ES.1 PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT

This Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) has been prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to analyze and disclose the environmental effects of the development of approximately 5,230 acres (2,117 hectares) in western Placer County under the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan (PVSP).

Development under the proposed PVSP, if authorized, would fill approximately 119.2 acres (43.24 hectares) of wetlands and other jurisdictional waters of the United States. This discharge of fill material requires approval pursuant to Section 404 of the federal Clean Water Act, under which the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) issues or denies Department of the Army (DA) permits for activities involving a discharge of dredged or fill materials into the waters of the United States, including wetlands.

The project proponents/applicants are seeking DA permits from the USACE under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (33 USC §1344). The USACE has received 22 permit applications to develop up to 3,746 acres (1,516 hectares) of land within the PVSP area and an application for the development of backbone infrastructure. The owners of the remaining properties (comprising 505 acres [204 hectares] within the PVSP area outside of the Special Planning Area [SPA] and 979 acres [396 hectares] within the SPA) are not applying for DA permits at this time. However, for reasons presented in **Chapter 1.0**, for purposes of this EIS, the Proposed Action encompasses the development of the entire PVSP site consistent with the footprint of the County-approved PVSP.

The USACE's general regulatory policies and approach are defined in 33 CFR Parts 320-325 and 332. In its regulatory capacity, the USACE is neither a proponent nor an opponent of projects seeking federal approvals; rather, as identified in 33 CFR § 320.1[a][1], USACE conducts a "public interest review" that seeks to balance a proposed action's favorable impacts against its detrimental impacts. Additionally, as identified in 33 CFR §325.2[a][6], the USACE is also required to review actions in accordance with guidelines developed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) under Section 404(b)(1) of the Clean Water Act (33 USC §1344(b)(1)) (hereinafter "404(b)(1) Guidelines"). The USACE's permit review and decision making triggers a requirement for environmental review under NEPA. The USACE has determined that the DA permit decision for the proposed development within the PVSP site constitutes a "major federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment," requiring the preparation of an EIS.

The USACE's permit action under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act is the proposed federal action analyzed in this EIS. As PVSP implementation is a reasonably foreseeable outcome of federal permit approval, this EIS analyzes the environmental effects of full buildout of the project site under the PVSP, and for brevity, the PVSP as proposed by the applicants is referred to as the Proposed Action throughout this EIS. The USACE is the federal lead agency under NEPA for the Proposed Action.

ES.2 PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION

The USACE has determined that the purpose of the Proposed Action is to construct a large-scale, regional mixed-use residential project in western Placer County.

The project is proposed as a large-scale residential community because the primary purpose of the project is to accommodate projected population growth in Placer County and provide a coordinated development envelope consisting of residential, commercial, recreational, public/quasi-public land uses, required infrastructure, and open space to accommodate a population range of approximately 30,000 to 50,000 persons. The project is intended to assist in meeting the region's future needs for residential opportunities through comprehensive planning.

The project is proposed as a mixed-use community with adequate employment-generating non-residential uses in order to provide a balance of jobs, housing, and other amenities. The commercial component of this community is important and necessary so that the County has sufficient tax revenues to provide services to the project. A large-scale residential-only development would not be fiscally sustainable because the tax revenue from property taxes alone would be insufficient to provide the needed County services. This is especially the case for the project site and its vicinity in western Placer County where a high proportion of the property tax revenues go to the local school district and the County share is relatively small. In addition, there are no nearby existing retail centers to serve the PVSP area, so early development of a commercial center is important from a service standpoint as well as for fiscal reasons.

Placer County has identified this area for urban development. This was based on a number of important planning factors, including that (1) the cities and areas surrounding the Specific Plan area are experiencing rapid growth in jobs, creating the need for additional housing in southwestern Placer County; (2) the area is contiguous to existing urban development to the south (Sacramento County) and new development to the north (Roseville); (3) the region is planning improvements to the transportation network that could accommodate the level of growth associated with the Specific Plan; and (4) the Specific Plan area is better suited to concentrated new growth than other locations, as it would create less sprawl. For purposes of this EIS, western Placer County is defined as the portion of Placer County west of Interstate 80 (I-80) and State Route 65 (SR 65).

ES.3 PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

The Proposed Action would implement the PVSP, which is a proposed specific plan project that includes development of the 5,230 acres (2,117 hectares) site with a mix of land uses. The Proposed Action encompasses two possible scenarios that represent the potential low-end and high-end of the range of development densities that could be developed on the project site: the "Base Plan scenario" and "Blueprint scenario." The development footprint under both scenarios would be the same, though the land use designations and acreages would differ. Under the Proposed Action - Base Plan scenario, the community would include about 3,361 acres (1,360 hectares) of residential uses, 309 acres (125 hectares) of commercial and office uses, 309 acres (125 hectares) of public/quasi-public uses (such as schools), 211 acres (85 hectares) of parks, 709 acres (287 hectares) of open space, and 331.5 acres (134 hectares) of

major roadways. Under the Proposed Action - Blueprint scenario, the community would include about 3,220 acres (1,303 hectares) of residential uses, 342 acres (138 hectares) of commercial and office uses, 366 acres (148 hectares) of public/quasi-public uses (such as schools), 273 acres (110 hectares) of parks, 709 acres (287 hectares) of open space, and 321 acres (130 hectares) of major roadways.

In addition to the Proposed Action, this EIS evaluates a No Action Alternative and five other on-site alternatives (Alternatives 1 through 5 individually or combined). All of the alternatives would also develop a similar large-scale, mixed-use, mixed-density, master-planned residential community on the project site. Under the No Action Alternative, the project site would be developed in a manner that avoids activities in jurisdictional waters of the United States, including wetlands, thereby avoiding the need for the USACE approvals under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Alternatives 1 through 5 individually or combined would place additional amounts of acreage in open space, ranging from a minimum of 1 additional acre (0.4 hectare) greater than the Proposed Action under Alternative 4 up to a maximum of 47 additional acres (19 hectares) under Alternative 3.

In addition to on-site development, off-site potable water, recycled water, and sewer infrastructure improvements would be required to serve the Proposed Action and all alternatives.

Table ES-1, Proposed Action and Alternatives – Acreages by Land Use, presents the key attributes of the Proposed Action and the alternatives and the potential impacts to the waters of the U.S. anticipated to result from the development of the Proposed Action and alternatives.

Table ES-1
Proposed Action and Alternatives – Acreages by Land Use

Alternative	Development Footprint (in acres)	Residential Development (in acres)	Residential Units at Buildout	Other Development (in acres)	Open Space (in acres)	Potential Direct Impacts on Aquatic Resources*
Proposed Action – Base Plan	4,522	3,361	14,132	Commercial – 309	709	119.3
				Public Uses – 309		
				Parks – 211		
				Roads – 332		
Proposed Action - Blueprint	4,522	3,220	21,634	Commercial – 342	709	119.3
				Public Uses – 366		
				Parks – 273		
				Roads – 321		
No Action Alternative	3,297	2,410	8,441	Commercial – 221	1,933	0
				Public Uses – 211		
				Parks – 124		
				Roads – 332		

Alternative	Development Footprint (in acres)	Residential Development (in acres)	Residential Units at Buildout	Other Development (in acres)	Open Space (in acres)	Potential Direct Impacts on Aquatic Resources*
Combined Alternatives 1 through 5	4,431	3,267	14,132***	Commercial – 340 Public Uses – 293 Parks – 200 Roads – 330	799	106.4
Alternative 1	4,504	3,357	14,132***	Commercial – 310 Public Uses – 301 Parks – 210 Roads – 329	726	115.1
Alternative 2	4,516	3,328	14,132***	Commercial – 340 Public Uses – 307 Parks – 207 Roads – 335	714	116.4
Alternative 3	4,473	3,322	14,132***	Commercial – 309 Public Uses – 304 Parks – 208 Roads – 332	757	114.3
Alternative 4**	4,520	3,361	14,132***	Commercial – 309 Public Uses – 309 Parks – 211 Roads – 332	711	119.1
Alternative 5	4,502	3,345	14,132***	Commercial – 309 Public Uses – 309 Parks – 208 Roads – 331	728	117.2

* *Direct impacts from all development on properties with active DA permit applications and within the Special Planning Area. An estimated 4.2 acres of direct impact expected to result from off-site infrastructure development is included in the reported values.*

** *Implementation of Alternative 4 would be contingent upon implementation of Alternative 3. Therefore, impact value reported for Alternative 4 is inclusive of impact value reported for Alternative 3, above.*

****The number of units that would be built under Alternatives 1 through 5 would be the same as the Proposed Action. This is because to the extent that the number of units to be built on a property is reduced due to the revised footprint, the same number of units would be built on another property by increasing the density, so that the total number of units for the PVSP as a whole would still remain 14,132 (or 21,634 units if Alternatives 1 through 5 are combined with the Blueprint scenario).*

ES.3.1 Major Conclusions of the Environmental Analysis

Summary of Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures

The environmental effects of the No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5 are summarized in **Table ES-2, Summary of Effects for Major Topics**. A full discussion of the environmental effects is provided in **Chapter 3.0, Affected Environment and Environmental**

Consequences. The basis of the impact conclusions summarized in the table are regulatory thresholds for those resource topics for which such thresholds exist, and qualitative thresholds for other resource topics. The significance thresholds are described for each topic in **Chapter 3.0.**

Significant Effects That Cannot Be Mitigated

The No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5 (individually or combined) would have several significant effects that cannot be mitigated, as described below.

Aesthetics

The visual resource analysis in this EIS evaluates the effects of the proposed development in terms of loss of scenic views and alterations to the visual character of the area. The project site is characterized by gently rolling topography and large, open annual grassland areas. Views of the project site, the Sierra foothills, and the Sierra Nevada are available from the roadways that border and pass through the site, including Baseline Road, Walerga Road, and Watt Avenue.

With the implementation of the No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5 (individually or combined), the project site would be developed with a variety of urban uses and views of open rangeland and the foothills and Sierra Nevada would no longer be available from Baseline Road, Walerga Road, and Watt Avenue. In addition to loss of views, the conversion of undeveloped rangeland to urban development under all of these alternatives would significantly modify the visual character of the project site.

No feasible mitigation is available to address these visual effects of the No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5 (individually or combined) on scenic vistas and visual character of the project area.

The construction and operation of off-site water pipeline infrastructure by the Placer County Water Agency (PCWA) which may be used by the No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5 (individually or combined), would result in less than significant effects to aesthetics with implementation of mitigation. However, the USACE does not have the authority to impose mitigation measures on PCWA's project and the impact would remain significant.

Agricultural Resources

The agricultural resource assessment evaluates the potential for the No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5 (individually or combined) to directly or indirectly convert Important Farmland to non-agricultural uses. The alternatives would result in a significant impact related to the conversion of agricultural land to non-agricultural uses and would be a significant effect. Mitigation is proposed that would partially mitigate this effect but not to a less than significant level.

Air Quality

The air quality assessment addresses the effects of the construction- and operation-related emissions of the No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5 (individually or combined) on the regional and local air quality.

The U.S. EPA and California Air Resources Board designate air basins or portions of air basins as being in "attainment" or "nonattainment" for each of the criteria pollutants. Nonattainment areas are ranked (marginal, moderate, serious, severe, or extreme) according to the degree of nonattainment. The Placer County portion of Sacramento Valley Air Basin is designated nonattainment for ozone, particulate matter 10 microns in diameter or less (PM10), and particulate matter 2.5 microns in diameter or less (PM2.5).

Construction associated with the No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5 (individually or combined) would result in emissions of reactive organic gases (ROG) and nitrogen oxide (NOx) which are ozone precursors, and PM10 emissions. The construction emissions under the Proposed Action and all of the alternatives would exceed Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) significance thresholds. Therefore, the No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5 (individually or combined) would have a significant effect on air quality in the air basin. Mitigation would partially mitigate this effect but not to a less than significant level.

Operational emissions of ROG, NOx, carbon monoxide (CO), and PM10 from buildout of the No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5 (individually or combined) are also estimated to exceed PCAPCD significance thresholds for these pollutants, and would have a significant effect on air quality in the air basin. Mitigation would partially mitigate this effect but not to a less than significant level.

The construction activities associated with the off-site water pipeline infrastructure that would be built by the PCWA to serve the No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5 (singly or combined), would result in exhaust emissions, primarily NOx, and fugitive dust. Given the nonattainment status of the Air Basin with respect to ozone and particulate matter, the USACE conservatively assumes that the emissions would result in a significant impact. Standard construction-phase mitigation measures would partially mitigate this effect but not to a less than significant level.

Biological Resources

The biological resource assessment evaluates the potential for construction and operation of the No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5 (individually or combined) to directly or indirectly affect the biological resources present on the project site and in the area of the off-site infrastructure improvements, including impacts to the waters of the U.S., special status invertebrates, other wildlife, riparian habitat, and plant species. The Proposed Action and Alternatives 1 through 5 individually or combined will result in the filling of the waters of the U.S. with impacts ranging between 106.4 and 119.3 acres depending on alternative. Because the mitigation strategy put forth by the Applicants is conceptual and a detailed plan has not been submitted to the USACE pursuant to the mitigation measure in this EIS, the USACE cannot fully evaluate the effectiveness of the mitigation

strategy to reduce the impact of the Proposed Action and Alternatives 1 through 5 (singly or combined) on the waters of the U.S. to less than significant, and has therefore concluded that the effect would remain potentially significant.

Climate Change

The evaluation of climate change effects in this EIS presents the greenhouse gas (GHGs) emissions associated with the construction and operation of the No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5 (individually or combined). The impact from construction emissions of GHGs associated with all of the alternatives would be significant. Mitigation would partially mitigate this effect but not to a less than significant level.

Similarly, the impact associated with the operational GHG emissions for the No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5 (individually or combined) would be significant. Mitigation would partially mitigate this effect but not to a less than significant level.

Geology, Soils, and Minerals

The construction and operation of off-site water pipeline infrastructure by the PCWA which may be used by the No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5 (individually or combined), would result in less than significant effects associated with geology, soils, and minerals with implementation of mitigation. However, the USACE does not have the authority to impose mitigation measures on PCWA's project and the impact would remain significant.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The construction and operation of off-site water pipeline infrastructure by the PCWA which may be used by the No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5 (individually or combined), would result in less than significant effects associated with hazards and hazardous materials with implementation of mitigation. However, the USACE does not have the authority to impose mitigation measures on PCWA's project and the impact would remain significant.

Hydrology and Water Quality

The hydrology and water quality assessment evaluates the potential for the No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5 (individually or combined) to result in on-site and off-site flooding and water quality effects. The water bodies that could be affected include Curry Creek, Dry Creek, and Steelhead Creek.

Due to a lack of flood control improvements, only the No Action Alternative would result in a significant impact related to the flood capacity of the on-site drainages. Mitigation would partially mitigate this effect but not to a less than significant level.

The construction and operation of off-site water pipeline infrastructure by the PCWA which may be used by the No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5 (individually or combined), would result in less than significant effects to hydrology and water quality with implementation of

mitigation. However, the USACE does not have the authority to impose mitigation measures on PCWA's project and the impact would remain significant.

Land Use

The land use assessment addresses the potential for the Proposed Action or an alternative to conflict with adopted local plans. The project site is located in unincorporated Placer County. The applicable plans are the Placer County General Plan and the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) Blueprint plan.

Implementation of the No Action Alternative, Proposed Action Base Plan scenario, and Alternatives 1 through 5 (individually or combined) would conflict with the SACOG Blueprint plan due to a lower provision of housing units. This conflict is a significant effect. No feasible mitigation is available to address this effect.

Noise

The construction of off-site water pipeline infrastructure by the PCWA which may be used by the No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5 (singly or combined), would result in less than significant noise effects with implementation of mitigation. However, the USACE does not have the authority to impose mitigation measures on PCWA's project and the impact would remain significant.

Transportation and Traffic

Traffic associated with the No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5 (individually or combined) would result in effects to intersections and roadways in Placer County, Sacramento County, Sutter County, and Roseville. These effects would be significant. Mitigation is available that would require that the proposed development pay its fair share of the cost of necessary improvements to the affected intersections and roadway segments by paying traffic impact fees to the applicable jurisdictions. However, the mitigation would not reduce effects to all roadways and intersections. In addition, USACE does not have jurisdiction over the required improvements to Sacramento County, Sutter County, and Roseville roadways. Therefore, these effects would remain significant.

Traffic from the No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5 (individually or combined) would result in significant effects to certain segments of Interstate 80, SR 65, and SR 70/99 which would already be deficient without the traffic added by the Proposed Action and alternatives in 2025. Mitigation would reduce effects on affected state highway segments. However, the USACE does not have control over the required improvements to state highway facilities and there is no guarantee that improvements would be built within the timeframe of any of the alternatives. Therefore, the effects would remain significant.

Utilities and Service Systems

The utilities analysis evaluated whether the No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5 (individually or combined) would result in a demand for utilities or service systems such that the existing facilities would not have adequate capacity to serve the Proposed Action or an alternative as well as the projected buildout of the surrounding area, and substantial expansion of the service facilities would be required.

As the analysis shows, the No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5 (individually or combined) would not have an adequate supply of recycled water to meet demand. This is a significant effect and no mitigation is available. In addition, implementation of all of the alternatives would significantly affect the Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) and the regional landfill. Mitigation, which includes a fair share payment toward the expansion of the MRF and regional landfill, would partially mitigate this effect but not to a less than significant level.

Cumulative Effects of the Proposed Action and Alternatives

The following significant cumulative effects are associated with the Proposed Action and alternatives.

Aesthetics

The No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5 (individually or combined) would have a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas and the visual character of the project vicinity by altering views of open rangeland, foothills, and Sierra Nevada, and by converting undeveloped rangeland to urban development as viewed from Walerga Road, Watt Avenue, and Baseline Roads. Development of both the project site and the Sierra Vista Specific Plan area to the north of the project site would permanently alter the visual character of the area, both under daytime conditions and at night. The Proposed Action and Sierra Vista Specific Plan development would also introduce new sources of light and glare. This would be a significant cumulative aesthetics effect. No feasible mitigation measures are available to fully address the cumulative effect.

Agricultural Resources

The project site contains 2,300 acres (931 hectares) that are designated as Important Farmland. The No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5 (individually or combined), in conjunction with other present and foreseeable future projects, would result in the conversion of Important farmland to non-agricultural uses. The Proposed Action and alternatives would implement **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.4-1a** which would reduce the contribution to the cumulative loss of agricultural land. However, because Important Farmland would be converted, its contribution to the significant cumulative effect would not be fully mitigated.

Air Quality

The project site is located in an area that is designated non-attainment for ozone, PM10, and PM2.5. As noted above, operational emissions from buildout of the No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5 (individually or combined) are estimated to exceed Air District thresholds for ROG and NOx (ozone precursors), and PM10.

In order to bring the region into compliance with state and federal air pollutant standards, air districts use General Plans and similar planning documents to determine where and how future growth will occur within the region. When development occurs that is not consistent with the intensity of development presented in a General Plan or if it was not previously accounted for, it is assumed that the emissions associated with that development are unaccounted for in the State Implementation Plan, which could hinder the region's ability to achieve compliance with state and federal air pollutant standards. The Proposed Action is consistent with the Placer County General Plan and therefore its emissions have been accounted for in the local air quality plans and in the SIP. As the No Action Alternative and Alternatives 1 through 5 (individually or combined) would develop a large-scale community that is similar to or smaller in size than the Proposed Action, the emissions from the alternatives are also within the emissions budget of the local air district and in the SIP. Because the Proposed Action Blueprint scenario is not consistent with the General Plan, it would result in emissions that would exceed the budgeted emissions.

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.8-3a through **4.8-3k,** and **4.13-1a** through **4.13-1p**, which require implementation of a number of measures to reduce vehicular and area source emissions, would reduce the amount of emissions generated by the No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, or Alternatives 1 through 5 (individually or combined). All of the alternatives would also be subject to a variety of policies that would promote the use of alternative forms of transportation and pedestrian access to commercial and office uses within the project site. However, even with mitigation, the emissions would be substantial and No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5 (individually or combined) would make a substantial contribution to the cumulative effect on regional air quality.

Biological Resources

Agricultural practices and conversions, urban development, and infrastructure development have resulted in a cumulative loss of wetlands, including vernal pools, in the study area. Future growth is anticipated to further add to this cumulative impact and the Proposed Action and Alternatives 1 through 5 (individually or combined) would contribute to this impact by filling vernal pools and other waters of the U.S. Compliance with the USACE's regulatory requirements will reduce the Proposed Action's or an alternative's contribution to the cumulative impact to less than significant. However, because a final wetlands mitigation plan has not been submitted to the USACE by the Applicants for the Proposed Action or any of the alternatives, the USACE cannot determine whether a no net loss of wetlands will be achieved and therefore concludes that the Proposed Action's contribution or the contribution of any of the alternatives to the cumulative impact would remain significant.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Proposed and current development within the Dry Creek watershed upstream of the project site combined with the Proposed Action or any alternative would increase the flows in Dry Creek, which is expected to result in adverse downstream flooding impacts. The contribution of any of the alternatives would be significant. **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.3.2-11a** and **4.3.2-11b** would reduce the contribution of all alternatives to the cumulative flooding effect but not to less than significant. The cumulative flooding effect would remain significant and unavoidable.

Noise

Several roadways adjacent to proposed residential areas under the No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5 (individually or combined) would have noise levels that exceed 60 decibels (dB) day-night average sound level (Ldn). Depending on the distance to residences at these locations, the exterior noise levels could exceed County standards under 2025 conditions (future conditions that include traffic from past, present and other reasonably foreseeable future development in the area). **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.9-4** requires new development on the project site to include noise reduction measures such as berms, setbacks, and other feasible measures to reduce noise impacts in residential areas of the project site. However, noise reduction measures may not be feasible in some cases and it is unlikely that the noise impact would be eliminated at all affected locations. The cumulative effect on on-site receptors near major roadways would remain significant.

Similarly, cumulative traffic, including traffic associated with the No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5 (individually or combined), would increase ambient noise levels along off-site roadways and despite installation of noise barriers where feasible, it is unlikely that the significant noise effect would be eliminated at all affected off-site locations. The cumulative effect on off-site receptors near major roadways would remain significant.

ES.3.2 Areas of Controversy and Issues to be Resolved

Areas of Controversy

NEPA regulations (40 CFR Section 1502.12) require that a summary of an EIS identify areas of controversy known to the lead agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public. During the public comment period for the Notice of Intent, various comment letters were received regarding the project. **Appendix 1.0** of the Draft EIS includes a scoping report containing a summary of the public scoping process as well as comments received in writing. In general, areas of potential controversy known to the USACE and the project Applicants included the selection of alternatives, compliance with the Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines, the reasonable range of on-site and off-site project alternatives, analysis of direct, secondary, and cumulative impacts, impacts to wetlands, impacts to flora and wildlife, water quality impacts from stormwater runoff, air quality mitigation, and impacts related to environmental justice. These issues were considered in the preparation of this Draft EIS and are addressed in the environmental impact analyses presented in **Chapter 3.0, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences, Chapter 4.0, Cumulative Impacts**, and **Chapter 5.0, Other Statutory Requirements**.

Issues to be Resolved

USACE will need to determine whether to grant permits for the Proposed Action pursuant to Section 404 of the Federal Clean Water Act (33 USC 3144).

ES.3.3 Intended Uses of the EIS

The EIS will be used by USACE in exercising its decision-making authority under Section 404 of the Federal Clean Water Act (33 USC 3144).

Table ES-2
Summary of Effects for Major Topics

Resource Topic/Impact	No Action	Proposed Action	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3/4	Alternative 5
Aesthetics						
Impact AES-1: Effect on Scenic Vistas	**Significant effect, no mitigation feasible**	**Significant effect, no mitigation feasible**	**Significant effect, no mitigation feasible**	**Significant effect, no mitigation feasible**	**Significant effect, no mitigation feasible**	**Significant effect, no mitigation feasible**
Impact AES-2: Effect on Scenic Resources	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact AES-3: Degradation of Visual Character	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**
Impact AES-4: Effects from New Sources of Light and Glare	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact AES-5: Indirect Effects on Aesthetics from Off-Site Infrastructure Not Constructed as Part of the Project	**Significant effect, no authority to impose mitigation**	**Significant effect, no authority to impose mitigation**	**Significant effect, no authority to impose mitigation**	**Significant effect, no authority to impose mitigation**	**Significant effect, no authority to impose mitigation**	**Significant effect, no authority to impose mitigation**
Agricultural Resources						
Impact AG-1: Conversion of Important Farmland	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**
Impact AG-2: Compatibility with Adjacent Agricultural Uses	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact AG-3: Indirect Effects on Agricultural Resources from Off-Site Infrastructure Not Constructed as Part of the Project	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Air Quality						
Impact AQ-1: Emissions Associated with Construction	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**

Resource Topic/Impact	No Action	Proposed Action	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3/4	Alternative 5
Impact AQ-2: Criteria Pollutant Emissions Associated with Occupancy/Operation	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**
Impact AQ-3: CO Hotspots	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact AQ-4: Exposure to Toxic Air Contaminants	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact AQ-5: Exposure to Objectionable Odors	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact AQ-6: Indirect Effects on Air Quality from Off-Site Infrastructure Not Constructed as Part of the Project	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**
Biological Resources						
Impact BIO-1: Loss and Degradation of Functions and Services of the Waters of the U.S. through Direct Removal, Filling, Hydrological Interruption or Other Means	No effect, no mitigation	**Potentially significant pending revised Mitigation Strategy**	**Potentially significant pending revised Mitigation Strategy**	**Potentially significant pending revised Mitigation Strategy**	**Potentially significant pending revised Mitigation Strategy**	**Potentially significant pending revised Mitigation Strategy**
Impact BIO-2: Effects on Listed Vernal Pool Invertebrates and Their Habitat	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact BIO-3: Effects on Federally Listed Plant Species	**Significant effect, no authority to impose mitigation**	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact BIO-4: Effects on Federally Listed Amphibian and Reptile Species	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact BIO-5: Effects on Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact BIO-6: Effects on Delta Smelt	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation

Resource Topic/Impact	No Action	Proposed Action	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3/4	Alternative 5
Impact BIO-7: Effects on State Special-Status Plant and Wildlife Species	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact BIO-8: Effects on Protected Raptor Species and Other Nesting Birds	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact BIO-9: Effects on Special-Status Bats	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact BIO-10: Effects on Wildlife Movement	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact BIO-11: Loss of Riparian Habitat	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact BIO-12: Effects on Special Status Fish Species	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact BIO-13: Effects on Fish Habitat from Water Diversions	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact BIO-14: Indirect Effects to Biological Resources from Off-Site Infrastructure Not Constructed as Part of the Project	**Significant effect, no authority to impose mitigation**	**Significant effect, no authority to impose mitigation**	**Significant effect, no authority to impose mitigation**	**Significant effect, no authority to impose mitigation**	**Significant effect, no authority to impose mitigation**	**Significant effect, no authority to impose mitigation**
Climate Change						
Impact GHG-1: GHG Emissions due to Construction	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**
Impact GHG-2: GHG Emissions due to Operation/Occupancy	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**
Impact GHG-3: Indirect Effects on Climate Change from Off-Site Infrastructure Not Constructed as Part of the Project	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation

Resource Topic/Impact	No Action	Proposed Action	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3/4	Alternative 5
Cultural Resources						
Impact CR-1: Possible Destruction of or Damage to Known Prehistoric and Historic-Era Cultural Resources during Construction	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact CR-2: Potential to Damage Undiscovered Historic Properties or Human Remains during Construction	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact CR-3: Indirect Effects on Cultural Resources from Off-Site Infrastructure Not Constructed as Part of the Project	No impact on Native American archaeological resources, unknown effects on historic sites	No impact on Native American archaeological resources, unknown effects on historic sites	No impact on Native American archaeological resources, unknown effects on historic sites	No impact on Native American archaeological resources, unknown effects on historic sites	No impact on Native American archaeological resources, unknown effects on historic sites	No impact on Native American archaeological resources, unknown effects on historic sites
Environmental Justice, Population, and Housing						
Impact EJ-1: Disproportionate Adverse Environmental Effects on Minority or Low-income Populations	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact EJ-2: Impacts to Population and Housing	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact EJ-3: Indirect Effects on Environmental Justice, Population, and Housing from Off-Site Infrastructure Not Constructed as Part of the Project	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Geology, Soils, and Minerals						
Impact GEO-1: Hazard associated with Seismic Ground-shaking	Less than significant, additional mitigation applied	Less than significant, additional mitigation applied	Less than significant, additional mitigation applied	Less than significant, additional mitigation applied	Less than significant, additional mitigation applied	Less than significant, additional mitigation applied
Impact GEO-2: Hazard associated with Slope Failure	Less than significant, additional mitigation applied	Less than significant, additional mitigation applied	Less than significant, additional mitigation applied	Less than significant, additional mitigation applied	Less than significant, additional mitigation applied	Less than significant, additional mitigation applied
Impact GEO-3: Potential Structural Damage due to Expansive Soils	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation

Resource Topic/Impact	No Action	Proposed Action	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3/4	Alternative 5
Impact GEO-4: Effect on Mineral Resources	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact GEO-5: Indirect Effects Associated with Geology, Soils, and Minerals from Off-Site Infrastructure Not Constructed as Part of the Project	**Significant effect, no authority to impose mitigation**	**Significant effect, no authority to impose mitigation**	**Significant effect, no authority to impose mitigation**	**Significant effect, no authority to impose mitigation**	**Significant effect, no authority to impose mitigation**	**Significant effect, no authority to impose mitigation**
Hazards and Hazardous Materials						
Impact HAZ-1: Exposure to Soil or Groundwater Contamination from Past Uses	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact HAZ-2: Hazards from Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials or Wastes	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact HAZ-3: Hazard associated with Adjacent Natural Gas Pipeline	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact HAZ-4: Risk related to Use of Recycled Water	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact HAZ-5: Risk of Exposure to Electromagnetic Fields from Transmission Lines	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact HAZ-6: Indirect Effects Associated with Hazards and Hazardous Materials from Off-Site Infrastructure Not Constructed as Part of the Project	**Significant effect, no authority to impose mitigation**	**Significant effect, no authority to impose mitigation**	**Significant effect, no authority to impose mitigation**	**Significant effect, no authority to impose mitigation**	**Significant effect, no authority to impose mitigation**	**Significant effect, no authority to impose mitigation**
Hydrology and Water Quality						
Impact HYDRO-1: Effect related to Off-Site Flood Hazards	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact HYDRO-2: Effects on Culvert Capacity	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation

Resource Topic/Impact	No Action	Proposed Action	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3/4	Alternative 5
Impact HYDRO-3: Effects on Flood Capacity	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact HYDRO-4: Effects from Construction within a Floodplain	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact HYDRO-5: Exposure to Flood Hazards related to Dam or Levee Failure	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact HYDRO-6: Water Quality Effects during Construction	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact HYDRO-7: Water Quality Effects from Project Occupancy and Operation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact HYDRO-8: Effect on Groundwater Recharge	Less than significant, additional mitigation applied	Less than significant, additional mitigation applied	Less than significant, additional mitigation applied	Less than significant, additional mitigation applied	Less than significant, additional mitigation applied	Less than significant, additional mitigation applied
Impact HYDRO-9: Effects on Groundwater Basin	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact HYDRO-10: Indirect Effects to Hydrology and Water Quality from Off-Site Infrastructure Not Constructed as Part of the Project	**Significant effect, no authority to impose mitigation**	**Significant effect, no authority to impose mitigation**	**Significant effect, no authority to impose mitigation**	**Significant effect, no authority to impose mitigation**	**Significant effect, no authority to impose mitigation**	**Significant effect, no authority to impose mitigation**
Land Use and Planning						
Impact LU-1: Result in Incompatible Land Uses	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact LU-2: Physically Divide an Established Community	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact LU-3: Conflict with General Plan	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation

Resource Topic/Impact	No Action	Proposed Action	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3/4	Alternative 5
Impact LU-4: Conflict with SACOG Blueprint	**Significant effect, no mitigation feasible**	**Significant effect, no mitigation feasible (*Base Plan only*)**	**Significant effect, no mitigation feasible**	**Significant effect, no mitigation feasible**	**Significant effect, no mitigation feasible**	**Significant effect, no mitigation feasible**
Impact LU-5: Indirect Effects on Land Use and Planning from Off-Site Infrastructure Not Constructed as Part of the Project	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Noise						
Impact NOISE-1: Construction Noise and Vibration	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact NOISE-2 Noise from Project Operations	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact NOISE-3: Increase in Traffic Noise at Buildout (Year 2025)	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact NOISE-4: Aviation Noise	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact NOISE-5: Indirect Effects on Noise from Off-Site Infrastructure Not Constructed as Part of the Project	**Significant effect, no authority to impose mitigation**	**Significant effect, no authority to impose mitigation**	**Significant effect, no authority to impose mitigation**	**Significant effect, no authority to impose mitigation**	**Significant effect, no authority to impose mitigation**	**Significant effect, no authority to impose mitigation**
Public Services						
Impact PUB-1: Demand for Law Enforcement Services	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact PUB-2: Demand for Fire Protection Services	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact PUB-3: Demand for School Facilities	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation

Resource Topic/Impact	No Action	Proposed Action	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3/4	Alternative 5
Impact PUB-4: Demand for Library Services	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact PUB-5: Indirect Effects on Public Services from Off-Site Infrastructure Not Constructed as Part of the Project	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Transportation and Traffic						
Impact TRA-1: Increased Traffic along Placer County Roadways	Less than significant, no mitigation	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**
Impact TRA-2: Increased Traffic at Placer County Intersections	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**
Impact TRA-3: Increased Traffic along Sacramento County Roadway Segments	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**
Impact TRA-4: Increased Traffic at Sacramento County Intersections	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**
Impact TRA-5: Increased Traffic along Sutter County Roadway Segments	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**
Impact TRA-6: Increased Traffic at Sutter County Intersections	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**
Impact TRA-7: Increased Traffic at City of Roseville Intersections	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**
Impact TRA-8: Increased Traffic on State Highway Segments	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**
Impact TRA-9: Increased Demand for Local Transit Service	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation

Resource Topic/Impact	No Action	Proposed Action	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3/4	Alternative 5
Impact TRA-10: Increased Demand for Local Bicycle Facilities	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact TRA-11: Impact to the Riego Road Railroad Crossing	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact TRA-12: Construction Impacts	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact TRA-13: Indirect Effects on Transportation and Traffic from Off-Site Infrastructure Not Constructed as Part of the Project	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Utilities						
Impact UTIL-1: Availability of Potable Water Supplies to Meet Demand	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact UTIL-2: Availability of Recycled Water Supplies to Meet Demand	**Significant effect, no mitigation feasible**	**Significant effect, no mitigation feasible**	**Significant effect, no mitigation feasible**	**Significant effect, no mitigation feasible**	**Significant effect, no mitigation feasible**	**Significant effect, no mitigation feasible**
Impact UTIL-3: Capacity for Wastewater Treatment Facilities to Meet Demand	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact UTIL-4: Increased Demand for Solid Waste Services	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**	**Significant residual effect after mitigation**
Impact UTIL-5: Increased Demand for Electricity, Natural Gas, and Telecommunications	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation
Impact UTIL-6: Indirect Effects on Utilities from Off-Site Infrastructure Not Constructed as Part of the Project	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation	Less than significant, no mitigation

*Significant effects that cannot be reduced to less than significant are indicated in **bold***