoidable direct impacts on wetland vegetation types during construction of future development projects on Sites 2, 3, 7, and 8 shall require consultation with the appropriate jurisdiction (USACE and RWQCB) and would require a permit from these agencies. Potential impacts shall be mitigated by restoration of the affected area to</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>

Table 2-1, continued

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>pre-construction conditions, offsite compensatory mitigation, or purchase of credits in a mitigation bank, in accordance with permits issued by the ACOE, RWQCB and CDFW.</p> <p>Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 2, 3, 7, 8, City of Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed.</p> <p>The following mitigation measures apply to Sites 10 – 13, and 17:</p> <p>4.4-3b Where potential wetland impacts are involved, the following mitigation measure would apply.</p> <p>A formal wetland delineation shall be conducted for areas that will be permanently or temporarily impacted by the proposed project including driveway improvements where access to the site would otherwise be prohibited. If jurisdictional waters cannot be avoided, the project developer shall apply for a CWA Section 404 permit from the USACE and a Section 401 permit from the RWQCB. These permits shall be obtained prior to issuance of grading permits and implementation of the proposed project.</p> <p>The project developer shall ensure that the project will result in no net loss of waters of the U.S. by providing mitigation through impact avoidance, impact minimization, and/or compensatory mitigation for the impact, as determined in the CWA Section 404/401 permits. Mitigation must also be consistent with any permitting requirements of the CDFW Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement.</p> <p>Compensatory mitigation may consist of (a) obtaining credits from a mitigation bank; (b) making a payment to an in-lieu fee program that will conduct wetland, stream, or other aquatic resource restoration, creation, enhancement, or preservation activities; these programs are generally administered by government agencies or nonprofit organizations that have established an agreement with the regulatory agencies to use in-lieu fee payments collected from permit applicants; and/or (c) providing compensatory mitigation through an aquatic resource restoration, establishment, enhancement, and/or preservation activity. This last type of compensatory mitigation may be provided at</p>	

Table 2-1, continued

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>or adjacent the impact site (i.e., on-site mitigation) or at another location, usually within the same watershed as the permitted impact (i.e., off-site mitigation). The project proponent/permit applicant retains responsibility for the implementation and success of the mitigation project. Written documentation of compliance with this mitigation measure shall be provided to the County prior to construction and grading activities for the proposed project.</p> <p>Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: County of Nevada.</p>	
<p>4.4-4 The Proposed Project has the potential to indirectly impact sensitive aquatic habitat as a result of erosion, sedimentation, and/or contamination.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Impact.</p>	<p>The following mitigation measure applies to Sites 2-9, 10-13, 17, and 18: Implement Mitigation Measures 4.4-1a, 4.4-3a and 4.4-3b. Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 2-9, City of Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed. County of Nevada for Sites 10-13, 17, and 18.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>
<p>4.4-5 The Proposed Project would impact oak woodland habitat</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>	<p>The following mitigation measure applies to Sites 13 through 18: 4.4-5 Prior to approval of a Site Plan, grading plan, or any permit authorizing construction for a property within the RH Combining District, the project developer shall prepare an oak woodland Management Plan (Management Plan) as required under the Nevada County Tree Preservation and Protection Ordinance. The Management Plan shall specify measures to mitigate for the loss of oak woodland habitat values as a result of site development to ensure no net loss of oak woodland habitat. Measures could include preservation of onsite oak woodlands in a conservation easement, purchase and preservation of offsite oak woodlands, on or offsite enhancement of degraded oak woodlands, or by paying in-lieu fees into a County-approved fund used to purchase and preserve comparable oak woodland communities in the region. The Management Plan shall also include measures to protect trees during construction and following site development. Measures could include specifications for protective fencing and construction buffers, project design modifications, woodland maintenance prescriptions for fuel reduction, forest health, and habitat improvements, and specifications for appropriate uses of the woodland area following site development. The plan shall identify financial</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>

Table 2-1, continued

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		responsibility and funding sources for all measures. Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: County of Nevada.	
Air Quality			
4.5-1 – The Proposed Project would result in temporary construction related dust and vehicle emissions during construction within the project area.	Potentially Significant Impact	<p>The following mitigation measures apply to all sites.</p> <p>4.5-1a Prior to the issuance of grading permits, all construction contracts shall include dust control mitigation requirements. All construction contracts shall require the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All construction activities shall be subject to the requirements of the NSAQMD’s Regulation 2, Rule 226 regarding dust control. ▪ Alternatives to open burning of vegetative material on the project site shall be used unless deemed infeasible by the NSAQMD. Suitable alternatives are chipping, mulching, or conversion to biomass fuel. ▪ Contractors shall be responsible for ensuring that adequate dust control measures are implemented in a timely manner during all phases of project development and construction. ▪ All material excavated, stockpiled, or graded shall be sufficiently watered, treated, or covered to prevent fugitive dust from leaving the property boundaries and causing a public nuisance or violation of an ambient air standard. Watering shall occur at least twice daily, with complete site coverage, preferably in the mid-morning and after work is completed each day. ▪ All areas (including unpaved roads) with vehicle traffic shall be watered or have a dust palliative applied as necessary for stabilization of dust emissions. ▪ All onsite vehicle traffic shall be limited to a speed of 15 mph on unpaved roads. ▪ All land clearing, grading, earth moving or excavation activities shall be suspended as necessary to prevent excessive windblown dust when winds are expected to exceed 20 miles per hour. Temporary traffic control shall be provided during all phases of the construction to improve traffic flow as deemed appropriate by the County and/or applicable local agencies. 	Significant and Unavoidable Impact

Table 2-1, continued

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Construction activities shall be scheduled to direct construction traffic flow to off-peak hours as much as possible. ▪ All inactive portions of the construction site shall be covered, seeded, or watered until a suitable cover is established. Alternatively, apply nontoxic soil stabilizers (according to manufacturer’s specifications) to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas which remain inactive for 96 hours) in accordance with County standards. Acceptable materials that may be used for chemical soil stabilization include petroleum resins, asphaltic emulsions, acrylics, and adhesives, which do not violate Regional Water Quality Control Board or California Air Resources Board standards. ▪ Track-out devices (e.g., gravel pads, wheel shakers, etc.) or wheel washers shall be installed where project vehicles and/or equipment enter and/or exit onto paved streets from unpaved roads. Vehicles and/or equipment shall be washed prior to each trip, as necessary to prevent visible dust emissions from adhering dirt or deposition on roadways. ▪ All material transported offsite shall be either sufficiently watered or securely covered to prevent public nuisance. ▪ Ground cover shall be re-established onsite through seeding and watering in accordance with the local grading ordinance. ▪ All mobile and stationary equipment shall be properly maintained. ▪ The County shall require projects to utilize best management practices and the use of construction equipment that meets applicable non-road diesel fuel emission standards. <p>4.5-1b The following measures shall be implemented by the contractor to reduce ROG emissions resulting from application of architectural coatings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use high-pressure-low-volume (HPLV) paint applicators with a minimum transfer efficiency of at least 50 percent; 	

Table 2-1, continued

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use required coatings and solvents with a low ROG content VOC pursuant to the limits in the U.S. EPA National Architectural Coating Rule (40 CFR Part 59); and ▪ Use pre-painted construction materials. <p>4.5-1c During ground disturbance activities associated with the Grass Valley candidate sites, the construction contractor shall comply with CARB's Airborne Toxic Control Measures (ATCM) addressing Naturally Occurring Asbestos (NOA) (Section 93105 and 93106 of Title 17 of the California Code of Regulations). These ATCMs regulate construction, grading, quarrying, and surface mining operations, as well as surfacing applications. It should be noted that this mitigation measure applies to the candidate sites within the Grass Valley sphere of influence. NOA is not anticipated to occur within the candidate sites in Penn Valley or Lake of the Pines.</p> <p>Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 1-9, City of Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed. County of Nevada for Sites 10-18.</p>	
<p>4.5-2 – The Proposed Project could result in an overall increase in local and regional mobile and stationary source emissions, which may exceed air quality standards.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>	<p>The following mitigation measures apply to all sites.</p> <p>4.5-2a Prior to the approval of any site plans, the Planning Director or City of Grass Valley Planning Director for Sites 1-9 shall confirm that all project plans incorporate the suggested mitigation measures for mobile source emissions identified in the <i>NSAQMD Draft Guidelines for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts of Land Use Projects</i> (Draft Guidelines). These measures include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Streets shall be designed to maximize pedestrian access to transit stops. ▪ Provide for onsite road and offsite bus turnouts, passenger benches, and shelters as demand and service routes warrant subject to review and approval by local transportation planning agencies. ▪ Larger projects may be required to contribute a proportionate share to the development and/or continuation of a regional transit system. Contributions may consist of dedicated right-of-way, capital improvements, easements, etc. 	<p>Significant and Unavoidable Impact</p>

Table 2-1, continued

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide for pedestrian access between bus service and major transportation points within the project, and between separate sections of the project, where feasible. ▪ Contribute to traffic-flow improvements (i.e., right-of-way, capital improvements, etc.) that reduce emissions and are not considered as substantially growth inducing. ▪ Larger projects may be required to provide for, contribute to, or dedicate land for the provision of offsite bicycle trails linking the project to designated bicycle commuting routes in accordance with an adopted citywide or countrywide bikeway plan. <p>4.5-2b Only natural gas/liquefied petroleum gas (LPG) fireplaces or stoves shall be permitted within the candidate sites. EPA Phase II-certified wood-burning fireplaces or stoves may be used if natural gas/LPG fireplaces or stoves are considered infeasible based on consultation with the County and NSAQMD. Conventional open-hearth fireplaces shall not be permitted.</p> <p>Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 1-9, City of Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed. County of Nevada for Sites 10-18.</p>	
4.5-3 - The Proposed Project could result in an overall increase in odors within the project area.	Less Than Significant Impact	No mitigation required	Less Than Significant.
4.5-4 - Carbon monoxide hot spots may occur as a result of the LRR specific plan.	Less Than Significant Impact	No mitigation required	Less Than Significant.
4.5-5 - The project may not be consistent with the air quality attainment plan (AQAP) criteria.	Potentially Significant Impact	<p>The following mitigation measure applies to all sites: Implement Mitigation Measures 4.5-1a, 4.5-1b, 4.5-1c, 4.5-2a, and 4.5-2b.</p> <p>Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 1-9, City of Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed. County of Nevada for Sites 10-18.</p>	Significant and Unavoidable Impact
Cumulative Impact - The project would result in additional vehicular travel to and from the project sites, with the	Potentially Significant Impact	<p>The following mitigation measure applies to all sites: Implement Mitigation Measures 4.5-1a, 4.5-1b, and 4.5-2.</p>	Significant and Unavoidable Impact

Table 2-1, continued

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
resultant exhaust emissions that contain ozone precursors and particulate matter. The County is within an area classified as nonattainment for Federal and State O3 and state PM10 standards.		Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 1-9, City of Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed. County of Nevada for Sites 10-18.	
Cumulative Impact - Additionally, the Housing Element Rezone's GHG emissions in combination with GHG emissions from other known and reasonably foreseeable project would result in a greater amount of GHG emissions. Therefore, the amount of cumulative GHG emissions would be cumulatively considerable, and would potentially hinder the intent and statewide reduction goals of AB 32.	Potentially Significant Impact	No additional mitigation has been identified.	Significant and Unavoidable Impact
Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
4.6-1 – Greenhouse gas emissions generated by the project would not have a significant impact on the environment.	Potentially Significant Impact	No additional mitigation has been identified.	Significant and Unavoidable Impact
4.6-2 – Implementation of the Proposed Project would not conflict with an applicable greenhouse gas reduction plan, policy, or regulation.	Less Than Significant Impact	No additional mitigation has been identified.	Less Than Significant Impact
Cultural Resources			
4.7-1 - The Proposed Project could potentially result in the damage or destruction of unique archaeological resources, as defined by Public Resources Code §21083.2(g), and historical resources, as defined by CEQA Guidelines §15064.5(a).	Potentially Significant Impact	The following mitigation measure pertains to Sites 2, 3, 7-9, 11 and 13. 4.7-1 Prior to approval of a Site Plan, grading plan, or any permit authorizing construction for a property within the RH Combining District, the project developer shall to the satisfaction of the Director of the County Planning Department (or City of Grass Valley Planning Department for Sites 1-9): Establish areas with potentially significant cultural resources as Environmentally Sensitive Areas consistent with the mapped areas in Figures 3-15 through 3-24 of this EIR. Prior to construction, all potential prehistoric and historic resources shall be designated as an ESA on project plans and specifications. No construction shall be permitted within	Less Than Significant Impact

Table 2-1, continued

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		the ESAs. Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 2, 3, 7-9, City of Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed. County of Nevada for Sites 11 and 13.	
4.7-2 - The Proposed Project could potentially result in the damage or destruction of unknown paleontological resources.	Potentially Significant Impact	The following mitigation measure applies to all sites. 4.7-2 Prior to approval of a Site Plan, grading plan, or any permit authorizing construction for a property within the RH Combining District, the project developer shall provide, to the satisfaction of the Director of the County Planning Department (or City of Grass Valley Planning Department for Sites 1-9), a letter from a qualified paleontologist that states one of the following: Should any paleontological resources (i.e., fossils) be uncovered during project construction activities, all work in the immediate vicinity shall be halted or diverted to other areas on the site and the County (or City as applicable) shall be immediately notified. A qualified paleontologist shall be retained to evaluate the finds and recommend appropriate mitigation measures for the inadvertently discovered paleontological resources. The County (or City as applicable) and the project developer shall consider the recommendations of the qualified paleontologist. The County (or City as applicable), the qualified paleontologist, and the project developer shall consult and agree upon implementation of a measure or measures that the County (or City as applicable), the qualified paleontologist, and the project developer deem feasible and appropriate. Such measures may include avoidance, preservation in place, excavation, documentation, curation, data recovery, or other appropriate measures. Further ground disturbance shall not resume within the area of the discovery until an agreement has been reached by the project developer, qualified paleontologist, and the County (or City as applicable), as well as the Native American tribal representative if relevant, as to the appropriate preservation or mitigation measures. Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 1-9, City of Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed. County of Nevada for Sites 10-18.	Less Than Significant Impact
4.7-3 - The Proposed Project could potentially result in the damage or	Potentially Significant Impact	The following mitigation measure applies to all sites. 4.7-3 Prior to approval of a Site Plan, grading plan, or any	Less Than Significant Impact

Table 2-1, continued

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>destruction of unknown archaeological resources, including human remains.</p>		<p>permit authorizing construction (or as part of the annexation request for sites 1-9) for a property within the RH Combining District, the project developer shall provide, to the satisfaction of the Director of the County Planning Department (or City of Grass Valley Planning Department for Sites 1-9), a letter from a qualified archaeologist that states the following:</p> <p>A. The project developer shall retain a qualified archaeologist meeting the Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in prehistoric or historical archaeology, as appropriate, to monitor all initial ground-disturbing activities in native soils or sediments, including all vegetation removal. If no cultural resources are identified during this phase of ground disturbance, and if determined between the qualified archaeologist and the lead agency, monitoring may be reduced to on-call status. If any prehistoric or historic artifacts or other indications of archaeological resources are found during site grading or once project construction is under way, the on-site monitor shall be empowered to temporarily halt or divert construction in the immediate vicinity of the discovery while it is evaluated for significance, and the County (or City as applicable) shall be immediately notified. Construction activities could continue in other areas. The archaeologist shall evaluate the finds and recommend appropriate mitigation measures for the inadvertently discovered cultural resources. The County and the project developer will consider the recommendations of the qualified archaeologist. The County (or City as applicable), the qualified archaeologist, and the project developer shall consult and agree upon implementation of a measure or measures that the County, the qualified archaeologist, and the project developer deem feasible and appropriate. Such measures may include avoidance, preservation in place, excavation, documentation, curation, data recovery, or other appropriate measures. Further ground disturbance shall not resume within the area of the discovery until an agreement has been reached by the project developer, the qualified project archaeologist, and the lead agency as to the appropriate preservation or mitigation measures.</p>	

Table 2-1, continued

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>B. Should cultural resources, other than human remains, be discovered during construction activities when an archaeological monitor is not present, project personnel shall halt such activities in the immediate area and notify a qualified archaeologist meeting the Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in prehistoric or historical archaeology immediately to evaluate the resource(s) encountered and recommend the development of mitigation measures for potentially significant resources consistent with PRC Section 21083.2(i). Construction activities could continue in other areas. The archaeologist shall evaluate the finds and recommend appropriate mitigation measures for the inadvertently discovered cultural resources. The County (or City, as applicable) and the project developer will consider the recommendations of the qualified archaeologist. The County (or City, as applicable), the qualified archaeologist, and the project developer shall consult and agree upon implementation of a measure or measures that the County (or City, as applicable), the qualified archaeologist, and the project developer deem feasible and appropriate. Such measures may include avoidance, preservation in place, excavation, documentation, curation, data recovery, or other appropriate measures. Further ground disturbance shall not resume within the area of the discovery until an agreement has been reached by the project developer, the qualified project archaeologist, and the lead agency, as well as the Native American tribal representative if relevant, as to the appropriate preservation or mitigation measures.</p> <p>Should the discovery include Native American human remains, in addition to the required procedures of Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, PRC Section 5097.98 and California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 15064.5(e), all work must stop in the immediate vicinity of the find and the Nevada County Coroner must be notified. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission, and the procedures outlined in CEQA Sections 15064.5(d) and (e) shall be followed.</p> <p>Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 1-9, City of</p>	

Table 2-1, continued

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed. County of Nevada for Sites 10-18.	
Geology and Soils			
4.8-1 - The Proposed Project could expose people or structures to potentially substantial adverse effects including the risk of loss, injury, or death as a result of secondary seismic hazards (ground shaking, differential compaction, liquefaction, seismically induced flooding and landslides).	Potentially Significant Impact	<p>The following mitigation measure applies to all sites:</p> <p>4.8-1 Prior to issuance of grading permits for development projects (or as part of the annexation request for sites 1-9) within the proposed project sites, a design-level investigation should be performed to ensure the findings of the Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering Report for Housing Element Rezone, Nevada County, California have been incorporated in the project design.</p> <p>Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 1-9, City of Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed. County of Nevada for Sites 10-18.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact
4.8-2 - The Proposed Project could result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	Potentially Significant Impact	<p>The following mitigation measure applies to all project sites:</p> <p>Implement Mitigation Measures 4.10-1b and 4.10-1d.</p> <p>Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 1-9, City of Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed. County of Nevada for Sites 10-18.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact
4.8-3 - The Proposed Project could be located on a geologic formation unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of construction, and potentially result in landslides or subsidence.	Potentially Significant Impact	<p>The following mitigation measure applies to all project sites:</p> <p>Implement Mitigation Measure 4.8-1 and 4.8-3.</p> <p>Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 1-9, City of Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed. County of Nevada for Sites 10-18.</p> <p>The following mitigation measure applies to Site 18:</p> <p>4.8-3 Prior to approval of a Site Plan, grading plan, or any permit authorizing construction for a property within the RH Combining District, the project developer shall to the satisfaction of the Director of the County Planning Department:</p> <p>Establish areas with slopes greater than 30% as Environmentally Sensitive Areas. Prior to construction, slopes greater than 30% shall be designated as an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) on all Site Plans, grading plans, or any plan authorizing construction for a property within the RH Combining District. No construction</p>	Less Than Significant Impact

Table 2-1, continued

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		shall be permitted within the ESAs, unless as part of a mitigation plan approved by the County. The boundaries of the ESAs shall be clearly shown on all final plans and specifications. Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: County of Nevada.	
4.8-4 - The Proposed Project could be located on expansive soil, as defined in table 18-1-b of the uniform building code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property.	Potentially Significant Impact	The following mitigation measure applies to all sites: Implement Mitigation Measure 4.8-1. Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 1-9, City of Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed. County of Nevada for Sites 10-18.	Less Than Significant Impact
Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
4.9-1 - The Proposed Project may create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.	Less Than Significant Impact	No mitigation required	Less Than Significant
4.9-2 - The Proposed Project may create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accidental conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.	Less Than Significant Impact	No mitigation required	Less Than Significant
4.9-3 - The Proposed Project may emit hazardous emissions or result in the handling of hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of a proposed school site.	Less Than Significant Impact	No mitigation required	Less Than Significant
4.9-4 - The Proposed Project would be located within an airport land use plan and could result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.	Potentially Significant Impact	The following mitigation measure applies to Sites 3 through 9. 4.9-4 All future development in the proposed project proposed within Safety Areas, as designated by the Nevada County Airpark Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), shall comply with all policies pertaining to safety hazards (including density standards) set forth in the ALUCP on a project-by-project basis, and the recordation of an Avigation Easement.	Less Than Significant Impact

Table 2-1, continued

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 3-9, City of Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed.	
4.9-5 - The Proposed Project may impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.	Less Than Significant Impact	No mitigation required	Less Than Significant
4.9-6 - The Proposed Project could expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.	Potentially Significant Impact	The following mitigation measure applies to all sites. Implement Mitigation Measures 4.13-1b and 4.13-1c. Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 1-9, City of Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed. County of Nevada for Sites 10-18.	Less Than Significant Impact
Hydrology and Water Quality			
4.10-1 - The Proposed Project could violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.	Potentially Significant Impact	<p>The following mitigation measure applies to Sites 10 and 13:</p> <p>4.10-1a Prior to approval of a Site Plan, grading plan, or any permit authorizing construction for a property within the RH Combining District, the project developer shall to the satisfaction of the Director of the County Planning Department:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Establish all floodplains as Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) in compliance with the ESA maps in Chapter 3.0. The placement of structures on sites 10 and 13 must avoid the floodplain ESA. Should development within the floodplain ESA be required, then the developer shall obtain a discretionary use permit for any development within the floodplain and a ministerial management plan for any development within the floodplain 100 foot setback. Prior to construction or vegetation removal, the floodplain ESA shall be designated as an ESA on plans and specifications. All work proposed within the ESA shall not begin until the ESAs are delineated on the ground with orange safety fencing. A biologist shall verify the limits of the ESA fencing on the ground prior to construction. The ESA fences shall remain in place for the entire duration of construction. No earthmoving activities, vehicles, heavy equipment, lay-down areas, or other construction shall be permitted within the ESAs unless as part of a mitigation plan approved by the 	Less Than Significant Impact

Table 2-1, continued

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>appropriate permitting agencies. The boundaries of the ESAs shall be clearly shown on all final plans and specifications.</p> <p>Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: County of Nevada.</p> <p>The following mitigation measure applies to all sites:</p> <p>4.10-1b Prior to approval of a Site Plan, grading plan, or any permit authorizing construction for a property within the RH Combining District, the project developer shall to the satisfaction of the Director of the County Planning Department (or City of Grass Valley Planning Department for Sites 1-9) prepare a Water Quality Management Plan that implements the following items:</p> <p>Best Management Practices to protect water quality. The contractor shall implement standard Best Management Practices during and after construction. These measures include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Construction in or near drainages shall only occur during the dry season. b) Coordination with CDFW, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and Regional Water Quality Control Board to obtain all required permits and comply with all terms and conditions of the permits. c) At no time shall heavy equipment operate in flowing water or saturated soils. d) Prior to the start of work, install silt-fencing, straw bales, sediment catch basins, straw or coir logs or rolls, or other sediment barriers to keep erodible soils and other pollutants from entering drainages. Retain existing ground cover to further reduce the potential impacts of the project on erosion along the steep bank. Before the first heavy rains and prior to removing the barriers, soil or other sediments or debris that accumulates behind the barriers shall be removed and transported away for disposal. e) Disruption of soils and vegetation near Squirrel Creek (on sites 10 and 13) shall be minimized to limit potential erosion and sedimentation; disturbed areas shall be graded to minimize surface erosion and siltation; bare 	

Table 2-1, continued

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>soils shall be immediately stabilized and re-vegetated. Seeded areas shall be covered with broadcast straw or mulch. If straw is used for mulch or for erosion control, utilize only certified weed free straw to minimize the risk of introduction of noxious weeds, such as yellow star thistle.</p> <p>f) The contractor shall exercise every reasonable precaution to protect nearby water bodies from pollution with fuels, oils, bitumen, calcium chloride and other harmful materials, Construction byproducts and pollutants such as oil, cement, and wash water shall be prevented from discharging into or near these resources and shall be collected and removed from the site. No slash or other natural debris shall be placed in or adjacent to water bodies. All construction debris and associated materials and litter shall be removed from the work site immediately upon completion.</p> <p>g) Provide copies of these BMPs to the Contractors and their workers to assure compliance with mitigation measures during construction.</p> <p>Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 1-9, City of Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed. County of Nevada for Sites 10-18.</p> <p>The following mitigation measure applies to all sites: 4.10-1c Prior to approval of a Site Plan, grading plan, or any permit authorizing construction (or as part of the annexation request for sites 1-9) for a property within the RH Combining District, the project developer shall submit, to the satisfaction of the Director of the County Public Works Department (for sites 10-18), or City Engineer (for sites 1-9), a project-specific hydrology report to verify expected pre- and post-project stormwater volumes from the proposed development, projected peak storage capacity of detention basins, and percolation characteristics of the soil. The hydrology reports shall confirm that adequate stormwater conveyance and capacity is available in either the region or onsite basins, depending on the chosen option, as well as no net increase in stormwater flow rate to the County's or City's storm drainage system.</p>	

Table 2-1, continued

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 1-9, City of Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed. County of Nevada for Sites 10-18.</p> <p>The following mitigation measure applies to Sites 1-9: 4.10-1d Prior to approval of an annexation request for a property within the RH Combining District, the project developer shall submit, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer (for Sites 1-9), a water quality management plan which include measures that filter pollutants from stormwater in order to ensure that discharged water meets applicable City standards, such as:</p> <p>Source Control BMPs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Permeable pavers/pavement ▪ Hybrid parking areas/parking groves ▪ Roof runoff controls (i.e., rain barrels) ▪ Efficient irrigation to minimize runoff of excess irrigation water <p>Treatment Control BMPs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Vegetated swales within parking lots ▪ Vegetated swales on lots (adjacent to pads) ▪ Bioretention ▪ Hydrodynamic separators/wet vaults ▪ Drain inserts <p>Flow Control BMPs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Detention <p>Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 1-9, City of Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed.</p>	
<p>4.10-2 – The Proposed Project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</p>	<p>The following mitigation measure applies to all sites: Implement Mitigation Measure 4.10-1c.</p> <p>Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 1-9, City of Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed. County of Nevada for Sites 10-18.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>
<p>4.10-3 - The Proposed Project could</p>	<p>Potentially</p>	<p>The following mitigation measure applies to all sites:</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>

Table 2-1, continued

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, which could result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.	Significant Impact	Implement Mitigation Measures 4.10-1b and 4.10-1c. Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 1-9, City of Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed. County of Nevada for Sites 10-18.	
4.10-4 - The Proposed Project could substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, which could substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site.	Potentially Significant Impact	The following mitigation measure applies to all sites: Implement Mitigation Measures 4.10-1b, 4.10-1c and 4.10-1d. Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 1-9, City of Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed. County of Nevada for Sites 10-18.	Less Than Significant Impact
4.10-5 - The Proposed Project could create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.	Potentially Significant Impact	The following mitigation measure applies to all sites: Implement Mitigation Measure 4.10-1c. Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 1-9, City of Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed. County of Nevada for Sites 10-18.	Less Than Significant Impact
4.10-6 - The Proposed Project could place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, or place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which could impede or redirect flood flows.	Potentially Significant Impact	The following mitigation measure applies to Sites 10 and 13: Implement Mitigation Measure 4.10-1a. Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: County of Nevada.	Less Than Significant Impact
4.10-7 - The Proposed Project could expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.	Potentially Significant Impact	The following mitigation measure applies to Sites 10 and 13: Implement Mitigation Measure 4.10-1a. Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: County of Nevada	Less Than Significant Impact
Noise			
4.11-1 - Construction-related activities resulting from the Proposed Project could generate noise levels in excess of established standards.	Potentially Significant Impact	The following mitigation measures apply to all sites: 4.11-1a Project developers shall ensure through contract specifications that construction best management practices (BMPs) be implemented by contractors to reduce construction noise levels. Contract specifications shall be included in construction documents, which shall be reviewed by the County or City prior to issuance of a grading or building permit (whichever is issued first) or as part of the annexation request for Sites 1-9. The construction BMPs shall include the following: • Ensure that construction equipment is properly muffled	Less Than Significant Impact

Table 2-1, continued

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>according to industry standards and be in good working condition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Place noise-generating construction equipment and locate construction staging areas away from sensitive uses, where feasible. • Implement noise attenuation measures to the extent feasible, which may include, but are not limited to, temporary noise barriers or noise blankets around stationary construction noise sources. • Use electric air compressors and similar power tools rather than diesel equipment, where feasible. • Construction-related equipment, including heavy-duty equipment, motor vehicles, and portable equipment, shall be turned off when not in use for more than 5 minutes. • Construction shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday. No construction is permitted on Sundays or legal holidays. • Construction hours, allowable workdays, and the phone number of the job superintendent shall be clearly posted at all construction entrances to allow for surrounding owners and residents to contact the job superintendent. If the County or the job superintendent receives a complaint, the superintendent shall investigate, take appropriate corrective action, and report the action taken to the reporting party. <p>4.11-1b Project developers shall require by contract specifications that heavily loaded trucks used during construction would be routed away from residential streets to the extent feasible. Contract specifications shall be included in construction documents, which shall be reviewed by the County prior to issuance of a grading permit.</p> <p>Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 1-9, City of Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed. County of Nevada for Sites 10-18.</p>	

Table 2-1, continued

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.11-2 – Construction-related activities resulting from the Proposed Project could generate or expose persons or structures to excessive ground-borne vibration.	Potentially Significant Impact	<p>The following mitigation measure applies to all sites.</p> <p>4.11-2 Future projects shall require by contract specifications that construction staging areas along with the operation of earthmoving equipment would be located as far away from vibration and noise sensitive sites as feasible. Should construction or grading activities take place within 25 feet of an occupied structure, a project specific vibration impact analysis shall be conducted, with appropriate recommendations to ensure vibration levels are below the 0.2 inch-per-second PPV significance threshold at sensitive uses. Contract specifications incorporating this measure shall be included in the proposed project construction documents, which shall be reviewed by the County prior to issuance of a grading permit or by the City as part of the annexation request for Sites 1-9.</p> <p>Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 1-9, City of Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed. County of Nevada for Sites 10-18.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact
4.11-3 - Future noise levels associated with the Proposed Project could contribute to an exceedance of the County's noise standards resulting in potential noise impacts to sensitive receptors.	Less Than Significant Impact	No mitigation required	Less Than Significant Impact.
Cumulative Mobile Noise - The Proposed Project, in conjunction with cumulative projects, would result in significant long-term mobile noise impacts, based on combined and incremental noise levels.	Potentially Significant Impact	<p>The following mitigation measures apply to all sites:</p> <p>Refer to Mitigation Measures 4.11-1a, 4.11-1b, and 4.11-2. Additional mitigation is not required.</p> <p>Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 1-9, City of Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed. County of Nevada for Sites 10-18.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact
Population and Housing			
4.12-1 - The Proposed Project would directly induce population growth in the City of Grass Valley.	Potentially Significant Impact	No feasible mitigation measures have been identified. The County of Nevada does not have land use authority over the City of Grass Valley to amend or alter the City's existing planning policies or the existing General Plan.	Significant and Unavoidable
Public Services, Utilities and Service Systems			
4.13-1 - The public service needs of the	Potentially	The following mitigation measures apply to all sites:	Less Than Significant Impact

Table 2-1, continued

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Proposed Project could result in substantial adverse impacts.</p>	<p>Significant Impact</p>	<p>4.13-1a Prior to the occupancy of any new development, the project developer shall ensure adequate staffing and fire service response times dictated by population.</p> <p>4.13-1b Construction Plan applications (or as part of the annexation request for Sites 1-9) submitted for all sites shall include a vegetation fuel management plan, which addresses overall fuels management for achieving a reduction in wildland fire intensity, subject to review and approval of the Fire Department. The plan shall also address management of the vegetative fuels in those areas that may be considered environmentally sensitive.</p> <p>4.13-1c Prior to the occupancy of any new development, the project developer shall ensure adequate staffing and police or sheriff service response times dictated by population.</p> <p>Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 1-9, City of Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed. County of Nevada for Sites 10-18.</p>	
<p>4.13-2 - The Proposed Project could result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that it has inadequate capacity to provide for the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>	<p>The following mitigation measure applies all sites:</p> <p>4.13-2 Prior to approval of a Site Plan, grading plan, or any permit authorizing construction (or as part of the annexation request for Sites 1-9) for a property within the RH Combining District, the project developer shall to the satisfaction of the Director of the County Planning Department (or City of Grass Valley Planning Department for Sites 1-9):</p> <p>Provide written documentation that adequate sewer capacity is available for the proposed development. The project developer may provide written documentation that the wastewater treatment plant has been upgraded to increase capacity or a report from a registered civil engineer demonstrating that that adequate capacity is available. If adequate sewer capacity does not exist, the developer will pay for WWTP upgrades to account for the additional effluent. The developer may develop a reimbursement agreement, if needed, to recuperate fair-share costs associated with other proposed developments nearby.</p> <p>Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 1-9, City of Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed. County of Nevada for Sites 10-18.</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable.</p> <p>This impact remains significant because it is unknown what the capacity of the wastewater treatment facilities would be at the time of project construction. It is also unknown if completion of the required wastewater facility improvements would be feasible for a single project developer. Furthermore, the County does not have jurisdiction over the timing of when wastewater improvements would occur within the City of Grass Valley.</p>

Table 2-1, continued

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.13-3 - Sufficient water supplies are available to serve the Proposed Project from existing entitlements and resources; no new or expanded entitlements would be required.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>	<p>The following mitigation measure applies all sites:</p> <p>4.13-3 Prior to approval of a Site Plan, grading plan, or any permit authorizing construction (or as part of the annexation request for sites 1-9) for a property within the RH Combining District, the project developer shall to the satisfaction of the Director of the County Planning Department (or City of Grass Valley Planning Department for Sites 1-9):</p> <p>Provide the County (or the City for Sites 1 through 9) with an approved set of improvement plans accepted by NID, which include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quantification of anticipated water usage by parcel. ▪ A comprehensive water system design for distribution piping and connection to the existing NID distribution system. ▪ Appropriate pipe sizing to accommodate minimum fire flow water pressures (as determined by CAL FIRE, NID, and the HFPD). ▪ Identification of pipe sizing, pipe location, and the location of the tie-in with NID facilities. ▪ Provisions for easement, rights-of-way, and in-fee land to NID for water facilities. <p>Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 1-9, City of Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed. County of Nevada for Sites 10-18.</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable.</p> <p>This impact remains significant and unavoidable because it is unknown what the capacity of the potable water facilities would be at the time of project construction. It is also unknown if completion of the required water infrastructure improvements would be feasible for a single project developer. Furthermore, the County does not have jurisdiction over the timing of when wastewater improvements would occur within the City of Grass Valley.</p>
<p>4.13-4 - The landfill that would serve the Proposed Project has sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. The project would comply with federal, state and local statues and regulations related to solid waste.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	<p>No mitigation required</p>	<p>Less Than Significant.</p>
<p>Recreation</p>			
<p>4.14-1 - The Proposed Project could increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>	<p>The following mitigation measure applies to all sites:</p> <p>4.14-1 Prior to approval of a Site Plan, grading plan, or any permit authorizing construction (or as part of the annexation request for sites 1-9) for a property within the RH Combining District, the project developer shall to the satisfaction of the Director of the County Planning Department (or City of Grass</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>

Table 2-1, continued

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		Valley Planning Department for Sites 1-9): Demonstrate that the proposed development is consistent with the County's Western Nevada County Non-motorized Recreational Trails Master Plan and pay recreation mitigation fees in an amount established by the County. For projects located within the City of Grass Valley SOI, the developer shall provide for community and regional parks consistent with the City's Park and Recreation Master Plan or pay an in-lieu fee in an amount established by the City. Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 1-9, City of Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed. County of Nevada for Sites 10-18.	
4.14-2 - The Proposed Project would not include the construction of recreational facilities that might have an adverse effect on the environment.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Mitigation required	Less Than Significant
Transportation and Traffic			
4.15-1 - The Proposed Project would result in an increase in traffic at study area intersections and roadway segments. Twenty three study intersections would continue to operate at acceptable levels of service in accordance with n Nevada County and the City of Grass Valley significance criteria during the weekday PM peak hour.	Less Than Significant Impact	No mitigation required	Less Than Significant
4.15-2 - The Proposed Project would add traffic to the intersection of Idaho-Maryland Road and Brunswick Road. This intersection is projected to operate at LOS F (unacceptable) in the PM peak hour.	Potentially Significant Impact	The following mitigation measure applies to Sites 3 through 9: 4.15-2 As described in the Loma Rica Ranch Specific Plan EIR (RBF Consulting, 2011), a roundabout shall be constructed at the intersection of Idaho-Maryland Road and Brunswick Road. This intersection is located on the downhill slope. The installation of a roundabout has been shown to reduce the number and severity of accidents. This mitigation would improve the operation of the intersection to LOS A. The improvement is identified in the Grass Valley Traffic Impact Fee (GVTIF). To mitigate direct traffic impacts on the Idaho-Maryland	Significant and Unavoidable This impact remains significant because it is unknown when the intersection improvement would occur and the construction of the complete improvement may not be feasible for a single project. Furthermore, the County of Nevada does not have jurisdiction over the approval of construction or timing of when the improvement would occur within the City of Grass Valley.

Table 2-1, continued

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Road and Brunswick Road intersection, a new roundabout is required at this intersection. However, the County of Nevada does not control the timing or implementation of construction because the intersection is within the jurisdiction of the City of Grass Valley. Additionally, it is not known whether it is feasible for one project applicant to construct the roundabout in its entirety as part of a single development project. Therefore, the developer shall pay a fair share contribution to the City of Grass Valley Development Impact Fee Capital Improvement Program towards the construction cost of this future intersection improvement.</p> <p>The individual development of Sites #3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 or 9 would generate 1 or more trips at the intersection and require implementation of the intersection mitigation.</p> <p>Timing Implementation: Prior to issuance of a building permit</p> <p>Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 1-9, City of Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed.</p>	
<p>4.15-3 - The Proposed Project would add traffic to the intersection of La Barr Meadows Drive and McKnight Way. This intersection is projected to operate at LOS F on the worst approach (unacceptable) in the PM peak hour.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>	<p>The following mitigation measure applies to Site 2:</p> <p>4.15-3 The provision of the dual roundabouts on McKnight Way at the SR 49 interchange would improve operation of the intersection to LOS A. This improvement would combine the McKnight Way / La Barr Meadows Road / Auburn Street and McKnight Way / SR 49 Northbound Ramps intersection into one intersection, and the McKnight Way / Taylorville Road and McKnight Way / SR 49 Southbound Ramps intersections into one intersection. Due to the close intersection spacing and the coordinated operation of the intersections, the roundabouts would need to be installed simultaneously in order to adequately accommodate traffic flows. This improvement is identified in the Nevada County Regional Transportation Plan and the City of Grass Valley Capital Improvement Program.</p> <p>To mitigate direct impacts at the La Barr Meadows and McKnight Way intersection dual roundabouts would be required to be constructed. However, the County of Nevada does not control the timing or implementation of construction because the intersection is within the jurisdiction of the City of Grass Valley. Additionally, it is not known whether it is feasible for one project applicant to construct the required</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p> <p>This impact remains significant because it is unknown when the intersection improvement would occur and the construction of the complete improvement may not be feasible for a single project. Furthermore, the County of Nevada does not have jurisdiction over the approval of construction or timing of when the improvement would occur within the City of Grass Valley.</p>

Table 2-1, continued

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>dual roundabouts in their entirety as part of a single development project. Therefore, the developer shall pay a fair share contribution to the City of Grass Valley Development Impact Fee Capital Improvement Program towards the construction cost of this future intersection improvement.</p> <p>Site Specific Development Analysis: The individual development of Site #2 would generate 10 or more trips at the intersection and require implementation of the intersection mitigation.</p> <p>Timing Implementation: Prior to issuance of a building permit</p> <p>Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: City of Grass Valley</p>	
<p>4.15-4 - The Proposed Project would add traffic to the intersection of Brunswick Road and Triple Crown Road. This intersection is projected to operate at an overall LOS E and LOS F at the worst approach (unacceptable) in the PM peak hour.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>	<p>The following mitigation measure applies to Sites 3 through 9:</p> <p>4.15-4 The realignment of Triple Crown Road with Town Talk Road into one intersection and the installation of a traffic signal will improve intersections of Brunswick Road and Triple Crown Drive and Brunswick Road and Town Talk Road / Bubbling Wells Road to LOS B during the PM peak hour. The intersection does meet peak hour Caltrans peak hour signal warrant for the installation of a traffic signal under Existing plus Background plus Project conditions. The proposed mitigation includes one additional southbound right turn lane, one southbound left turn lane, one northbound left turn lane and one northbound right turn lane. In addition, the existing unsigned driveway (designated as "Ranchview Court" in County Map data) located approximately 35 feet to the south of Town Talk Road shall be combined with Town Talk Road at the west leg of the intersection.</p> <p>The project developer shall install or fund the improvement at the intersection prior to issuance of a building permit.</p> <p>Site Specific Development Analysis: This improvement would be triggered when the proposed project generates 1 or more trip to the intersection of Brunswick Road and Triple Crown Road. The individual development of Sites #3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 or 9 would generate 1 or more trips at the intersection and require implementation of the intersection mitigation.</p> <p>Timing Implementation: Prior to issuance of a building</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p> <p>While the proposed improvement is expected to mitigate the potential impacts to less than significant, this impact remains significant because the County of Nevada does not have jurisdiction over the approval of construction or timing of when the improvement would occur within the City of Grass Valley.</p>

Table 2-1, continued

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		permit Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 1-9, City of Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed.	
4.15-5 - The Proposed Project would add traffic to the intersections of SR 49 / Combine Road. This intersection is projected to operate at Los F (unacceptable) in the PM Peak Hour.	Potentially Significant Impact	The following mitigation measure applies to Sites 14 through 18: 4.15-5 The Nevada County Regional Transportation Plan and RTMF includes the following improvements to the SR 49 / Combie Road intersection. The improvements would improve the PM peak hour level of service to LOS C. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construct one additional southbound left turn lane that is at least 325 feet in length • Construct one additional receiving lane at the east leg of intersection on Combie Road • Reconstruct or reconfigure the westbound left turn lanes to be a minimum of 250 feet in length to allow for adequate storage The project developer shall install or fund the improvement at the intersection. The developer and the County of Nevada should enter into a reimbursement agreement for the remaining portion of the improvement costs that are not the project developer's fair share. Site Specific Development Analysis: This improvement would be triggered when the proposed project generates 1 or more trip to the intersection of SR 49 / Combie Road. The individual development of Sites #14, 15, 16, 17, or 18 would generate 1 or more trips at the intersection and require implementation of the intersection mitigation. Timing Implementation: Prior to issuance of a building permit Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: Nevada County	Less Than Significant Impact
4.15-6 – The Proposed Project would add traffic to the intersections of Higgins Road and Combie Road. This intersection is projected to operate at Los F (unacceptable) in the PM peak hour.	Potentially Significant Impact.	The following mitigation measure applies to Sites 14 through 18: 4.15-6 The Higgins Marketplace EIR (2007) identified mitigation for this intersection including of the installation of a traffic signal and the installation of an additional eastbound through lane. Implementation of this mitigation measure would improve level of service to an acceptable LOS C during the PM peak hour.	Less Than Significant Impact.

Table 2-1, continued

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Prior to the development of the project site, the Project Developer shall pay a fair share contribution to the LTMF and RTMF program.</p> <p>Site Specific Development Analysis: This improvement would be triggered when the proposed project generates 1 or more trip to the intersection of Higgins Road and Combie Road. The individual development of Sites #14, 15, 16, 17, or 18 would generate 1 or more trips at the intersection and require implementation of the intersection mitigation.</p> <p>Timing Implementation: Prior to issuance of a building permit</p> <p>Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: Nevada County</p>	
<p>4.15-7 – The Proposed Project would add traffic at new driveway intersections which would have restricted sight distance and close spacing and may impact safety and traffic operations.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Impact.</p>	<p>The following mitigation measure applies to all sites:</p> <p>4.15-7 The sight distances at all project site access intersections shall be reviewed during the design phase of the project sites with attention given to horizontal and vertical sight distance constraints. To maintain adequate corner sight distance consistent with Caltrans Highway Design Manual requirements, parking shall not be permitted on major onsite roadways within close proximity to intersections. All onsite intersections, landscaping, signing, and parking shall be designed so that adequate corner sight distance is achieved.</p> <p>Prior to issuance of a building permit, the developer shall provide verification by a professional engineer that sight distance has been evaluated.</p> <p>Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 1-9, City of Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed. County of Nevada for Sites 10-18.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>
<p>5.2.14.1 - Cumulative Impact - The Proposed Project would add traffic to the signalized intersection of Nevada City Highway and Brunswick Road. This intersection is projected to operate at LOS E (unacceptable) in the PM peak hour.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>	<p>The following mitigation measure pertains to Sites 3 through 9:</p> <p>5.2.14.1 - Prior to issuance of a building permit, the project developer shall pay a fair share contribution to the City of Grass Valley Development Impact Fee Capital Improvement Program towards the installation of signal timing at the intersection of Nevada City Highway and Brunswick Road to improve operations and meet future traffic volume demand. Signal timing splits shall be optimized based upon a cycle length of 90 seconds. This mitigation would improve the operation of the intersection to LOS D.</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p> <p>While the proposed fair share contribution is expected to reduce cumulative impacts to less than significant, this impact remains significant and unavoidable because the County of Nevada does not have jurisdiction over the approval of funding or construction of the improvement within the City of Grass Valley.</p>

Table 2-1, continued

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		Timing Implementation: Prior to issuance of a building permit Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: City of Grass Valley	
5.2.14.2 - The proposed project would add traffic to the intersection of Brunswick road and Town Talk Road (Sites 7 and 8 access). This intersection is projected to operate at an overall LOS E and LOS F at the worst approach (unacceptable) in the pm peak hour.	Potentially Significant Impact	The following mitigation measure pertains to Sites 3 through 9: 5.2.14.2 Prior to issuance of a building permit, the project developer shall install or fund the realignment of Triple Crown Road with Town Talk Road (Sites 7 and 8 access) into one intersection and the installation of a traffic signal. This measure will improve intersections of Brunswick Road / Triple Crown Drive and Brunswick Road / Town Talk Road / Bubbling Wells Road to LOS C during the PM peak hour. The intersection does meet peak hour Caltrans peak hour signal warrant for the installation of a traffic signal. The proposed mitigation includes one additional southbound right turn lane, one southbound left turn lane, one northbound left turn lane and one northbound right turn lane. The developer and the City of Grass Valley should enter into a reimbursement agreement for the remaining portion of the improvement costs that are not the project developer's fair share. Timing Implementation: Prior to issuance of a building permit. Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: For Sites 1-9, City of Grass Valley, if annexed; County of Nevada if not annexed.	Significant and Unavoidable While the proposed improvement is expected to mitigate the potential impacts to less than significant, this impact remains significant because the County of Nevada does not have jurisdiction over the approval of construction or timing of when the improvement would occur within the City of Grass Valley.
5.2.14.3 The Proposed Project would add traffic to the intersection of SR 49 northbound ramps and McKnight Way. This intersection is projected to operate at overall LOS E (unacceptable) in the PM Peak Hour.	Potentially Significant Impact	The following mitigation measure pertains to Site 2: Prior to the development of the project site, the Project Developer shall pay a fair share contribution to the City of Grass Valley Development Impact Fee Capital Improvement Program for the provision of the dual roundabouts on McKnight Way at the SR 49 interchange described in Mitigation Measure 4.15-3. Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: City of Grass Valley	Significant and Unavoidable. While the proposed fair share contribution is expected to reduce cumulative impacts to less than significant, this impact remains significant and unavoidable because the County of Nevada does not have jurisdiction over the approval of funding or construction of the improvement within the City of Grass Valley.
5.2.14-4 – The proposed project would add traffic to the intersections of the SR 49/Combie Road. This intersection is	Potentially Significant Impact	The following mitigation measure pertains to Sites 14 through 18: 5.2.14-4 Prior to issuance of a building permit, the project	Less Than Significant Impact

Table 2-1, continued

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>projected to operate at LOS E (Unacceptable) in the PM Peak Hour</p>		<p>developer shall pay a fair share contribution to the Nevada County RTMF program for the construction of an additional southbound left turn lane that is at least 325 feet in length shall be installed at the intersection of SR 49 and Combie Road. This improvement will improve operations at the intersection to LOS D during the PM peak hour. The addition of a southbound left turn lane is an identified improvement in the Nevada County Regional Transportation Plan and RTMF.</p> <p>Enforcement / Monitoring Agency: County of Nevada.</p>	

This Page Intentionally Left Blank