



FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

(SCH # 2019060004)

FOR THE

2040 PLACER COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

NOVEMBER 2019

Prepared for:

Placer County Transportation Planning Agency
299 Nevada St.
Auburn, CA 95603
(530) 823-4032

Prepared by:

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

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

A Land Use Planning, Design, and Environmental Firm



FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

(SCH # 2019060004)

FOR THE

2040 PLACER COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

NOVEMBER 2019

Prepared for:

Placer County Transportation Planning Agency
299 Nevada St.
Auburn, CA 95603
(530) 823-4032

Prepared by:

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

The Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA) is the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for Placer County, which includes the cities of Roseville, Lincoln, Rocklin, Auburn, Colfax, and the town of Loomis. The nine-member PCTPA Board of Directors consists of one councilmember from each of Placer County's six incorporated jurisdictions, two members of the Placer County Board of Supervisors; and one citizen representative. PCTPA is the forum for making decisions about the regional transportation system in Placer County.

Both, federal and state laws require each MPO and RTPA to prepare a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) in urban areas every four years. The RTP is a long-range, 20-year minimum, comprehensive transportation plan for all modes including: highways, local streets and roads, transit, bicycle, aviation, rail and goods movement. The purpose of the RTP is to serve as a foundation for the development of the shorter "action" plans called the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), which satisfies California transportation planning requirements, and the federal counterpart referred to as the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) for all transportation projects that require federal approval. The 2040 RTP Program EIR covers the Tier 1 list of projects. The Tier 1 list of projects identifies the 20-year list of financially constrained transportation investments in the region.

The 2040 RTP fulfills the federal and state requirements using the specific guidance from the CTC RTP Guidelines, as recently amended. The most recent CTC RTP Guidelines were adopted in 2017. PCTPA is the lead agency for the environmental review of the proposed project evaluated herein and has the principal responsibility for approving the project.

1.1 PURPOSE AND INTENDED USES OF THE EIR CEQA REQUIREMENTS FOR A FINAL EIR

This Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the 2040 RTP has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and State CEQA Guidelines. State CEQA Guidelines Section 15132 requires that an FEIR consist of the following:

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

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

An EIR must disclose the expected environmental impacts, including impacts that cannot be avoided, growth-inducing effects, impacts found not to be significant, and significant cumulative impacts, as well as identify mitigation measures and alternatives to the proposed project that could reduce or avoid its adverse environmental impacts. CEQA requires government agencies to consider and,

where feasible, minimize environmental impacts of proposed development, and an obligation to balance a variety of public objectives, including economic, environmental, and social factors.

PURPOSE AND USE

The PCTPA, as the lead agency, has prepared the Draft EIR and this Final EIR to disclose the expected environmental impacts, including impacts that cannot be avoided, growth-inducing effects, impacts found not to be significant, and significant cumulative impacts, as well as identify mitigation measures and alternatives to the proposed project that could reduce or avoid its adverse environmental impacts. CEQA requires government agencies to consider and, where feasible, minimize environmental impacts of proposed projects, and confers an obligation to balance a variety of public objectives, including economic, environmental, and social factors.

This document and the Draft EIR, as amended herein, constitute the Final EIR, which will be used as programmatic-level environmental document to evaluate subsequent planning and permitting actions associated with the 2040 RTP. Many subsequent actions will require subsequent and/or supplement analysis as the details of the action become clear from the development of detailed project planning, design, and engineering. Subsequent actions that may be associated with the 2040 RTP are identified in Chapter 2.0 of the Draft EIR.

1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

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

NOTICE OF PREPARATION AND INITIAL STUDY

The PCTPA circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR for the proposed project and an Initial Study on June 6, 2019 to trustee and responsible agencies, the State Clearinghouse (SCH# 2019060004), and the public. A scoping meeting was held on June 26th, 2019 at 6:00 PM at the PCTPA office. The NOP and Initial Study are presented in Appendix A.

NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY AND DRAFT EIR

The PCTPA published a public Notice of Availability (NOA) for the Draft EIR on August 28, 2019, inviting comment from the general public, agencies, organizations, and other interested parties. The NOA was filed with the State Clearinghouse (SCH # 2019060004) and the County Clerk, and was published in the adjudicated newspaper pursuant to the public noticing requirements of CEQA. The Draft EIR was available for public review from August 28, 2019 through October 14, 2019. The Draft EIR contains a description of the project, description of the environmental setting, identification of project impacts, and mitigation measures for impacts found to be significant, as well as an analysis of project alternatives, identification of significant irreversible environmental changes, growth-inducing impacts, and cumulative impacts. This Draft EIR identifies issues determined to have no impact or a less than significant impact, and provides detailed analysis of potentially significant and significant and unavoidable impacts.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS/FINAL EIR

The PCTPA received one comment letter regarding the Draft EIR. No additional oral or written comments were received. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15088, this Final EIR responds to the written comments received. There were no edits made to the Draft EIR based on the comments received. This document and the Draft EIR, as amended herein, constitute the Final EIR.

CERTIFICATION OF THE EIR/PROJECT CONSIDERATION

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

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

Upon certification of the Final EIR, the PCTPA Board may take action to approve, revise, or reject the project. A decision to approve the 2040 RTP, for which this EIR identifies significant environmental effects, must be accompanied by written findings in accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091 and 15093. A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, as described below, would also be adopted in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21081.6(a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15097 for mitigation measures that have been incorporated into or imposed upon the project to reduce or avoid significant effects on the environment. This Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program will be designed to ensure that these measures are carried out during project implementation, in a manner that is consistent with the EIR.

1.3 ORGANIZATION OF THE FINAL EIR

This Final EIR has been prepared consistent with Section 15132 of the State CEQA Guidelines, which identifies the content requirements for Final EIRs. This Final EIR is organized in the following manner:

CHAPTER 1.0 – INTRODUCTION

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

CHAPTER 2.0 – COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR AND RESPONSES

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

CHAPTER 3.0 – FINAL MMRP

Chapter 3.0 consists of a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP). The MMRP is presented in a tabular format that presents the impacts, mitigation measure, and responsibility, timing, and verification of monitoring.

CHAPTER 4.0 – REPORT PREPARERS

Chapter 4.0 lists all authors and agencies that assisted in the preparation of the EIR, by name, title, and company or agency affiliation.

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The PCTPA received one (1) comment letter during the Draft EIR 45-day public review period. Acting as the lead agency, the PCTPA has prepared a response to the Draft EIR comments. Responses to comments received during the comment period do not involve any new significant impacts or “significant new information” that would require recirculation of the Draft EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5. There were no text changes made to the Draft EIR.

2.2 LIST OF COMMENTORS

Table 2-1 lists the comments on the Draft EIR that were submitted to the PCTPA. The assigned comment letter number, letter date, letter author, and affiliation, if presented in the comment letter or if representing a public agency, are also listed.

TABLE 2-1 LIST OF COMMENTORS

RESPONSE LETTER/ NUMBER	INDIVIDUAL OR SIGNATORY	AFFILIATION	DATE
A	Gabriele Quillman	California Department of Fish and Wildlife – North Central Region	11-11-2015

2.3 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

REQUIREMENTS FOR RESPONDING TO COMMENTS ON A DRAFT EIR

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088 requires that lead agencies evaluate and respond to all comments on the Draft EIR that consider an environmental issue. The written response must address the significant environmental issue raised and provide a detailed response, especially when specific comments or suggestions (e.g., additional mitigation measures) are not accepted. In addition, the written response must be a good faith and reasoned analysis. However, lead agencies need to only respond to significant environmental issues associated with the project and do not need to provide all the information requested by the commentor, as long as a good faith effort at full disclosure is made in the EIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15204).

CEQA Guidelines Section 15204 recommends that commentors provide detailed comments that focus on the sufficiency of the Draft EIR in identifying and analyzing the possible environmental impacts of the project and ways to avoid or mitigate the significant effects of the project, and that commentors provide evidence supporting their comments. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064, an effect shall not be considered significant in the absence of substantial evidence.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088 also recommends that revisions to the Draft EIR be noted as a revision in the Draft EIR or as a separate section of the Final EIR.

RESPONSES TO COMMENT LETTERS

Written comments on the Draft EIR are reproduced on the following pages, along with responses to those comments. To assist in referencing comments and responses, the following coding system is used:

- Those comments received from government agencies are represented by a lettered response while comments received by individual or private firms or individuals are represented by a numbered response.
- Each letter is lettered (i.e., Letter A) and each comment within each letter is numbered (i.e., comment A-1, comment A-2).

From: Quillman, Gabriele@Wildlife <Gabriele.Quillman@wildlife.ca.gov>

Sent: Friday, October 11, 2019 6:22 PM

To: Aaron Hoyt <ahoyt@pctpa.net>

Cc: Wildlife R2 CEQA <R2CEQA@wildlife.ca.gov>; state.clearinghouse@opr.ca.gov

Subject: CDFW's comments on the DEIR for the 2040 Placer County Regional Transportation Plan (SCH 2019060004)

Dear Mr. Hoyt:

The Department of Fish and Wildlife (Department) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the 2040 Placer County Regional Transportation Plan (project; RTP) [State Clearinghouse No. 2019060004]. The Department is responding to the DEIR as a Trustee Agency for fish and wildlife resources (California Fish and Game Code sections 711.7 and 1802, and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines section 15386), and as a Responsible Agency regarding any future discretionary actions (CEQA Guidelines section 15381), such as the issuance of a Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement (California Fish and Game Code sections 1600 et seq.) and/or a California Endangered Species Act (CESA) Permit for Incidental Take of Endangered, Threatened, and/or Candidate species (California Fish and Game Code sections 2080.1 and 2081).

A-1

Comments and Recommendations

Following review of the DEIR, the Department offers the comments and recommendations presented below to assist the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA; the CEQA lead agency) in adequately identifying and/or mitigating the project's significant, or potentially significant, impacts on biological resources:

Wildlife Movement

Placer County's roads impact wildlife in a number of ways including direct mortality from vehicle strikes, habitat fragmentation, and barriers to wildlife movement (Spencer et al, 2011). As the population grows and traffic increases, and as roads are widened or otherwise updated to accommodate higher use, the impacts on wildlife tend to increase. Barriers to wildlife movement are expected to cause greater impacts as climate change impacts existing habitats and changes where animals can live. While the DEIR's Mitigation Measure BIO-5 requires individual projects to incorporate design measures to allow fish and wildlife to pass through movement corridors, individual projects identified in the RTP may have a cumulatively significant impact on wildlife movement which may not be identified when viewing individual projects separately.

A-2

In order to address potentially significant cumulative impacts and to help minimize the impacts of existing roads, the Department encourages PCTPA to prioritize building wildlife crossing structures, such as overpasses, underpasses, bridges, and large box culverts, in areas where wildlife movement is significantly impaired by roadways. Wildlife crossing structures allow wildlife to move over or under roadways, which increases habitat and genetic connectivity and reduces risk of injury caused by vehicle strikes both to wildlife and motorists.

Interstate 80 in particular poses a significant barrier to wildlife movement, and the areas between Auburn and Alta, near the Yuba Gap area, and at the ends of the Truckee River canyon have been identified as high-priority areas for wildlife crossings. Highway 49 between Auburn and Grass Valley has also been identified as a priority area, particularly in the Bear River area.

Wildlife movement across roads can also be improved opportunistically by including crossing-friendly design elements into maintenance and repair projects. For example, existing culverts may be replaced with larger culverts with interior shelves to allow terrestrial wildlife to pass through when water is flowing through.

Useful resources for wildlife crossing design include the Department's "Transportation Planning Companion Plan" associated with the State Wildlife Action Plan (CDFW, 2016), the California Essential Habitat Connectivity Project (<https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/conservation/planning/connectivity/CEHC>), and Caltrans' "Wildlife Crossings Guidance Manual" (Caltrans, 2009).

Further Coordination

The Department appreciates the opportunity to comment on the DEIR for the for the 2040 Placer County Regional Transportation Plan (State Clearinghouse No. 2019060004), and requests that the County address the Department's comments and concerns prior to circulating the final EIR. If you have any questions pertaining to these comments, please contact Gabriele Quillman at (916) 358-2955 or gabriele.quillman@wildlife.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Gabriele (Gabe) Quillman

California Department of Fish and Wildlife – North Central Region

1701 Nimbus Road, Suite A

Rancho Cordova, CA 95816

(916) 358-2955

References

Caltrans, 2009. Wildlife Crossings Guidance Manual. Prepared by Robert J. Meese, Fraser M. Shilling, and James F. Quinn.

CDFW, 2016. California State Wildlife Action Plan, Transportation Planning Companion Plan. Prepared by Blue Earth Consultants, LLC., Sacramento, CA.

Spencer, W.D., P. Beier, K. Penrod, K. Winters, C. Paulman, H. Rustigian-Romsos, J. Strittholt, M. Parisi, and A. Pettler. 2010. California Essential Habitat Connectivity Project: A Strategy for Conserving a Connected California. Prepared for California Department of Transportation, California Department of Fish and Game, and Federal Highways Administration.

A-2
(continued)

A-3

Response to Letter A: Gabriele Quillman, California Department of Fish and Wildlife – North Central Region

Response A-1: This comment serves as an introduction to the comment letter. The commentor states that the CDFW has comments and recommendations to assist the PCTPA in adequately addressing and/or mitigating the project's impacts to biological resources. No further response is required to this comment. It should be noted that the Biological Resources topic was not included as a topic for analysis in the Draft EIR. Instead, impacts associated with the Biological Resources topic were analyzed within the Notice of Preparation/Initial Study (NOP/IS) for the proposed project and were found to have a less than significant impact with mitigation. With implementation of the mitigation measures BIO-1 through BIO-6, as included within the NOP/IS, the 2040 RTP would not generate a significant impact relating to biological resources (further details on these mitigation measures is provided under Response A-2, below).

Although the analysis of biological resources has been provided previously in the proposed project NOP/IS, a thorough response to comments related to biological resources included in this comment letter is provided below.

Response A-2: This comment states that Placer County's roads impact wildlife in a number of ways, including direct mortality from vehicle strikes, habitat fragmentation, and barriers to wildlife movement (Spencer et al, 2011). The commentor also states that as the population in Placer County grows and traffic increases, and as roads are widened or otherwise updated to accommodate higher use, the impacts on wildlife tend to increase. The commentor further states that individual projects identified in the RTP may have a cumulatively significant impact on wildlife movement which may not be identified when viewing individual projects separately. Finally, the commentor provides a number of possible mitigation strategies to reduce impacts to wildlife movement.

It is noted that the citation provided by the commentor (Spencer et al, 2011) is related to vehicle strikes, habitat fragmentation, and barriers in California as a whole, and is not specifically related to Placer County. To learn more about the issues that the commentor identified in this letter, and to receive specific recommendations from the CDFW regarding solutions that should be incorporated into transportation projects, a conference call was requested by PCTPA. The conference call included the commentor (Gabrielle Quillman), PCTPA Senior Planner Aaron Hoyt, De Novo Planning Principal Biologist Steve McMurtry, and De Novo Planning Associate Planner Josh Smith. The call was held on October 23, 2019. During the meeting, Ms. Quillman suggested that it would be ideal if there would be 20+ wildlife/deer crossings provided throughout the Placer County roadway network, namely on Interstate 80 (I-80). Mr. McMurtry requested more detailed information regarding vehicle strikes, habitat fragmentation, and barriers that the CDFW has available to substantiate any claim that there is an issue in Placer County, and to justify any planning effort for a future significant expenditure for wildlife crossings on I-80. Mr. McMurtry explained that Caltrans and PCTPA provide transportation design solutions where they have data that show that they are warranted. Separately, when asked about what was being referred to with regard to the potential cumulative impacts on wildlife

movement, Ms. Quillman did not provide any detail on how or what specific cumulative impacts could occur.

Mr. McMurtry noted that there are examples of deer crossings in areas of other states where there are significant deer populations, and major migration routes crossing freeways. Mr. McMurtry further explained that such crossings require more than just a crossing to be erected, they require the construction of extensive fencing along the entire freeway to funnel wildlife into the crossing, which functionally fragments habitat on both sides of the freeway where wildlife can no longer pass. Mr. McMurtry emphasized that only a very small amount of deer and other wildlife will utilize the crossing unless they are funneled to the crossing using the extensive fencing system. Predation success also increases in the funnel area because the density of deer in the funnel area increase making the deer very easy prey in these locations. Mr. McMurtry went on to explain that there are resident black-tailed deer populations in the foothill regions of Placer County, and that these are not migratory. Mr. McMurtry explained that there are migratory black-tailed deer that generally migrate annually from their summer range in the higher areas to the wintering range in the lower foothills as the temperatures drop and winter weather approaches. The migration paths generally follow canyons and ridges between 20 to 40 miles to the lower elevations generally at or just below snow level. Mr. McMurtry stated that he knows of no major migration routes, or natural funnels, within Placer County, and none that specifically cross I-80. Mr. McMurtry explained that in order to start a planning effort to consider a wildlife crossing, the PCTPA and Caltrans would need to have evidence/data that shows that there is a problem, then they would have a starting point to develop and consider solutions for specific locations. Mr. McMurtry asked for any evidence/data that the CDFW has and could share with PCTPA and Caltrans. The commentor did not have any evidence/data available, and did not identify any specific locations for major migration routes or high deer mortality. The commentor noted that the CDFW would see if they have any such data and get back to PCTPA if available. As of the writing of this response, the CDFW has not provided any data/evidence to support the need for wildlife crossings in Placer County. It is noted that Mr. McMurtry explained that PCTPA and Caltrans do incorporate median design measures that specifically address barriers and fragmentation of habitat. Such measures included constructing gaps/breaks in freeway medians dividers, passage ways under the dividers, and lower dividers in some locations, all of which are intended to ensure that smaller wildlife can pass through the area. Medians dividers are not considered a barrier to larger wildlife, such as deer.

Caltrans requires review of individual projects under their jurisdiction for potential impacts to wildlife corridors (i.e. the analysis of whether a proposed project will interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, is a requirement under CEQA). As of 2019, Caltrans has constructed more than 50 projects statewide that include built-in features promoting the safe passage of wildlife, such as deer and endangered or threatened species. Several of these projects are stand-alone wildlife crossings, such as a Highway 101 cougar crossing in Southern California, costing nearly \$60 million. However, Caltrans District 3 does not maintain a list of wildlife crossings or fish

passages that are needed with Caltrans District 3. In general, Caltrans recommends that potential impacts to wildlife corridors are addressed at the level of each individual project.

It is noted that, as described in the NOP/IS, if wildlife has the potential to be impacted significantly by individual projects within the RTP, then mitigation is required. Several mitigation measures included within the NOP/IS directly address potential impacts to biological resources that occur from individual projects included within the 2040 RTP (see Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-6, as provided within the NOP/IS). For example, Mitigation Measure BIO-1 requires the implementing agency to hire a qualified biologist to conduct a field reconnaissance of the environmental limits of individual projects to identify any biological constraints for individual projects, including special status plants, animals, and their habitats, as well as protected natural communities including wetland and terrestrial communities, prior to final design approval of individual projects. Additionally, Mitigation Measure BIO-5 requires the implementing agency to incorporate economically viable design measures, as applicable and necessary, to allow wildlife or fish to move through the transportation corridor, both during construction activities and post construction, prior to design approval of individual RTP projects that contain movement habitat. Furthermore, Mitigation Measure BIO-6 provides that, if the Placer County Conservation Plan (PCCP) has been adopted, prior to design approval of individual projects, the implementing agency shall coordinate with Placer County (or the designated agency responsible for implementing the PCCP) to determine the appropriate coverage, permits, compensatory mitigation or fees, and project specific avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures. No cumulative impacts on wildlife crossings are anticipated to occur due to implementation of the individual projects included the 2040 RTP. Furthermore, these mitigation measures also lessen the contribution of the 2040 RTP to any potential cumulatively significant impacts to wildlife movement.

The proposed project is a Regional Transportation Plan and because the proposed project was analyzed at the program-level (thereby providing a “bird-eye” view of the development and maintenance of transportation projects in Placer County through 2040), the 2040 RTP EIR is not the appropriate vehicle to provide mitigation measure that may be appropriate on the level of an individual project. Individual projects within the Placer County 2040 RTP are required to undergo environmental review, and those projects that would interfere with wildlife movement would be subject to mitigation to reduce the impact to a less than significant level. Therefore, consistent with the mitigation measures provided within the NOP/IS regarding the biological resources topic, environmental review of individual projects (at the stage where individual projects are ready to go forward) is the appropriate point at which specific biological resources impacts will be analyzed.

Any specific wildlife/deer crossing is potentially a project itself that would require extensive planning, design, and analysis. Such an endeavor would warrant locational evidence/data that shows high mortality, vehicle damage issues, safety concerns, or some other significant concerns/issue. There are no revisions/edits to the DEIR that are warranted at this time. PCTPA will continue to work with CDFW, Caltrans, and other responsible agencies to identify ways to reduce wildlife and habitat

issues related to the transportation network in Placer County, as individual projects are ready to be implemented, as provided by the Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-6, as included within the NOP/IS. The relevant agencies, including PCTPA and Caltrans, will continue to consult with CDFW as individual projects are developed to determine appropriate measures to minimize impacts to wildlife movement at the project level, where applicable. No further response is required.

Response A-4: This comment serves as a conclusion to the comment letter. The commentor provides contact information and thanks the PCTPA for the opportunity to comment on the comment letter. No response is required.

This document is the Final Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (FMMRP) for the 2040 RTP. This FMMRP has been prepared pursuant to Section 21081.6 of the California Public Resources Code, which requires public agencies to “adopt a reporting and monitoring program for the changes made to the project or conditions of project approval, adopted in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment.” A FMMRP is required for the proposed project because the EIR has identified significant adverse impacts, and measures have been identified to mitigate those impacts.

The numbering of the individual mitigation measures follows the numbering sequence as found in the Draft EIR. There were no revisions made in response to public comments. Therefore, no revisions to the Draft EIR have been incorporated into this FMMRP.

3.1 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

The FMMRP, as outlined in the following table, describes mitigation timing, monitoring responsibilities, and compliance verification responsibility for all mitigation measures identified in this Final EIR. Agencies considering approval of subsequent activities under the 2040 RTP project would utilize this EIR as the basis in determining potential environmental effects and the appropriate level of environmental review of a subsequent activity.

The agencies responsible for implementing the mitigation measures (implementing agency) will be the lead agency for the individual RTP project. The implementing agency for individual projects will vary by individual project, but will involve one of the following: Placer County Transportation Planning Agency, Placer County, the cities of Auburn, Colfax, Lincoln, Roseville, Rocklin, the town of Loomis, and Caltrans District 3. The implementing agency will be responsible to monitor mitigation measures that are required to be implemented during the operation of the project.

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

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

This page left intentionally blank.

TABLE 3.0-1: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY	TIMING	VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)
	<i>include landscaping to block light from sensitive land uses, such as residences.</i>			
AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES				
Impact 3.2-1: Conversion of farmlands, including prime farmland, unique farmland, and farmland of statewide importance, to non-agricultural uses, or conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.2-1: <i>Prior to the design approval of individual RTP improvement projects, the implementing agency shall assess the potential for agricultural impacts. For federally funded projects, the implementing agency shall complete form AD-1006 to determine the Farmland Conversion Impact Rating in compliance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act. The AD-1006 shall be submitted to the NRCS for approval. For non-federally funded projects, the implementing agency shall assess the project for the presence of important farmlands (prime farmland, unique farmland, farmland of statewide importance).</i></p> <p><i>If significant agricultural resources are identified within the limits of an individual RTP improvement project, the implementing agency shall consider alternative designs that seek to avoid and/or minimize impacts to the agricultural resources. Design measures may include, but are not limited to, reducing the proposed roadway width or relocating/realigning the improvement to avoid important and significant farmlands to the extent feasible. If the improvement cannot be designed without complete avoidance of important or significant farmlands, the implementing agency shall compensate for unavoidable conversion impacts at a 1:1 ratio.</i></p>	Implementing Agency	Prior to Design Approval	
Impact 3.2-2: Potential to conflict with forest or timber zoning or result in the conversion of forest lands or timber lands	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.2-2: <i>Prior to the design approval of individual RTP improvement projects that could impact forest or timber resources, the implementing agency shall retain a qualified arborist, forester, and, or biologist to assess the potential impacts of tree removal and encroachment activities, and provide recommendations to the implementing agency.</i></p>	Implementing Agency	Prior to Design Approval	
AIR QUALITY				
Impact 3.3-2: Short-term - Conflict with, or Obstruct, the Applicable Air Quality Plan, Cause a Violation of Air Quality Standards, Contribute Substantially to an Existing Air	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.3-1: <i>The implementing agency for any construction activities, including dismantling/demolition of structures, processing/moving materials (sand, gravel, rock, dirt, etc.), or operation of machines/equipment, shall prepare a dust control plan in accordance with APCD Rule 228 (Fugitive Dust Emissions). The dust control plan shall use reasonable precautions to prevent dust emissions, which may include: cessation of operations at times,</i></p>	Implementing Agency	Prepare DCP prior to Design Approval, implement DCP	

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY	TIMING	VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)
Quality Violation, or Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Net Increase of a Criteria Pollutant in a Non-Attainment Area	<i>cleanup, sweeping, sprinkling, compacting, enclosure, chemical or asphalt sealing, or other recommended actions by the APCD.</i>		during construction.	
Impact 3.3-3: Occasional Localized Carbon Monoxide Concentrations from Traffic Conditions at Some Individual Locations	Mitigation Measure 3.3-2: <i>The implementing agency shall screen individual RTP projects at the time of design for localized CO hotspot concentrations and, if necessary, incorporate project-specific measures into the project design to reduce or alleviate CO hotspot concentrations.</i>	Implementing Agency	Prior to Design Approval	
Impact 3.3-5: Potential to release asbestos from earth movement or structural asbestos from demolition/renovation of existing structures	Mitigation Measure 3.3-3: <i>Prior to construction of RTP projects, the implementing agency should assess the site for the presence of asbestos including asbestos from structures such as road base, bridges, and other structures. In the event that asbestos is present, the implementing agency should comply with applicable state and local regulations regarding asbestos, including ARB's asbestos airborne toxic control measure (ATCM) (Title 17, CCR § 93105 and 93106), and Placer County APCD Rule 228 –Fugitive Dust, to ensure that exposure to construction workers and the public is reduced to an acceptable level. This may include the preparation of an Asbestos Hazard Dust Mitigation Plan to be implemented during construction activities, or other recommended actions by the APCD.</i>	Implementing Agency	Prior commencement of construction activities	
CULTURAL AND TRIBAL RESOURCES				
Impact 3.4-1: Potential to cause a substantial adverse change to a significant historical resource, as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5	Mitigation Measure 3.4-1: <i>During environmental review of individual RTP improvement projects, the implementing agencies shall retain a qualified architectural historian to inventory and evaluate architectural resources located in project area using criteria for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources. In addition, the resources would be recorded by the architectural historian on appropriate California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 forms, photographed, and mapped. The DPR forms shall be produced and forwarded to the Central California Information Center. If federal funding or approval is required, then the implementing agency shall comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.</i> <i>If architectural resources are deemed as potentially eligible for the California Register of Historic Resources or the National Register of Historic Places, the implementing shall consider avoidance through project redesign as feasible. If</i>	Implementing Agency	Prior to Design Approval	

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY	TIMING	VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)
	<p><i>avoidance is not feasible, the implementing agencies shall ensure that the historic resource is formally documented through the use of large-format photography, measured drawings, written architectural descriptions, and historical narratives. The documentation shall be entered into the Library of Congress, and archived in the California Historical Resources Information System. In the event of building relocation, the implementing agency shall ensure that any alterations to significant buildings or structures conform to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings.</i></p>			
<p>Impact 3.4-2: Potential to cause a substantial adverse change to a significant archaeological resource, as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5, or a significant tribal cultural resource, as defined in Public Resources Code §21074</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-2: <i>During environmental review of individual RTP improvement projects, the implementing agencies shall:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Consult with the United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC) to determine whether a project could affect cultural resources that may be of importance to the UAIC. Provide the UAIC with copies of any archaeological reports, environmental documents, and mitigation measures that are prepared for a project. Consult with the UAIC to determine if tribal monitors are needed for field surveys on individual projects.</i> • <i>Consult with the Native American Heritage Commission to determine whether known sacred sites are in the project area, and identify the Native American(s) to contact to obtain information about the project area</i> • <i>Conduct a records search at the Central California Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System to determine whether the project area has been previously surveyed and whether resources were identified.</i> <p><i>In the event the records indicate that no previous survey has been conducted, the Central California Information Center will make a recommendation on whether a survey is warranted based on the archaeological sensitivity of the project area. If recommended, a qualified archaeologist shall be retained to conduct archaeological surveys. The significance of any resources that are determined to be in the project area shall be assessed according to the applicable local, state, and federal significance criteria. Implementing agencies shall devise treatment measures to ameliorate "substantial adverse changes" to significant archaeological resources, in consultation with qualified</i></p>	<p>Implementing Agency</p>	<p>Prior to Design Approval, and during construction activities</p>	

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY	TIMING	VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)
	<p><i>archaeologists and other concerned parties. Such treatment measures may include avoidance through project redesign, data recovery excavation, and public interpretation of the resource.</i></p> <p><i>Implementing agencies and the contractors performing the improvements shall adhere to the following requirements:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>If an improvement project is located in an area rich with cultural materials, the implementing agency shall retain a qualified archaeologist to monitor any subsurface operations, including but not limited to grading, excavation, trenching, or removal of existing features of the subject property.</i> • <i>If, during the course of construction cultural resources (i.e., prehistoric sites, historic sites, and isolated artifacts and features) are discovered work shall be halted immediately within 50 meters (165 feet) of the discovery, the implementing agency shall be notified, and a qualified archaeologist that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in prehistoric or historical archaeology shall be retained to determine the significance of the discovery.</i> • <i>The implementing agency shall consider mitigation recommendations presented by a professional archaeologist that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in prehistoric or historical archaeology for any unanticipated discoveries and shall carry out the measures deemed feasible and appropriate. Such measures may include avoidance, preservation in place, excavation, documentation, curation, data recovery, or other appropriate measures. The project proponent shall be required to implement any mitigation necessary for the protection of cultural resources.</i> 			
Impact 3.4-3: Potential to directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-3: <i>During environmental review of RTP projects, the implementing agencies shall retain a qualified paleontologist to identify, survey, and evaluate paleontological resources where potential impacts are considered high. All construction activities shall avoid known paleontological resources, if feasible, especially if the resources in a particular lithologic unit formation have been determined to be unique or likely to contain paleontological resources. If avoidance is not feasible, paleontological resources should be excavated by a qualified paleontologist and given to a local</i></p>	Implementing Agency	Prior to Design Approval	

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY	TIMING	VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)
	<p>agency, State University, or other applicable institution, where they could be curated and displayed for public education purposes.</p>			
<p>Impact 3.4-4: Potential to disturb human remains, including those interred outside formal cemeteries</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-4: Implement Stop-Work and Consultation Procedures Mandated by Public Resources Code 5097. In the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains during construction or excavation activities associated with an RTP project, the implementing agency shall cease further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until the following steps are taken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Placer County Coroner has been informed and has determined that no investigation of the cause of death is required. • If the remains are of Native American origin, either of the following steps will be taken: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The coroner will contact the Native American Heritage Commission in order to ascertain the proper descendants from the deceased individual. The coroner will make a recommendation to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods, which may include obtaining a qualified archaeologist or team of archaeologists to properly excavate the human remains. ○ The implementing agency or its authorized representative will retain a Native American monitor, and an archaeologist, if recommended by the Native American monitor, and rebury the Native American human remains and any associated grave goods, with appropriate dignity, on the property and in a location that is not subject to further subsurface disturbance when any of the following conditions occurs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Native American Heritage Commission is unable to identify a descendent. 	<p>Implementing Agency</p>	<p>Prior to Design Approval, and during construction</p>	

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY	TIMING	VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The descendant identified fails to make a recommendation. ▪ The implementing agency or its authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendant, and the mediation by the Native American Heritage Commission fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner. 			
GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS				
Impact 3.5-1: Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.5-1: The PCTPA should continue to explore the feasibility of a transportation pricing policy for the transit system and selected portions of the road network to encourage people to drive less and increase use of transit, walking and bicycling modes. The PCTPA should continue to participate and host programs that are deemed feasible by the PCTPA for the region to incentivize alternative transportation modes (e.g. Spare the Air program, Commuter Club, , and the \$10 Youth Summer Pass program,).</p>	Implementing Agency	On-going	
	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.5-2: The PCTPA should consider incorporating a complete streets policy with a strong focus on identifying opportunities to create more active transportation within the region (i.e. bike and pedestrian facilities).</p>	Implementing Agency	On-going	
	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.5-3: Consistent with Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines, the agencies implementing RTP projects should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote measures to reduce wasteful, inefficient and unnecessary consumption of energy during construction, operation, maintenance and/or removal. As the individual RTP projects are designed there should be an explanation as to why certain measures were incorporated in the RTP project and why other measures were dismissed. • Site, orient, and design projects to minimize energy consumption, increase water conservation and reduce solid-waste. 	Implementing Agency	On-going	

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY	TIMING	VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote efforts to reduce peak energy demand in the design and operation of RTP projects. Promote the use of alternate fuels (particularly renewable ones) or energy systems for RTP projects. Promote efforts to recycle materials used in the construction (including demolition phase) of RTP projects. 			
	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.5-4: The PCTPA should coordinate with local and regional agencies to assist in efforts to develop local and regional CAPs (Climate Action Plans) and/or General Plan policy that address climate change and greenhouse gas emissions. Some local agencies in Placer County have adopted a local CAP (Roseville, 2009 and Rocklin 2012), or are in the process of preparing a local CAP to address climate change and greenhouse gas emissions. Separately, Placer County also released a Draft Sustainability Plan in 2019. Local and regional CAPs should include the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline inventory of GHG emissions from community and municipal sources. A target reduction goal consistent with AB 32 and SB 32. Policies and measures to reduce GHG emissions. Quantification of the effectiveness of the proposed policies and measures. A monitoring program to track the effectiveness and implementation of the CAP(s). <p>PCTPA's role in the development of local and regional CAPs should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assistance in seeking and securing funding for the development of local and regional CAPs. Collaboration with local and regional agencies throughout their respective planning processes. 	Implementing Agency	On-going	
	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.5-5: PCTPA has included alternative vehicle fueling/charging stations in the RTP. PCTPA should consider the development of an Alternative Fuel Vehicle (AFV) and Infrastructure Policy in the future and</p>	Implementing Agency	On-going	

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY	TIMING	VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)
	<p>assist local agencies with the development of an Alternative Fuel Vehicle (AFV) and Infrastructure Policy. In developing an AFV policy, PCTPA should consider the studies prepared by SACOG (i.e. TakeCharge II: Infrastructure Roadmap). The policy could include provisions that address best practices, and standards related to saving energy and reducing GHG emissions through AFV use, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A procurement policy for using AFV by franchisees of these cities, such as trash haulers, green waste haulers, street sweepers, and curbside recyclable haulers. Such AFVs should have GHG emissions that are lower than comparable gasoline- or diesel- powered vehicles. • To the extent that is deemed economically feasible for the local agency, a fleet purchase policy to increase the number of AFVs (i.e., vehicles not powered strictly by gasoline or diesel fuel) for municipally owned fleets. • A public education policy to encourage the use of alternative fuel vehicles and development of supporting infrastructure. 			
LAND USE AND POPULATION				
Impact 3.6-1: Physical division of an established community	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.6-1: Prior to approval of RTP projects, the implementing agency shall consult with local planning staff to ensure that the project will not physically divide the community. The consultation should include a more detailed project-level analysis of land uses adjacent to proposed improvements to identify specific impacts. The analysis should consider new road widths and specific project locations in relation to existing roads. If it is determined that a project could physically divide a community, the implementing agency shall redesign the project to avoid the impact, if feasible. The measures could include realignment of the improvements to avoid the affected community. Where avoidance is not feasible, the implementing agency shall incorporate minimization measures to reduce the impact. The measures could include: alignment modifications, right-of-way reductions, provisions for bicycle, pedestrian, and vehicle facilities, and enhanced landscaping and architecture.</p>	Implementing Agency	Prior to Design Approval	

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURE	MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY	TIMING	VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)
TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION				
Impact 3.7-2: The Proposed project could result in the alteration of present patterns of vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian circulation, increased traffic delay, and increased traffic hazards during construction of future projects	<i>Mitigation Measure 3.7-1: The implementing agencies shall develop a traffic control plan for construction projects to reduce the effects of construction on the roadway system throughout the construction period. As part of the traffic control plan, project proponents shall coordinate with emergency service providers to ensure that emergency routes are identified and remain available during construction activities.</i>	Implementing Agency	Prior to the commencement of construction	
CUMULATIVE IMPACTS				
Impact 4.2: Cumulative Impact on Agricultural and Forest Land and Uses	<i>Implement mitigation measure 3.2-1.</i>	Implementing Agency	Prior to Design Approval	
Impact 4.5: Increased Transportation Greenhouse Gas Emissions May Contribute to Climate Change	<i>Implement mitigation measures 3.5-1 through 3.5-5.</i>	Implementing Agency	On-going	

This page left intentionally blank.

PLACER COUNTY TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY

Mike Luken.....Executive Director
 Luke McNeel-Caird, P.E..... Deputy Executive Director
 Aaron Hoyt.....Senior Planner

DE NOVO PLANNING GROUP

Steve McMurtry Principal Planner/Project Manager
 Ben Ritchie Principal Planner
 Beth Thompson..... Principal Planner
 Elise CarrollSenior Planner
 Josh SmithAssociate Planner

KITTLESON AND ASSOCIATES

Matt BraughtonSenior Planner
 Mike Aronson..... Principal Engineer

This page left intentionally blank.