The Village at Loomis Project

Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations

SCH # 2007112072

December 2018

I. INTRODUCTION

This Statement of Findings (Findings) is made with respect to the approval of a General Plan Amendment, rezoning to a planned development district, Tentative Subdivision Map, related entitlements and a Development Agreement for the Village at Loomis project (Project) and states the findings of the Town Council of the Town of Loomis (Town Council) relating to the potentially significant environmental effects of the Project. This Statement of Findings addresses the environmental effects associated with the Project located in the Town of Loomis on approximately 66 acres, comprised of the following 13 parcels: 043-080-007-015, 043-080-008, 043-080-015, 043-080-044, 043-100-025, 043-100-027, 044-094-001, 044-094-004, 044-094-005, 044-094-006, 044-094-010, 043-092-037, and 043-092-036.

The Town Council, in the exercise of its independent judgment, makes and adopts these findings to comply with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub. Resources Code §§ 21000 et seq.; see esp. Pub. Resources Code, § 21081), and sections 15091, 15092, and 15093 of the California Code of Regulations, title 14, section 15000 et seq. (CEQA Guidelines). All statements set forth herein constitute formal findings of the Town Council.

The Project site is located north and northeast of Interstate 80 (I-80) at the Horseshoe Bar Road interchange and is bounded by Horseshoe Bar Road and Laird Street to the west; the Silver Ranch, Sun Knoll, and Dave Avenue neighborhoods to the north; I-80 to east-southeast; and Raley's Shopping Center to the south. The Project includes detached single-family residential uses, multiple-family residential units, a village-themed retail center, commercial uses, parks, open space, and circulation improvements. The Project is more fully described in Section III, below.

The applicant requests that the Town take the following actions:

1. Certification of the Village at Loomis Environmental Impact Report (EIR) as being complete, adequate, and in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act, adopting Findings of Fact, Statement of Overriding Considerations and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan;

2. Amendment to the Town of Loomis General Plan Land Use Diagram for the project site and amendment to Table 3-1 of the Community Development – Land Use Element of the General Plan Text;

3. Rezoning of the site to the Planned Development (PD) Zone District, including:

    a. Approval of the Village at Loomis Preliminary Development Plan, including development standards and design guidelines for the entire site;

    b. Approval of the Village at Loomis Specific Development Plan for PD Areas 1, 2 and 3;

4. Village at Loomis Tentative Subdivision Map, subject to conditions of approval and findings under the Subdivision Map Act; and

5. Development Agreement between the Town of Loomis and The Village at Loomis, LLC.

In addition, as individual development phases proceed, the project applicant and/or developers would seek issuance of grading permits, tree permits, building permits, and other approvals from the Town.

Approval of the General Plan Amendment, Rezone, Tentative Subdivision Map and other requested entitlements constitutes the Project for purposes of CEQA and these determinations of the Town Council. These Findings are based upon the entire record of proceedings for the Project. The Town Council finds as follows:

1. The Final EIR has been prepared in accordance with all requirements of CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and the Town's Environmental Protection Ordinance, codified in Title 15 of the Town's Municipal Code;
2. The Draft EIR, the Final EIR were presented to and reviewed by the Planning Commission and Town Council;
3. The Final EIR was prepared under the supervision of the Town and reflects the independent judgment of the Town. The Town Council has reviewed the Final EIR, and bases the Findings stated below on such review and other substantial evidence in the record as a whole;
4. The Town finds that the Final EIR considers a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives, sufficient to foster informed decision making, public participation and a reasoned choice, in accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines;
5. The Town Council hereby certifies the Final EIR as complete, adequate and in full compliance with CEQA, and as providing an adequate basis for considering and acting upon the Village at Loomis Project and makes the following specific findings with respect thereto. The Town Council has considered evidence and arguments presented during consideration of the Project and the Final EIR. In determining whether the Project may have a significant impact on the environment, and in adopting the Findings set forth herein, the Town Council certifies that it has complied with Public Resources Code sections 21081, 21081.5, and 21082.2;
6. The Town Council agrees with the characterization of the Final EIR with respect to all impacts initially identified as "less than significant" or "no impact" and finds that those impacts have been described accurately, and are less than significant or no impact would occur as so described in the Final EIR. This finding does not apply to impacts identified as significant or potentially significant that are reduced to a less than significant level by mitigation measures included in the Final EIR. The disposition of each of those impacts, and the mitigation measures adopted to reduce them, are addressed specifically in the findings below;
7. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP) includes all mitigation measures adopted with respect to the Project and explains how and by whom they will be implemented and enforced;
8. The mitigation measures and the MMRP have been incorporated into the Conditions of Approval for the Tentative Subdivision Map and have thus become part of and limitations upon the entitlements conferred by the Tentative Subdivision Map and other Project approvals;
9. The descriptions of the impacts and mitigation measures in these Findings are summary statements. The impacts and mitigation measures in the Final EIR are incorporated by

reference as if fully set forth herein. Reference should be made to the Final EIR for a more complete description; and

10. The Town Clerk is directed to file a Notice of Determination with the County Clerk within five working days in accordance with Public Resources Code section 21152, subdivision (a) and CEQA Guidelines section 15094.

II. STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS FOR FINDINGS

Public Resources Code section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines section 15091 require that a lead agency prepare written findings for identified significant impacts, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The Town is the lead agency for the Village at Loomis Project.

CEQA requires that the lead agency adopt mitigation measures or alternatives, where feasible, to avoid or mitigate significant environmental impacts that would result from implementation of the project. Project mitigation measures or alternatives are not required, however, where substantial evidence in the record demonstrates that they are infeasible or where the responsibility for carrying out such mitigation measures or alternatives lies with another agency. Specifically, Public Resources Code section 21081 states:

> …[N]o public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an environmental impact report has been certified which identifies one or more significant effects on the environment that would occur if the project is approved or carried out unless both of the following occur::
>
> (a) The public agency makes one or more of the following findings with respect to each significant effect:
>
> (1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.
>
> (2) Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.
>
> (3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.
>
> (b) With respect to significant effects which were subject to a finding under paragraph (3) of subdivision (a), the public agency finds that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the significant effects on the environment.

III. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Project involves construction of a village-themed retail center, commercial uses, detached single-family residential units, and multiple-family residential units on an approximately 66-acre project site in the Town of Loomis. The project also includes parks and open space. Seven

existing structures on the site would be demolished as part of the project (six residences and one commercial building). The Project site is organized into seven districts: three single-family residential districts of varying density (Village Single-Family Traditional, Village Residential, and Village Court), a multi-family district (Village High Density), a mixed-use district (Village Mixed Use), a commercial district (Village Commercial), and a public open space district (Village Public). In addition, public parks, trails and circulation improvements are included. These districts, public improvements, and other aspects of the Project are described in more detail below.

Additionally, because the Project has evolved as a result of the public environmental review and approval process, the changes to the Project as originally proposed and evaluated in the Draft EIR are discussed below. Because the Transportation Alternative evaluated in the Draft EIR (as slightly modified in the Final EIR), became the Town and applicant's preferred project, the minor differences between the approved Project and the Modified Transportation Alternative are also discussed. In general, the changes to the Project since the release of the Draft EIR do the following: implement the Town's recent General Plan Circulation Element update; increase lot sizes/reduce density; increase side setbacks; increase the supply of off-street parking; reduce unit counts; and increase the amount of active parkland within the Project. As discussed below, these modifications to the Project do not constitute "significant new information" requiring recirculation of the Draft EIR.

Village Residential

Approved Project

The Village Residential district (PD Area 1) includes 14.5 acres (20.4 acres of open space is included in calculation) of detached single-family alley-loaded residences in row-house style located on the western portion of the project site, north of Library Drive. These homes would be designed to face each other, separated by pedestrian mews or walkways. Where this district borders Laird Street and Library Drive, the alley-loaded residences would face those streets, with vehicular access at the rear of the properties. The pedestrian mews would be approximately 20 to 25 feet wide and would be landscaped to create a tree canopy throughout the walkways.

The Village Residential District would consist of 113 residences, a public park (Paseo Park, Parcel D) with playground equipment and turf area of approximately 25,570 square feet in the center of the district, a public park (Bocce Park, Parcel O) of approximately 15,995 square feet in the northeastern corner of the district, and a public park (Bramble Park, Parcel J) of approximately 20,520 square feet along the eastern edge of the district. This district would be developed with a main internal roadway that would connect to Library Drive and to Laird Street, and with alleys arranged in a grid format, consistent with the street pattern of historic downtown Loomis. This neighborhood site is immediately adjacent to the half-plex homes in the Laird Street/Thornwood Drive neighborhood. Along the edge adjoining the Laird Street neighborhood, a 10-foot-wide building setback will be required as a landscape buffer that will be planted with trees. The lots along Library Drive would have extra depth to allow for street tree planting along Library Drive.

This district includes 14.5 acres, and the average density would be 7.8 dwelling units/acre. The minimum parcel size in this district is 3,500 square feet that includes a portion (approximately 440 sf) of the privately-owned alley on the rear of the lot. The average lot size is 3,917 square feet. The front setback is 10 feet to living space and 5 feet to porch for units fronting a street and

0 feet to the porch and 5 feet to living space for units fronting on a mew/paseo. Rear setbacks are 4 feet and side setbacks are 5 feet.

The Project includes a change in the land use designation of this district from General Commercial with Residential High Density Overlay to Residential Medium-High Density to allow development of 6 to 10 acres per acre. The Project would remove the existing High Density Overlay from this location.

Comparison to Project as Proposed in the Draft EIR

The approved Project's Village Residential district is less dense and has greater lot sizes and setbacks than the Project as proposed in the Draft EIR. In addition, the amount of parkland in the Village Residential district has increased. In particular, based on feedback received from the Planning Commission and Town Council, the Village Residential district has been reduced from 141 to 113 units (28 units). The minimum lot size has increased from 2,160 square feet to 3,500 square feet. The density per acre has decreased from 9.5 to 7.8 units per acre. The side setbacks have been increased from 3 feet to 5 feet. Additional offsite parking spaces have also been added by requiring that each lot include one offsite parking space. The park proposed in "Parcel D" has increased in size from 0.41 acres to 0.59 acres. In addition, a "Bocce Park" (0.37 ac) and "Bramble Park" (0.47 ac) have been added to the Village Residential District.

Comparison to the Modified Transportation Alternative in the Final EIR

As described in Section IV, Environmental Review and Approval Process, below, following the release of the Draft EIR for the project, the Town adopted a new General Plan Circulation Element. Among the alternatives to the Project evaluated in the Draft EIR was a "Transportation Alternative," which contemplated realigning Webb Street through the project site and constructing roundabouts instead of traditional intersections, consistent with the road network described in the (then draft) General Plan Circulation Element update. In order to help the Town implement its (now adopted) General Plan Circulation Element update, the Project applicant proposes to implement the Transportation Alternative evaluated the Draft EIR. In order to further reduce the biological impacts of the Transportation Alternative, after the Draft EIR was released, the applicant proposed minor changes to the Transportation Alternative that would reduce the Transportation Alternative's unit count and reduce the amount of commercial and office space so as to further avoid impacts to biological resources. These changes in the Transportation Alternative were incorporated in the Final EIR and analyzed as the "Modified Transportation Alternative."

Under the originally proposed Project, the main internal road in this district, Gates Drive, would head north from Library Drive and turn west to connect to Laird Street. Under the Modified Transportation Alternative (and under the approved Project), Gates Drive would head north from Library Drive and turn west to connect Webb Street with a roundabout and Webb Street will be extended from Laird Street to Horseshoe Bar Road.

Like the Project originally proposed and evaluated in the Draft EIR, the Modified Transportation Alternative proposes 141 units in the Village Residential district (compared to 113 units under the approved Project). The minimum parcel size under the Modified Transportation Alternative is 2,160, like the Project as originally proposed in the Draft EIR. Side setbacks are 5 feet under the approved Project, as compared to 3 feet under the Modified Transportation Alternative. The park at Parcel D in the Village Residential district would be 0.29 acres under the Modified Transportation Alternative, as compared to 0.59 acres under the approved Project, and 0.41

acres under the Project as originally proposed and evaluated in the Draft EIR. In addition, a "Bocce Park" (0.37 ac) and "Bramble Park" (0.47 ac) have been added to the Village Residential District.

Summary of Evolution of the Village Residential District

Village Residential District	**Draft EIR Project**	**Modified Transportation Alternative**	**Approved Project**
Units	143	143	113
Minimum Lot Size	2,160 sf	2,160 sf	3,500 sf
Side Setbacks	3 ft.	3 ft.	5 ft.
Parkland	0.41 acres (active)	2.85 acres (active)	5.69 acres (active)
On-site circulation	Gates Drive would head north from Library Drive and turn west to connect to Laird Street	Gates Drive would head north from Library Drive and turn west to connect to Webb Street with a roundabout. Webb Street will be extended from Laird Street to Horseshoe Bar Road	Gates Drive would head north from Library Drive and turn west to connect to Webb Street with a roundabout. Webb Street will be extended from Laird Street to Horseshoe Bar Road

Village Court

Approved Project

The Village Court district (previously known as the Village Green Court district) (PD Area 2), is 9.8 acres, located north of the on-site extension of Doc Barnes Drive. It includes 64 alley-loaded (Village Court) detached single-family homes. The minimum parcel size in this district would be 3,500 square feet (with an average lot size of 3,852 square feet), which includes a portion (approximately 470 sf) of the private drive on the front of the lot. Front setbacks would be 5 feet to living and 18 feet to garage, rear setbacks would be 10 feet, and side setbacks would be 5 feet on one side, and 4 feet on one side. The maximum lot coverage in the Village Court district is 55%.

The Project includes a change in the general plan land use designation of this district of 9.8 acres from Residential Medium Density with Residential High Density Overlay to Residential Medium-High Density to allow development of 6 to 10 acres per acre. The Project would remove the existing High Density Overlay from this location.

Comparison to Project as Proposed in the Draft EIR

As originally proposed and analyzed in the Draft EIR, the Village Court district would be 9.6 acres and would include 71 alley-loaded detached single-family homes. As originally proposed,

the lots would front onto common landscaped courtyards. In contrast, under the approved Project, lots would have a traditional front driveway/garage and the shared front paseo "green court" is eliminated. The minimum parcel size or the originally proposed Village Court district would be 2,625 square feet. Side setbacks would be 3 feet, front setbacks would be 0 feet from paseo and 10 feet from a private lot, and the rear setback would be 5 feet. The maximum lot coverage would be 70%.

Comparison to the Modified Transportation Alternative in the Final EIR

Under the Modified Transportation Alternative, the Village Court district would be 9.6 acres, and would include 64-alley loaded detached single-family homes. Like the Project originally proposed and evaluated in the Draft EIR, the lots under the Modified Transportation Alternative would front onto common landscaped courtyards. This common yard concept has been eliminated in the approved Project. The minimum lot size under the Modified Transportation Alternative was 2,360 square feet. Side setbacks would be 3 feet, front setbacks would be 0 feet from paseo and 10 feet from a private lot, and the rear setback would be 5 feet. The maximum lot coverage under the Modified Transportation Alternative would be 70%.

Summary of Evolution of the Village Court District

Village Court District	**Draft EIR Project**	**Modified Transportation Alternative**	**Approved Project**
Acres	9.6	9.6	9.8
Units	71	64	64
Minimum Lot Size	2,625 sf	2,360 sf	3,500 sf
Side Setbacks	3 ft.	3 ft.	5 ft. one side, 4 ft. one side
Maximum Lot Coverage	70%	70%	55%
Shared Green Court	Included	Included	Eliminated (driveway/garage style homes proposed)

Village Single-Family Traditional

Approved Project

The Village Single-Family Traditional district (PD Area 3) includes 74 dwelling units on approximately 16.1 acres located to the south and east of the existing Day Avenue and Silver Ranch neighborhoods. The minimum lot size in the Village Single-Family Traditional district is 5,000 square feet. Front setbacks would be 18 feet for garages and 10 feet for living space. Side setbacks would be 5 feet and rear setbacks would be 15 feet. Twenty-foot rear setbacks would apply to lots that back up to Day Avenue, David Avenue and Silver Ranch Avenue lots. A single-story height restriction would also apply to lots that back up to Day Avenue, David Avenue and Silver Ranch Avenue lots. A 0.58-acre active park ("Village Park") is also proposed within the Village Single-Family Traditional district. The park would provide playground equipment, a turf area and a par course trail that would link to the park in the Village Residential district and pass through the central open space.

The Project would remove the existing High Density Overlay from the portion of APN 043-080-015 in this location.

Comparison to Project as Proposed in the Draft EIR

As originally proposed, the Village Single-Family Traditional district included 87 units on approximately 16.8 acres. The minimum lot size was proposed to be 4,050 square feet, and maximum lot coverage would be 60%. Side setbacks would be 4 feet. A 0.18 acre active park (Parcel H) was also proposed as part of the original Village Single-Family Traditional district evaluated in the Draft EIR.

Comparison to the Modified Transportation Alternative in the Final EIR

Under the Modified Transportation Alternative, the Village Single-Family Traditional district would include 87 single-family detached residences. The minimum parcel size under the Modified Transportation Alternative is 4,000 square feet. Side setbacks would be 4 feet. The active park within this district would be 0.3 acres under the Modified Transportation Alternative. The park would provide a parcourse trail that would link to the park in the Village Residential district and pass through the central open space.

Summary of Evolution of the Village Single-Family Traditional District

Village Single-Family Traditional	**Draft EIR Project**	**Modified Transportation Alternative**	**Approved Project**
Units	87	87	74
Minimum Lot Size	4,050 sf	4,000 sf	5,000 sf
Side Setbacks	4 ft.	4 ft.	5 ft.
Maximum Lot Coverage	60%	60%	55%
Parkland	0.18 ac	0.3 ac (includes parcourse and linkage to park in Village Residential district)	0.58 ac (includes parcourse, play equipment and turf area and linkage to park in Village Residential district)

Village High-Density Multiple-Family Residential

Approved Project

In the Village High-Density Multiple-Family Residential (PD Area 4), and consistent with the Town's General Plan Housing Element, approximately 6.6 acres of the Project site will be designated for high-density residential land. On-site constraints, including a significant rock cropping and road right of way, limit development opportunities on approximately 2 of these 7 acres. Under the RH-20 High Density Residential – 20 units per acre minimum (RH-20) density range of between 20 and 25 units per acre, the site would support a maximum of 117 dwelling units. This portion of the project site would include an active park located on 21,092 square feet (Boulder Park, Parcel K). The remainder of this portion of the site would be public right-of-way that would be offered for dedication to the Town.

Comparison to the Project as Proposed in the Draft EIR

The Project as originally proposed did not include the 21,092 square-foot Boulder Park.

Comparison to the Modified Transportation Alternative in the Final EIR

The Modified Transportation Alternative did not include the 21,092 square-foot Boulder Park.

Village Mixed Use

Approved Project

Under the Town's existing General Plan, the small portion of the Project site that fronts Horseshoe Bar Road north of Library Drive is designated commercial land use. Under the Project, this Village Mixed Use district (PD Area 5) would be designated for Town Center Mixed Use land uses, with commercial uses at the street level and multiple-family units above. The area would support 13 multiple-family dwelling units and commercial land uses. Under the approved Project, this district would include 12,000 square feet of commercial area and the district would consist of 0.87 acres.

Comparison to the Project as Proposed in the Draft EIR

As originally proposed, the Village Mixed Use district would support seven multiple-family dwelling units and commercial land uses. The district would include 12,000 sf of commercial space and consist of 0.72 acres.

Comparison to the Modified Transportation Alternative in the Final EIR

Under the Modified Transportation Alternative, the Village Mixed Use district would support seven multiple-family dwelling units and commercial land uses. The district would include 5,000 sf of commercial space and consist of 0.37 acres.

Summary of Evolution of the Village Single-Family Traditional District

Village Mixed Use	**Draft EIR Project**	**Modified Transportation Alternative**	**Approved Project**
Units	7 multiple family	7 multiple family	13 multiple family
Commercial area	12,000 sf. (0.72 ac)	5,000 sf. (0.37 ac)	12,000 sf (0.87 ac)

Village Commercial and Village Civic Park

Approved Project

The Village Commercial district (PD Area 7) is located in the southwestern portion of the project site on approximately 4.9 acres. It will consist of 44,000 square feet of commercial space and approximately 176 park spaces. Access would be provided from Library Drive, Doc Barnes Drive, and a north/south road connecting Library Drive and Doc Barnes Drive.

A 1.3 acre Village Civic Park (PD Area 6) is also proposed adjacent to the Loomis Library and Learning Center. Improvements to 0.6 acres of the Library site and Memorial Hall are also included. These improvements consist of outdoor reading areas, a demonstration orchard and small stage area.

Comparison to the Project as Proposed in the Draft EIR and the Modified Transportation Alternative

The Village Commercial district has not been changed since the release of the draft EIR. However, both the original proposed Project and the Modified Transportation Alternative included a Village Office district that would consist of 1.4 acres, supporting approximately 25,000 sf of office. The office district has been eliminated in the approved Project. Under the approved Project, the area originally proposed for the office district) is now proposed as the 1.3 acre Village Civic Park discussed above.

Village Park and Open Space

The Village Park and Open Space district (PD Area 8) includes 12.5 acres of open space and active park in the center of the Project site surrounding the onsite drainage-way, including approximately 1 acre of public roadway right-of-way for the portion of Doc Barnes Drives through this location. The open space proposed at the Project center will be offered for dedication to the Town as public open space. The Project would construct a trail along the western edge of the open space and along the northern portion of the eastern edge. The trail would include parcourse stations.

This area would also include a 0.91-acre active park (Parcel F, Bark Park) located at the future end of Library Drive and designed for a trail, parcourse equipment and enclosed dog run areas.

Comparison to the Project as Proposed in the Draft EIR and the Modified Transportation Alternative

The Project as originally proposed and the Modified Transportation Alternative did not include the 0.91-acre active in Parcel F. This area previously was proposed as 0.77 acres of passive park.

Parks, Trails, and Open Space

Approved Project

As noted, within the Village Park and Open Space district, the Project includes 12.5 acres of open space. Additional open space is provided at the end of Monument Rock Court (0.1 ac) (Parcel I), and at Parcel Q (0.24 ac) and Parcel P (0.71 ac), for a total of 13.06 acres of open space, not including trails. Further, the Project includes 5.69 acres of active parks (including 0.49 acres of trails), 0.44 acres of Class I bike trails and 0.93 acres of Class II bike trails. The 5.68 acres of active parks include: a 1.2 acre Civic Park (Parcel B); a 0.48 ac Boulder Park (Parcel K); a 0.91 acre Bark Park (Parcel F); a 0.47 acre Bramble Park (Parcel J), a 0.37 acre Bocce Park (Parcel O), a 0.58 acre Village Park (Parcel L), a 0.59 acre Paseo Park (Parcel D), 0.6 acre of improvements to the Loomis Library site, and 0.49 acres of trails within the open space.

The Project is designed for pedestrian connectivity within the project and also connecting with adjoining neighborhoods, with a focus on enhanced pedestrian connectivity toward downtown and walkability to Loomis Grammar School, Del Oro High School and the Raley's Town Center. Every street within the Project includes sidewalks and these sidewalks connect to existing sidewalks that adjoin the Project site. A new pedestrian crossing is proposed across Doc Barnes Drive and Gates Drive to connect the Project to the Raley's Town Center.

Comparison to the Project as Proposed in the Draft EIR

As originally proposed and evaluated in the Draft EIR, the Project proposed 0.59 acres of active park, 1.84 acres of passive park, 1.33 acres of trails, and 0.93 acres of Class II bicycle lanes, and 9.55 acre of open space (excluding trails). Because the amount of active parkland originally proposed did not meet the Town's Quimby Act standards, the Draft EIR included Mitigation Measure 4.12b, requiring the Project to pay the Town's in-lieu park fees. Because the Project has been modified to meet the Town's park standards, this mitigation measure is no longer required.

Comparison to the Modified Transportation Alternative in the Final EIR

The Modified Transportation Alternative proposed a slightly different configuration and size of park and open space parcels than the originally proposed project. Specifically, the Modified Transportation Alternative proposed 1.22 acres of passive park, 0.59 acres of active park, 1.23 acres of trail. Like the originally proposed Project, because the Modified Transportation Alternative did not meet the Town's Quimby Act standards, implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.12b would be required for the Modified Transportation Alternative.

Summary of Evolution of the Parkland and Open Space

Parks and Open Space	**Draft EIR Project**	**Modified Transportation Alternative**	**Approved Project**
Parks			
Paseo Park	0.41 acre (Parcel D) (active park)	0.29 acre (Parcel D) (active park)	0.59 acre(Parcel D) (active park)
Village Park	0.18 acre (Parcel H) (active park)	0.30 acre (Parcel H) (active park)	0.58 acre (Parcel L) (active park)
Civic Park	N/A	N/A	1.2 acre (Parcel B) (active park)
Bocce Park	N/A	N/A	0.37 acre (Parcel O) (active park)
Bramble Park	N/A	N/A	0.47 acre (Parcel J) (active park)
Boulder Park	0.48 acre (Parcel A-A) (passive park)	0.48 acre (Parcel A-A) (passive park)	0.48 acre (Parcel K) (active park)
Bark Park	0.77 acre (Parcel F)	0.74 acre (Parcel F)	0.91 acre (Parcel F)
Library site improvements	Not included	Not included	0.6 acres
Total	1.84 acre (0.58 ac active; 1.25 ac passive)	1.81 acre (0.59 ac active; 1.22 ac passive)	5.2 acres (all active)
Trails			

West Edge Trail (counted as active park)	+/- 1,650' x. 10' wide; 0.38 acre	+/- 1,650' x. 10' wide; 0.38 acre	+/- 1,650' x. 10' wide; 0.38 acre
East Edge Trail (counted as active park)	+/- 900' x 10' wide; 0.21 acre	+/- 900' x 10' wide; 0.11 acre	+/- 450' x 10' wide; 0.11 acre
Multi-Use Trail (not counted as active park)	+/- 4,050' x 8'; .74 acre*	+/- 4,050' x 8'; .74 acre*	+/- 3,850' x 4'; 0.35 acre*
Total	1.33 acre (0.59 active)	1.23 acre	0.84 acre (0.49 ac active)
Bike Trails			
Class II bicycle lanes on Doc Barnes Drive			+/- 4,050' x 5' x 2' 0.93*
Open Space			
Center of Project Site (Excluding Trails)	9.42 acres	9.84 acres	10.1 acres
End of Monument Rock	0.13 acre	0.13 acres	
Parcel Q	N/A	N/A	0.24
Parcel P	N/A	N/A	0.71
Total	9.55 acres	9.97 acres	11.15 acres

* Not counted as active park.

Circulation Improvements

Primary access to the project site would be provided from Library Drive and the proposed extension of Doc Barnes Drive, connecting Horseshoe Bar Road directly to King Road. Library Drive currently connects with Horseshoe Bar Road at the western boundary of the project site and terminates approximately 500 feet to the east, at the eastern edge of the library property. The project would extend Library Drive eastward approximately 500 feet where it would terminate in a cul-de-sac. Library Drive would be constructed in a 52-foot-wide right-of-way consisting of a 5-foot-wide sidewalk separated from the street by a 5-foot-wide landscaping strip on one side of the street, and a street section measuring 37 feet from back of curb to back of curb.

The 500-foot-long north/south road that would connect Library Drive to Doc Barnes Drive along the east edge of the proposed Commercial/Office district would be constructed in a 50-foot-wide right-of-way consisting of a 4-foot-wide sidewalk along each side and a street section measuring 42 feet from back of curb to back of curb. Bicycle lanes, sidewalks, and provisions for stormwater collection and treatment would be included in the cross-section.

Consistent with the General Plan Circulation Element, the Project would extend Doc Barnes Drive from Horseshoe Bar Road along the southern project site boundary to connect with Boyington Road at King Road. Doc Barnes Drive would be constructed generally parallel to I-80 in a 73-foot-wide right-of-way, with two vehicle lanes separated by a landscaped median with occasional left-turn access points to the north side. This right-of-way would include two 12-foot-wide travel lanes; a 12-foot-wide landscaped center median; a striped, 4-foot-wide Class II bicycle lane on each side; and a 10- foot-wide paved multi-use trail separated from the street by 7.5 feet of landscaping on the north side of the street.

The streets internal to each of the residential districts would consist of 20- and 22-foot-wide private alleys (Village Court and Village Residential, respectively) and 44-foot-wide right-of-way public streets. The internal public streets would include a 4-foot-wide sidewalks. Sidewalks would be provided on both sides of the public streets, with the exception of Doc Barnes Drive, which would have a sidewalk only on the north side.

The Project would also construct the Webb Street Extension and the Webb Street Extension/Horseshoe Bar Road/Library Drive Roundabout, as described and anticipated in the recently-adopted General Plan Circulation Element Update. The Webb Street Extension would include construction of a two-lane roadway from Laird Street to the intersection of Library Drive at Horseshoe Bar Road. This roadway would have a 52-foot right of way consisting of two traffic lanes and curb, gutter and sidewalk on both sides. The Webb Street Extension/Horseshoe Bar Road/Library Drive Roundabout would realign the intersection of Horseshoe Bar Road/Library Drive with the Webb Street Extension, converting the intersection into a roundabout.

Comparison to the Project as Proposed in the Draft EIR

The originally proposed Project did not include the construction of the Webb Street Extension and the Webb Street Extension/Horseshoe Bar Road/Library Drive Roundabout. This improvement was included in the equal-weight Transportation Alternative, evaluated in the Draft EIR.

Comparison to the Modified Transportation Alternative in the Final EIR

The approved Project's circulation is identical to that of the Modified Transportation Alternative.

Drainage and Grading

Traditional systems to collect and convey storm drainage to existing natural streams are proposed. A detention system would be employed to ensure that the project reduces its impact on the existing 100-year floodplain, and the rate and volume of water runoff from the site would remain at pre-project levels.

Two detention basins are proposed to be constructed in the northeast portion of the site: one in the southeast quadrant of the Doc Barnes Drive/King Road intersection and one near the southeast corner of the Silver Ranch subdivision. A detention basin measuring approximately 70 feet wide by 170 feet long would be constructed in the southeastern quadrant of the Doc Barnes Drive/King Road intersection, and another detention basin measuring approximately 75 feet wide by 75 feet long would be constructed at the southwest portion of this triangular parcel.

Comparison to the Project as Proposed in the Draft EIR and the Modified Transportation Alternative

No changes.

Easements

Two existing utility easements run through the central portion of the project site. One is controlled by South Placer County Municipal Utility District (SPMUD) and the other is controlled by Placer County Water Agency (PCWA). PCWA provided comments on the Notice of Preparation indicating that Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) transferred the easement for the

Eastside Canal, which PCWA maintains and operates, to PCWA. The project proposes to relocate a portion of the existing canal and must enter into a facilities agreement with PCWA to do so. The portion of the Eastside Canal that is proposed to be relocated would start under the pavement for the alleyway that would intersect Library Drive, between proposed lot 43 and the proposed park at the end of Library Drive, and would continue southerly under the bulb end of the proposed extension of Library Drive and the proposed multi-family residential area. The proposed realigned portion of the Eastside Canal would be placed below paved areas of the project site in Library Drive and South Gates Drive. SPMUD would also continue to have access to its utility easement. The project applicant would create an access road from the on-site extension of Library Drive north to an existing manhole to facilitate SPMUD's vehicular access to the manhole. The all-weather access road will be approximately 15 feet wide and 120 feet long, consistent with SPMUD's request for an all-weather access sufficient to support a 40,000-pound maintenance vehicle. The access road will be generally parallel to the existing PCWA easement.

Comparison to the Project as Proposed in the Draft EIR and the Modified Transportation Alternative

No changes.

Project Phasing and Construction

Project construction activities would include site clearing, grubbing, grading, and trenching for utilities, followed by paving, building construction, and installation of landscaping. The preliminary grading analysis indicates that there would be approximately 130,000 cubic yards of grading for the entire project, including for construction of Doc Barnes Drive. Across most of the site the average cut/fill depth/height would be 3 feet. Final grading is expected to balance; therefore, no soil would be imported to or exported from the project site.

Construction is estimated to occur between summer 2019 and fall 2020, with initial tasks to include site preparation (e.g., demolition of existing structures, grading, and installing utilities and backbone roadways, including Doc Barnes Drive). Although the actual construction schedule may vary from these estimates, the overall duration and types of activities is not expected to change. Eight development phases have been identified for the project, but these phases are anticipated to develop concurrently. Construction phases consist of the following:

1. Phase A – Village Residential (Village Planned Development Area 1) (113 homes): between September 2019 and September 2022.

2. Phase A – Village High Density (Village Planned Development Area 4) (117 units): between April 2020 and April 2021.

3. Phase A – Village Commercial (Village Planned Development Area 7) (44,000 square feet of commercial space and approximately 176 parking spaces): between September 2019 and September 2020.

4. Phase B (45 homes): between September 2019 and February 2021

5. 5. Phase C (64 homes): between September 2019 and February 2021.

6. 6. Phase D (29 homes): between December 2020 and September 2021.

7. Phase E – Mixed Use (12,000 square feet of commercial space, 13 units, and 30 parking spaces): between April 2021 and April 2022.

Comparison to the Project as Proposed in the Draft EIR and the Modified Transportation Alternative

At the time EIR's impact analysis related to construction-period impacts was prepared, construction was estimated to occur between May 2016 and fall 2019. Although the start of construction has been delayed, the overall duration of activities has not changed. The delay in Project implementation does not alter the impact conclusions of the Draft EIR and Final EIR.

Utilities

The proposed project would require placement of utilities to serve the new development, including sewer, water, electricity, telephone, natural gas, and cable. These new utilities are described in detail in the Final EIR (pp. 3-25 to 3-27).

Comparison to the Project as Proposed in the Draft EIR and the Modified Transportation Alternative

No changes.

Entitlements and Required Approvals

The following entitlements, permits, and approvals are required from the Town and from other responsible agencies for the Project.

- Certify the EIR (Town of Loomis)
- General Plan Amendment (Town of Loomis)
- Zoning Ordinance Amendment (Town of Loomis)
- Village Preliminary Development Plan and Village Development Standards (Town of Loomis)
- Specific Development Plans for Village Plan Areas 1, 2, and 3 (Town of Loomis)
- Tentative Subdivision Map (Town of Loomis)
- Development Agreement (Town of Loomis)
- Grading Permit(s) (Town of Loomis [ministerial])
- Building Permit(s) (Town of Loomis [ministerial])
- Tree Removal Permit(s) (Town of Loomis [ministerial])
- Section 404 Individual Permit (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers)

- Section 401 Certification (Regional Water Quality Control Board – Central Valley Region)

- Section 402 National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Compliance (Regional Water Quality Control Board – Central Valley Region)

- Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement (California Department of Fish and Wildlife)

- Section 7 Consultation (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)

- Sewer Will-Serve Letter (South Placer Municipal Utility District [ministerial])

- Water hook-ups (Placer County Water Agency [ministerial])

- Building Permit sign-off (Loomis Fire Protection District [ministerial].)

IV. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL PROCESS

1. Notice of Preparation

To initiate the CEQA review process, the Town circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) to solicit agency and public comments on the scope of the environmental analysis to be included in the EIR. The public review period for the NOP began on November 13, 2014, and comments were received through December 16, 2014. A public scoping session was held by the Town on December 2, 2014. The NOP and the comment letter submitted on the NOP are included as Appendix A to the Draft EIR.

2. Draft EIR

On May 2, 2016, the Draft EIR was completed and a Notice of Availability (NOA) was sent to the State Clearinghouse to begin a 45-day public and agency review period that closed on June 16, 2016. During the public review period on the Draft EIR, the Planning Commission and Town Council held separate public workshops, respectively on May 24, and May 31, 2016, to receive public comments on the Draft EIR.

At the time the Draft EIR was prepared, the Town was in the process of amending its General Plan Circulation Element. Based on this, the Draft EIR included a ”Transportation Alternative,” which considered the development of the project generally as proposed, but with a modification to the Gates Drive alignment through the project site. This alternative differed from the originally proposed project in that it would create a four-way intersection at Webb Street/Gates Drive/Laird Street, extending Webb Street approximately 180 feet into the project site. A roundabout would be created at this point and Gates Drive would be extended both to the east toward the interior of the project site and to the south toward Library Drive. A second roundabout would be created at the intersection of Gates Drive/Library Drive/Horseshoe Bar Road. The Draft EIR’s Traffic Impact Analysis (Draft EIR, Appendix E), evaluated the traffic impacts of the Project and the Transportation Alternative at an equal level of detail.

In addition to the Transportation Alternative (Alternative 2), the Draft EIR evaluated: a No Project/No Build Alternative (Alternative 1a), which assumed that no development would occur and the site would remain unchanged from its current condition; a No Project/Existing

Designations Alternative (Alternative 1b), which assumed that development would occur under the existing General Plan and Zoning designations for the Project site; a Reduced Density Alternative (Alternative 3a), which reduced the proposed commercial and office development by approximately 10% and reduced the average single-family residential land use density to seven dwelling units per acres, as compared to 7.7 dwelling units per acre; a Reduced Density/Transportation Alternative (Alternative 3b), which combined the Reduced Density Alternative with the Transportation Alternative; a Reduced Footprint Alternative (Alternative 4a), which assumed a reduced development footprint, while keeping a similar level of density as the originally proposed project; and a Reduced Footprint/Transportation Alternative (Alternative 4b), which combined the Reduced Footprint Alternative with the Transportation Alternative.

3. Final EIR

During the public review period on the Draft EIR, the Town received comment letters from respondents, including agencies, organizations, and individuals. Comments were also made during two public workshops and by signatories on a Facebook petition. The Town prepared written responses to the public comments received. The responses to comments are included in the Final EIR.

Subsequent to the circulation of the Draft EIR, the Town approved the 2016 Circulation Element Update of the General Plan. Based on this, and in consultation with Town staff, the applicant proposed to pursue the Transportation Alternative as the proposed Project. The applicant also proposed to omit eight of the single-family residential parcels from the proposed project to reduce impacts to wetlands, riparian vegetation, and trees. Further, the applicant proposed to apply the Town's Planned Development zoning requirements to the project. The Final EIR included revisions made to the Draft EIR reflecting these changes to the Project.

4. Planning Commission Recommendation of Denial

The Planning Commission met eleven times to consider the Project. The first public hearing was on September 12, 2017, at a joint workshop of the Town Council and Planning Commission. The second was a public hearing on September 26, 2017, the third was a continuation of the public hearing at a special meeting on October 11, 2017, the fourth was a continuation of the public hearing on October 24, 2017, the fifth was a continuation of the public hearing on November 7, 2017, the sixth a continuation of the public hearing on January 10, 2018, the seventh a continuation of the public hearing on January 27, 2018, the eighth a continuation of the public hearing on February 27, 2018, the ninth a continuation of the public hearing on March 14, 2018, the tenth a continuation of the public hearing on March 27, 2018, and the eleventh, a continuation of the public hearing on April 25, 2018.

In response to comments received, the applicant presented the following modifications to the project: (1) Reduction in the total number of units from 418 to 416, by decreasing the unit count in the Village Residential component by eight units and adding six units to the Village Mixed Use site; (2) Replacement of the Village Office site with Civic Park; (3) Increase in the supply of off-street parking to meet the Town's requirements; and (4) Reconfiguration of the Village Residential subdivision design to reduce dead-end alleys.

At public hearings in March and April, the Commission discussed the revised project and identified additional concerns regarding development standards (e.g. setbacks, lot sizes) for the Village Residential and Green Courts, the amount of parkland, and the elimination of the Village Office site. On April 25, 2018, the Commission recommended denial of the project based on the

following considerations: (1) insufficient minimum lot sizes for the Village Residential and Village Green Court districts; (2) too small of setbacks; (3) aesthetic defects from situating two-story homes along David Avenue; (4) inadequate active park space; and (5) inadequate general commercial zoning.

The applicant appealed Planning Commission's recommendation in a letter dated May 4, 2018.

5. Town Council Approval

The Town Council held a Study Session on the Project on May 24, 2018, the purpose of which was to discuss the Planning Commission's recommendation of denial of the Project, and to provide feedback and direction to Town Staff and/or the applicant. After reviewing and discussing the Planning Commission's recommendations and additional public comment, the Council provided direct to the applicant regarding project revisions, including: (1) lot sizes and setbacks should be increased in the Village Residential and Village Green Court districts to 3,500 SF and the Village Traditional district to 5,000 SF to more closely align with the Town's current minimum lot sizes; (2) additional active parkland should be incorporated in the project to meet the Town's standard for active parkland on-site; (3) applicant should provide single-story units on lots adjacent to existing residential units on David Avenue; and (4) a retail impact analysis should be prepared to evaluate the demand for retail commercial uses in the project and provide information regarding the market area.

In response to the Council's direction, the applicant proposed revisions to the Project, including to: (1) reduce the residential density; (2) increase residential lot sizes; (3) increase setbacks, and (4) increase active park acreage. The applicant presented the revisions to the Town Council at the Second Study Session on July 31, 2018. The changes to the Project are discussed in the Section III, Project Description, above and in the Town Council's staff report for the December 10, 2018 meeting.

An errata was prepared by the environmental consultant that prepared the EIR to analyze the environmental impacts associated with the changes made to the Project. The errata concluded that no new impacts and no exacerbation of existing impacts would occur. The Town Council hereby finds that the revisions to the Project adequately address the concerns raised by the Planning Commission in its resolution recommending of denial as well as the concerns raised by the Town Council at the First Study Session. The Project being approved by the Council in connection with these Findings incorporates these revisions.

V. RECIRCULATION NOT REQUIRED

Under CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5, recirculation of an EIR is required when "significant new information" is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the Draft EIR for public review but prior to certification of the Final EIR. The term "information" can include changes in the project or environmental setting, as well as additional data or other information. New information added to an EIR is not "significant," however, unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that is considerably different from others analyzed and that the project's proponents have declined to implement. "Significant new information" requiring recirculation includes, for example, a disclosure showing that:

(1) A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.

(2) A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.

(3) A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project, but the project's proponents decline to adopt it.

(4) The DEIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.

(CEQA Guidelines, § 15088.5, subd. (a).)

Recirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR. The above standard is "not intend[ed] to promote endless rounds of revision and recirculation of EIRs." (*Laurel Heights Improvement Assn. v. Regents of the Univ. of Cal*. (1993) 6 Cal.4th 1112, 1132.) "Recirculation was intended to be an exception, rather than the general rule." (*Ibid*.)

As discussed in Sections III and IV, above, since the Draft EIR was released, the Project has been revised in response to concerns raised by members of the public, Town staff, members of the Planning Commission and members of the Town Council. These changes include incorporation of the Transportation Alternative, consistent with the General Plan Circulation Element Update, a reduction in residential density, an increase in residential lot sizes, an increase setbacks, and an increase active park acreage.

The revisions to the Project do not trigger CEQA's recirculation requirements. (See *South County Citizens for Smart Growth v. County of Nevada* (2013) 221 Cal.App.4th 316, 330–331; *Western Placer Citizens for an Agricultural and Rural Environment v. County of Placer* (2006) 144 Cal.App.4th 890 (*WPCARE v. Placer County*).) The changes to the Project are not considerably different than the Transportation Alternative analyzed in the Draft and the Modified Transportation Alternative evaluated in the Final EIR. Impacts would be similar as disclosed in the Draft EIR and Final EIR for the Transportation Alternative and Modified Transportation Alternative. Some impacts would be slightly reduced from what was disclosed in the Draft EIR and Final EIR as a result of the further reduction in residential units and increase in onsite parkland.

The post-Final EIR refinements do not require recirculation. (*South County Citizens*, *supra*, 221 Cal.App.4th 316; *WPCARE v. Placer County*, *supra*, 144 Cal.App.4th at p. 899.) To the contrary, CEQA encourages the type of project refinements that occurred here. (See *County of Inyo v. City of Los Angeles* (1977) 71 Cal.App.3d 185, 199; *Citizens for a Sustainable Treasure Island v. City and County of San Francisco* (2014) 227 Cal.App.4th 1036, 1046-1047.) The Project was refined based on input received during the CEQA process, resulting in a final Project that responds to the community's concerns, reduces environmental impacts compared to the initially proposed Project, while still achieving the Project's objectives.

The Council finds that none of the changes and revisions to the Project substantially affects the analysis or conclusions presented in the Draft EIR. Therefore, recirculation of the Draft EIR for additional public comments is not required. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15088.5, subd. (a).)

VI. RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

In accordance with Public Resources Code section 21167.6, subdivision (e), the record of proceedings for the Town's decision on the Village at Loomis Project includes, without limitation, the following documents:

1. The NOP and all other public notices issued by the Town in conjunction with the Project;
2. All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the comment period on the NOP (provided in Appendix A of the Draft EIR);
3. The Draft EIR (May 2016) for the Project;
4. All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the comment period on the Draft EIR;
5. All comments and correspondence submitted to the Town with respect to the Project, in addition to timely comments on the Draft EIR;
6. The Final EIR (July 2017) for the Project, including comments received on the Draft EIR and responses to those comments;
7. Documents cited or referenced in the Draft and Final EIRs;
8. The November, 2018 Village at Loomis Revised project Environmental Effects Analysis (errata) (Dudek)
9. The Project MMRP;
10. All findings and resolutions adopted by the Town in connection with the Project and all documents cited or referred to therein;
11. All reports, studies, memoranda, maps, staff reports, or other planning documents relating to the Project prepared by the Town, consultants to the Town, or responsible or trustee agencies with respect to the Town's compliance with the requirements of CEQA and with respect to the Town's action on the project;
12. All documents submitted to the Town (including the Town Council) by other public agencies or members of the public in connection with the Project;
13. Any minutes and/or verbatim transcripts of all information sessions, public meetings, and public hearings held by the Town in connection with the Project;
14. Any documentary or other evidence submitted to the Town at such information sessions, public meetings and public hearings;
15. The *Town of Loomis General Plan* and all environmental documents prepared in connection with the adoption of the General Plan including the recently-updated Circulation Element and Negative Declaration adopted in support of the Circulation Element (July 2016);
16. Any and all resolutions and/or ordinances adopted by the Town regarding the Project, and all staff reports, analyses, and summaries related to the adoption of those resolutions;
17. Matters of common knowledge to the Town, including, but not limited to federal, state, and local laws and regulations;
18. Any documents cited in these findings, in addition to those cited above; and

19. Any other materials required for the record of proceedings by Public Resources Code section 21167.6, subdivision (e).

The Town Council has relied on all of the documents listed above in reaching its decision on the Project, even if not every document was formally presented to the Town Council or Town Staff as part of the Town files generated in connection with the Project.

The official custodian of the record is the Town Planner, located at 3665 Taylor Road, Loomis, California 95650.

VII. LIST OF IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT DETERMINED TO BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT OR NO IMPACT WITHOUT IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES

The Town Council agrees with the characterization in the Final EIR with respect to all impacts initially identified as "no impact" or "less than significant" that do not require implementation of mitigation measures. The modifications made to the project by the applicant in response to the Planning Commission workshop and meetings, and those modifications later approved by the Town Council, do not alter the conclusions of the Final EIR with respect to the "no impact" or "less than significant" conclusions. These include:

Impact 4.1-2: Conflict with surrounding land uses, current and planned, or physically divide an existing community.

Impact 4.2-1 Induce substantial population growth in an area.

Impact 4.2-2 Displace substantial numbers of existing housing and/or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Impact 4.2-3 Reduce the affordable housing supply, impair the Town's ability to meet its RHNA obligations, or create a substantial increase in demand for affordable housing.

Impact 4.2-4 Contribute to cumulative impacts associated with population and housing.

Impact 4.3-4 Interfere with resident or migratory wildlife movement.

Impact 4.4-4 Project construction could contribute to a cumulative loss of cultural resources.

Impact 4.5-1 Substantial damage to scenic resources.

Impact 4.5-3 Create a new source of substantial light or glare.

Impact 4.5-4 Contribute to cumulative impacts to the visual character of the region.

Impact 4.6-2 Increase impacts to vehicle safety due to roadway design features or incompatible uses.

Impact 4.6-3 Result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses.

Impact 4.6-5 "Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities."

Impact 4.6-6 Cause a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location resulting in substantial safety risks.

Impact 4.6-7 Result in increased vehicle circulation or congestion due to a lack of sufficient parking capacity on site or off site.

Impact 4.7-3 Excessive groundborne vibration/noise.

Impact 4.7-4 Traffic noise levels causing a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels.

Impact 4.7-5 Traffic noise levels causing a substantial permanent increase in cumulative noise levels.

Impact 4.10-4 Project construction could result in substantial alterations to existing landforms.

Impact 4.10-5 Project construction could directly or indirectly affect unknown paleontological resources.

Impact 4.10-6 Project construction could make a considerable contribution to cumulative soil erosion impacts.

Impact 4.11-1 Project construction or operation could contribute to a substantial degradation of surface or groundwater quality.

Impact 4.11-4 Project implementation could deplete groundwater supply.

Impact 4.11-5 Project construction and operation could contribute to cumulative violations of water quality standards and/or waste discharge requirements.

Impact 4.11-6 Project construction and operation could result in increased numbers of residents and structures exposed to a regional 100-year flood event in the cumulative scenario.

Impact 4.12-1 Inadequate water supply and distribution infrastructure requiring construction of new facilities.

Impact 4.12-2 Inadequate water supply and distribution infrastructure requiring construction of new facilities in the cumulative scenario.

Impact 4.12-4 Exceed existing treatment, collection, and disposal facilities, resulting in the need for expansion or new wastewater infrastructure in the cumulative condition.

Impact 4.12-5 Increased demand for gas or electricity requiring new production facilities.

Impact 4.12-6 Increased demand for gas or electricity requiring new production facilities in the cumulative condition.

Impact 4.12-7 Extension of dry utility infrastructure to the site that could cause significant environmental impacts.

Impact 4.12-8 Extension of dry utility infrastructure to the site that could cause significant environmental impacts in the cumulative condition.

Impact 4.12-9 Conflict with school district ability to provide educational services or create a substantial increase in school population.

Impact 4.12-10 Conflict with school district ability to provide educational services or create a substantial increase in school population in the cumulative condition.

Impact 4.12-11 Increase demand for library services.

Impact 4.12-12 Increase demand for library services in the cumulative condition.

Impact 4.12-13 Need to construct new or expand existing parks and facilities[1]

Impact 4.12-14 Need to construct new or expand existing parks and facilities in the cumulative condition.

Impact 4.12-15 Prevention of emergency access or evacuation plans or inadequacy of water supply for firefighting.

Impact 4.12-16 Increased demand for fire protection and emergency services requiring new facilities or reducing overall fire protection

Impact 4.12-17 Interference with emergency response or evacuation or increased demand for fire protection and emergency services requiring new facilities or reducing overall fire protection in the cumulative condition.

Impact 4.12-18 Require new law enforcement facilities.

Impact 4.12-19 Interfere with ability to provide law enforcement services.

Impact 4.12-20 Require new law enforcement facilities or interfere with law enforcement response in the cumulative condition.

Impact 4.12-21 Generate waste of a daily volume that cannot be accommodated by the Recology Auburn Placer, the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill, or the materials recovery facility.

Impact 4.12-22 Generate waste of a daily volume that cannot be accommodated by the Recology Auburn Placer, the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill, or the materials recovery facility in the cumulative condition.

Impact 4.13-2 Expose people and/or the environment to hazardous materials due to the routine storage or transport of hazardous materials during operation of the project.

Impact 4.13-3 Expose school students and staff to hazardous emissions or hazardous or acutely hazardous materials.

Impact 4.13-4 Exposure of people to existing hazardous conditions or materials on site.

---

[1] Although the Draft EIR and Final EIR identified Impact 4.12-13 as potentially significant, the increase in on-site active parkland made to the Project after release of the Final EIR has eliminated this impact.

Impact 4.13-5 Impair implementation of an adopted emergency response plan.

Impact 4.13-6 Exposure to risks associated with wildland fires.

Impact 4.13-8 Contribute to cumulative increases in exposure to hazards and hazardous materials.

VIII. FINDINGS FOR IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT MITIGATED TO LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT

This section includes the Project's direct and indirect impacts as well as the Project's contribution to cumulative impacts.

In accordance with Public Resources Code section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a), a specific finding is made for each impact and its associated mitigation measures in the discussions below. Mitigation measures are summarized below and are presented in full in the EIR and the MMRP, which is incorporated herein by reference.

Impacts in the Transportation and Traffic and Air Quality sections have some components that would be mitigated to a less than significant level, and components that would remain significant and unavoidable. These are noted in the findings for the applicable impact and separate findings are reached for the significant and unavoidable impacts in Section XIII.

Land Use

Impact 4.1-1: Conflict with land use plans, policies, or regulations.

The Project would be inconsistent with the existing land use and zoning designations on the project site and could be inconsistent with General Plan policies that were adopted to avoid or reduce adverse effects on the environment. These inconsistencies may result in physical impacts related to public services, traffic, biological resources, park requirements, cultural resources, and noise. These are evaluated in detail under the appropriate sections of the Draft EIR. Amending the land use and zoning designations as proposed would enable the Project to be consistent with the Town's land use and zoning map and the requirements specific to the land use designations and zone districts within the project site. With respect to potential inconsistencies with General Plan policies adopted to avoid or reduce adverse effects on the environment, the resource-specific mitigation measures identified in the Draft EIR analysis of impacts to public services, traffic, biological resources, cultural resources, and noise would ensure that adverse effects on the environment that reflect an inconsistency with General Plan policies are avoided. Therefore, the Project's environmental impacts associated with conflicts with land use plans, policies, and regulations would be less than significant.

> **Explanation:** The Project proposes some development under existing land use and zoning designations and some development that would occur under new land use and zoning designations. With amendment of the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance to reflect the proposed new designations, the development on-site would meet all of the development standards applicable to the site. Overall, the Project meets the intent of the Town's General Plan to ensure that future development in this area is carefully coordinated and integrated to ensure that adequate access and circulation are provided; the riparian corridor is protected; and development provides a transition to the existing commercial and residential areas.
>
> Additionally, the modifications approved the Town Council, decreasing density to 391 units, and increasing active parkland to 6.41 acres, bring the Project into compliance with the

General Plan requirements for parkland. However, inconsistencies with land use remain, requiring mitigation measures. Specifically, the Draft EIR identifies that the Project has the potential to be inconsistent with some of the policies included in the General Plan. Where such inconsistencies could occur, the Draft EIR identifies mitigation measures to avoid them. The mitigation measures require changes in project design or identify performance standards that the Project must attain. Therefore, the Project is no longer inconsistent with land use plans, policies, and regulations. Finalizing the required project revisions and meeting the identified performance standards would ensure that the Project is compatible with the site-specific physical constraints of the project site and the surrounding properties.

Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Biological Resources

Impact 4.3-1: Substantial disturbance to natural vegetation or reduction in habitat for plants and animals.

The Final EIR identified a loss of 1.5 acres of the 4.4 acres of the valley oak woodland habitat on the project site. This would result in a significant impact because this habitat is considered a sensitive natural community by the CDFW. (In contrast, the Project's impact to annual grasslands would be less than significant because this habitat is common in the region and does not support unique resources). Mitigation Measure 4.3a would provide compensation for the 1.5 acre loss of on-site valley oak woodland habitat and reduce this impact to less than significant. The removal of trees, including dead trees that provide snags and cavities that may provide nesting habitat for special status species is considered a potentially significant impact. Mitigation Measure 4.3b requires that the Project be changed to incorporate a requirement to complete nesting bird surveys to ensure that disturbance to nesting birds is avoided, which would reduce this impact to less than significant.

Explanation: Mitigation Measure 4.3a requires the project applicant to obtain a conservation easement or acquire property in fee title for 2 acres of valley oak woodland habitat located within a radius of 10 miles of the project site. This would preserve the habitat values of valley oak woodlands within the project region and support wildlife and plant populations that rely on this habitat type. Mitigation Measure 4.3b requires that nesting bird surveys be completed no more than 2 weeks prior to construction and periodically throughout construction that occurs during the breeding season (generally February 15 through August 31), and defines protocols to be followed in the event that an active nest is observed in or within 500 feet of the construction area. This would ensure that active nests are not disturbed during construction such that no take of nesting birds occurs.

Significance After Mitigation: Less than Significant.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR**.** For aspects of the mitigation measures that require efforts from other agencies, including, but not necessarily limited to the Corps, the Town Council finds the changes or alterations have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

Impact 4.3-2: Impacts to riparian habitat and waters of the United States.

The project site supports a total of approximately 6.04 acres of wetlands and waters of the United States as well as 5.6 acres of riparian habitat that does not meet the definition of a wetland or waters of the United States. The Project would require filling 0.97acres of wetlands and waters of the US, and impacts to 0.94 acres of riparian habitat.

Explanation: The Project would result in the direct removal, filling, or hydrological interruption of approximately 0.97acres of federally or state-protected wetlands as defined in the Clean Water Act and/or the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. This is a significant impact. Mitigation Measure 4.3c requires a change in the Project that would substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. The required project change is that the project applicant must purchase credits at an approved wetland mitigation bank. This would ensure that impacts to wetlands are reduced to a less-than-significant level**.**

The project applicant is requesting a Clean Water Act Section 404 permit from the Corps to authorize the proposed impacts to waters of the United States. The Project would preserve 4.66 acres of the riparian habitat on site within a designated open space area located in the central portion of the project site. The Project would also preserve 5.07acres of wetlands and waters of the U.S., including a large portion of the riparian wetland on-site. Mitigation Measure 4.3c would reduce the impacts to wetlands to a less-than-significant level by requiring the project applicant to purchase credits at an approved wetland mitigation bank. This would provide for conservation, creation, and management of compensatory habitat to ensure that the Town's and the Corps' no-net-loss standard is achieved.

Significance After Mitigation: Less than Significant.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR**.** For aspects of the mitigation measures that require efforts from other agencies, including, but not necessarily limited to the Corps, the Town Council finds the changes or alterations have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

Impact 4.3-3: Impacts to special-status species, including critical habitat.

The Project would disturb valley oak woodland habitat, riparian wetland habitat, and on-site trees and elderberry shrubs, and as such could adversely affect special-status species that rely on these habitat types and vegetation. This would be a significant impact of the Project. Modifications to the Project, including those approved by the Town Council since the Final EIR completed, have decreased the density of the Project from 418 units to 391 units, and increased total public open space to approximately 16.7 acres. This increase in open space and decrease in density has the potential to be more environmentally protective than the originally proposed project, but impacts would remain significant. Required changes to the Project would avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect are identified in the EIR. Specifically, implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.3b, 4.3c and 4.3e will ensure that the potential for the Project to adversely affect special status species, directly or indirectly, would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Explanation: The oak woodland habitat on site provides nesting habitat for several raptor species known to exist within the project vicinity, and loss of trees and woodland habitat would be a significant impact due to the loss of raptor nesting and foraging habitat. Mitigation measures 4.3b, 4.3c, 4.3d, 4.3e, and 4.3f will ensure nesting birds, raptors, the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle and other special status species are identified and that proper protocol (including surveys, impact avoidance, and acquisition of conservation easement) is followed prior to beginning or resuming construction. This will reduce disturbance to active nesting areas and roosts, and disruption of reproductive behavior for special status species found on construction sites, ensuring that the Project does not jeopardize the long-term survival of special status species.

Significance After Mitigation: Less than Significant.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR**.** To the extent the mitigation measures require efforts from other agencies, including, but not necessarily limited to CDFW, the Corps, and USFWS, the Town Council finds the changes or alterations have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

Impact 4.3-5: Conflict with the Town's Tree Conservation Ordinance

The project would result in the removal of 938 trees that meet the definition of a protected tree under the Town's Tree Conservation Ordinance. However, many of these trees are exempt from mitigation requirements under the ordinance due to their health and/or because their removal is necessary to allow for construction of Doc Barnes Drive. Of the trees proposed to be removed, 470 protected trees are not exempt from mitigation requirements. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.3g would ensure that the project complies with the Town's Tree Conservation Ordinance by replacing non-exempt protected trees that are removed or impacted during construction. Thus this impact would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Mitigation has been required under Mitigation Measure 4.3g to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level**.** These changes include the submittal of a tree plan by the project applicant, prepared by a certified arborist, prior to the issuance of the first grading permit for each phase of the project. The tree plan will ensure that off-site tree planting and/or the payment of in-lieu fees, consistent with the Town's Tree Conservation (formally, the Tree Preservation and Protection) ordinance, occurs.

Explanation: The Tree Preservation and Protection Ordinance requires that replanting be accomplished within the project site or within the Town. Mitigation Measure 4.3f requires that project changes be implemented to ensure the Project complies with the ordinance requirements for replacement of protected trees, to ensure that the adverse effects associated with tree loss will be reduced to less than significant by providing for replacement and/or compensation for the tree loss. Mitigation Measure 4.3f requires the project applicant to submit a tree plan to the Town and obtain a tree permit before removal of any trees, to plant replacement trees on-site, to conduct public education workshops and community tree-planting events, and to pay the Town's in-lieu fee and/or obtain a conservation easement to protect off-site trees. These requirements are consistent with the Town's Tree Conservation Ordinance. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.3f, the impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. Compliance with the ordinance requirements for replacement

of lost trees would ensure that substantial tree canopy is retained and/or replaced within the Town.

Significance After Mitigation: Less than Significant.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR**.**

Cultural Resources

Impact 4.4-2: Project construction could cause a substantial adverse change in unidentified subsurface archaeological resources.

Although no prehistoric archaeological resources were identified during the current or prior evaluations of the project site and surrounding areas, the possibility exists that ground-disturbing activities could disturb previously unknown historical or archaeological resources, resulting in a potentially significant impact. Mitigation Measure 4.4b requires that changes be implemented to ensure that potential impacts to archaeological resources would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. The modifications to the Project adopted by the Town Council will decrease the density of the Project from 418 to 391 residential units, and thus has the potential to reduce the level of ground disturbance required to construct the Project. This has the potential to be more protective of cultural resources. Nevertheless, impacts will remain significant.

Explanation: If sub-surface archaeological resources are discovered during construction, Mitigation Measure 4.4b would require earth-disturbing activities to be halted within 100 feet of the potential resource until a qualified archaeologist completes a significance evaluation and any recommendations of the archaeologist and Native American Heritage Commission are implemented. The surveys and implementation of resource protection and/or data recovery measures would ensure the impact would be less than significant.

Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR**.** To the extent the mitigation measures require efforts from other agencies, including, but not necessarily limited to the Native American Heritage Commission, the Town Council finds the changes or alterations have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

Impact 4.4-3: Project construction could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Explanation: Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.4c would reduce this impact to less than significant by ensuring that the proper protocols, as set forth by the California Health and Safety Code and Public Resources Code, are followed in the event human remains are discovered. Although no human remains are known or expected to occur on site, discovery of human remains is a potentially significant impact. The modifications to the Project adopted by the Town Council since the Final EIR was completed will decrease the density of the project from 418 residential units to 391 units, and thus has potential to reduce the

level of ground disturbance required to construct the Project. This has the potential to be more protective of human remains. Nevertheless, impacts will remain significant. Mitigation Measure 4.4c requires that the project applicant adhere to defined procedures in the event that human remains are discovered. These procedures will ensure that potential impacts to human remains would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR**.**

Transportation and Traffic

Impact 4.6-1: Result in an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing and/or planned future year traffic load and capacity of the roadway system, including consideration of LOS and ADT.

The Project would generate new traffic that could reduce traffic levels of service (LOS) through intersections and along roadway segments under existing plus project conditions and under cumulative plus project conditions. As discussed in the Village at Loomis: Revised Project Environmental Effects Analysis, the total daily trips of the Project would be less than under the original project evaluated in the Draft EIR or the Modified Transportation Alternative evaluated in the Final EIR. Nevertheless, without mitigation, Impact 4.6.1 would be significant. However, the Project includes construction of roadway improvements and measures required under Mitigation Measure 4.6a-d to ensure that these effects are reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Explanation: Under existing plus project conditions, the Project would result in significant impacts at two locations. These locations and the mitigation requirements that would reduce the impacts to less-than-significant levels include:

1. **King Road/Boyington Road:** The Project would increase delay for the southbound approach to this intersection in the AM peak hour from 18.7 seconds to 31.5 seconds. This would cause the LOS to drop from the acceptable LOS C in the existing condition to an unacceptable LOS D with implementation of the Project. However, this condition would be resolved with installation of a traffic signal and other intersection improvements, which would be the responsibility of the project applicant at the time that Doc Barnes Drive is extended to King Road, as required under Mitigation Measure 4.6b. Required improvements to this intersection include widening King Road to provide separate eastbound and westbound left-turn lanes, installing a traffic signal, and installing pedestrian landings and school crosswalks. As the project site is adjacent to this intersection and development of the Project and the extension of Doc Barnes Drive would require completion of these improvements, the applicant for The Village at Loomis Project would install this traffic signal at the time that Doc Barnes Drive is constructed and receive reimbursement or fee credits from the Town for the costs that exceed the Project's fair share contribution for this signal. Installation of this signal and crosswalk markings on the pavement would ensure that pedestrians have sufficient protected time to cross King Road. The traffic signal would ensure that the intersection operates at an acceptable LOS B during both the AM and PM peak hours and the impact would remain less than significant.

2. **Horseshoe Bar Road/Eastbound I-80 Ramps:** The Project would result in an increase in delay for the westbound approach to this intersection in both the AM and PM peak hours. The current LOS for both peak hours is LOS E; with implementation of the Project, the LOS would decrease to LOS F in both peak hours. In the PM peak hour, the average delay would increase from 35.3 seconds to more than 300 seconds. However, a traffic signal is planned for this intersection under the Town's General Plan. Payment of the traffic impact fee, as required by the traffic impact fee program, would include a fair-share contribution to these improvements. With installation of the traffic signal, the intersection would operate at LOS B during both the AM and PM peak hours and the impact would remain less than significant. The project applicant shall also be required to pay their fair share contribution to installation of a traffic signal at the Horsehoe Bar Road/Laird Road intersection.

3. **Taylor Road/Webb Street Intersection:** At the time that the Webb Street extension is constructed, the project applicant shall install a traffic signal at the Taylor Road/Webb Street intersection.

4. **Signage Prohibiting Left Turn Lanes:** The project applicant shall install signage prohibiting left turns from Laird Street onto Horseshoe Bar Road during peak periods. The signs shall be installed prior to issuance of occupancy permits for any new building constructed on site.

Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR**.** To the extent the mitigation measures require efforts from other agencies, including, but not necessarily limited to Caltrans, the Town Council finds the changes or alterations have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

Impact 4.6-4: Create hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists.

The Project is designed for strong pedestrian connectivity within the Project and also for connecting the development to adjoining neighborhoods. Specifically, the Project is designed with a strong pedestrian focus towards downtown and walkability to Loomis Grammar School and Del Oro High School. Every street within the Project includes sidewalks and these sidewalks will connect to the existing sidewalks that adjoin the project site. A specially designed pedestrian crossing is proposed across Doc Barnes Drive and Gates Drive to connect the Project to the Raley's Town Center. The Project would increase traffic through the King Road/Boyington Road intersection, which would be used by Project residents who may be walking to Del Oro High School. Mitigation Measure 4.6b requires that changes be incorporated into the Project such that the project applicant must install a traffic signal and pedestrian improvements at this intersection, described above, when the extension of Doc Barnes Drive is constructed through the project site to ensure pedestrian safety. In addition, the Project will construct Doc Barnes Drive in a relatively straight alignment. Given this alignment, the roadway has the potential for high-speed traffic, which could result in a significant traffic safety impact. Mitigation Measure 4.6e requires that changes be incorporated into the Project to reduce this potential impact to a less-than-significant level.

Explanation: Mitigation Measure 4.6b requires that the project applicant install a traffic signal and pedestrian improvements at one intersection while Mitigation Measure 4.6e requires the project applicant to construct intersection bulb-outs at all public street intersections on Doc Barnes Drive to calm traffic to reduce conflicts between vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians. These measures would reduce the potential for adverse safety conditions for pedestrians and bicyclists to a less-than-significant level.

Significance After Mitigation: Less than Significant.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR**.** To the extent the mitigation measures require efforts from other agencies, including, but not necessarily limited to Caltrans, the Town Council finds the changes or alterations have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

Impact 4.6-8: Contribute to a cumulative increase in traffic that conflicts with adopted policies and plans related to intersection and roadway segment function, including consideration of LOS and ADT.

This finding and explanation address only the locations where the Project's contribution to cumulative traffic impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. The Project's significant and unavoidable contributions to cumulative traffic impacts are discussed in Section IX. The traffic generated by the Project in combination with the background growth in traffic volumes in the cumulative scenario would result in reduced LOS through intersections and along roadway segments. Additionally, although the modifications to the Project approved by the Town Council since the Final EIR was completed will decrease the density of the Project from 418 residential units to 391 units, which has the potential to decrease impacts to LOS, nevertheless, cumulative impacts to traffic will remain significant. The project applicant will be required to implement Mitigation Measures 4.6a-h to reduce the Project's effects on traffic operations in the area, to the extent feasible. This would reduce the Project's impacts to a less-than-significant level in some locations, as discussed in the following explanation.

Explanation: Under the Cumulative No Project condition, several of the study area intersections would operate at unacceptable LOS (D or worse), as shown in Draft EIR Table 4.6-7. The Project will exacerbate conditions at two of these locations. Changes incorporated in the Project through mitigation measures would reduce the impacts at three locations to less than significant, as follows:

1. **The Horseshoe Bar Road/Library Drive:** Webb Street Connection Roundabout intersection is projected to operate at LOS D in the PM peak hour. This exceeds the LOS C standard, and therefore is a significant impact of the proposed project. To achieve LOS C it would be necessary to add a second northbound lane on Horseshoe Bar Road into the roundabout to the Webb Street exit. Adding this second northbound lane is required under Mitigation Measure 4.6h.

2. **The Horseshoe Bar Road/Laird Road:** The Horseshoe Bar Road/Laird Road intersection is projected to operate at LOS E during the PM peak hour. As LOS E exceeds the minimum LOS standard, the operation of the Project will result in a significant impact at this intersection. Mitigation Measure 4.6g

requires construction of a separate eastbound right-turn lane at this intersection. This will improve the LOS at this intersection to LOS C in both the AM and PM peak hours, and thus would reduce the impact to less than significant.

Significance After Mitigation: Less than significant, except the segment of I-80 between Sierra College Boulevard and Horseshoe Bar Road as discussed in Section IIX.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR**.** To the extent the mitigation measures require efforts from other agencies, including, but not necessarily limited to Caltrans, the Town Council finds the changes or alterations have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

Noise

Impact 4.7-1: Generation of construction noise exceeding established noise standards or that causes a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels.

Noise generated by project construction could exceed the Town's standards for short duration events near residential areas, as listed in Table 4.7-7. Therefore, a potentially significant noise impact could occur during project construction. The modifications to the Project approved by the Town Council after the Final EIR was completed will decrease the density of the Project from 418 residential units to 391 units, which has the potential to decrease the time required to construct the Project, and thus to decrease construction noise impacts. Nevertheless, impacts will remain significant. Changes are required to the Project under Mitigation Measure 4.7a to reduce construction noise impacts to a less-than-significant level, by requiring implementation of construction management practices that would reduce noise exposure for residential neighbors of the project site.

Explanation: During construction, heavy equipment would be used for demolition, grading, paving, and building construction, which would increase ambient noise levels. Noise levels would vary depending on the type of equipment used, how it is operated, and how well it is maintained. Noise exposure at any single point outside the project site would also vary depending on the proximity of construction activities to that point. Mitigation Measure 4.7a identifies management practices to be implemented during construction to reduce noise exposure for adjacent residences to the extent feasible. Existing residences that are closest to the project site would experience the greatest noise levels during the times when construction occurs at the perimeter of the site. Noise levels for adjacent residences would be lower when construction occurs within the central and southern portions of the site. Further, the noise levels provided in Table 4.7-8 reflect the maximum noise level generated by the equipment when operating at full power. During construction, the use of equipment varies such that equipment is typically not operated continuously at full power. Therefore, individual existing residences would not be continually exposed to the maximum construction noise levels. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.7a would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR**.**

Impact 4.7-2: Exposure of people within the project site to traffic noise levels that exceed established noise standards.

Noise from traffic on I-80 is the most substantial traffic noise source affecting the project site and would expose residents of the site to exterior and interior noise levels that exceed the Town's noise standards. This would be a significant impact of Project. Project changes have been incorporated in the Project as required under Mitigation Measures 4.7b through 4.7e. These changes, which include construction of a sound barrier, provision of air conditioning units, and increasing the sound transmission class (STC) ratings for certain windows, would reduce exterior and interior noise levels and ensure that this impact remains less than significant.

Explanation: Mitigation Measure 4.7b requires construction of a sound wall along Doc Barnes Drive to provide the necessary amount of noise attenuation to achieve compliance with the Town's exterior noise level standards. Mitigation Measure 4.7c requires that air conditioning units be provided in each residential unit so that residents would have the option of leaving doors and windows closed. Mitigation Measure 4.7d is provided to ensure interior noise levels comply with the Town's standard by requiring higher STC ratings on second-floor windows with a view of I-80. Mitigation Measure 4.7e is provided to require that future development plans for the multifamily component of the Project are reviewed by an acoustical consultant to verify that the Project's design incorporates appropriate measures to ensure that the Town's noise standards are achieved and to reduce the potential noise exposure impact to a less-than-significant level.

Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR**.**

Air Quality

Impact 4.8-1: Generate air pollutant emissions that would cause or contribute to a localized exceedance of any ambient air quality standard or exceed Placer County Air Pollution Control District's (PCAPCD) emission thresholds.

Finding: This finding and explanation apply only to project operation. The Project's significant and unavoidable impact to air quality during construction is discussed in Section IX of these Findings. All of the air pollutant emissions from project operation would remain below the PCAPCD thresholds. To ensure that the Project will avoid emissions associated with wood-burning stoves and fireplaces, which could result in significant impacts, Mitigation Measure 4.8c prohibits installation of such devices. Thus the Project is not expected to violate air quality standards during operation and the impact would be less than significant.

Explanation: All of the air pollutant emissions from project operation would remain below the PCACD's threshold. Mitigation Measure 4.8c prohibits the installation of wood-burning devices that would increase emissions of NO_x and particulate matter. The Project's impact during project operations would remain less than significant.

Significance After Mitigation: Less than significant during operation.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR**.**

Impact 4.8-2: Implementation of the Project would conflict with the policies identified in the Air Quality Element of the Town of Loomis General Plan or the goals of the PCAPCD.

The Town's General Plan requires that site preparation and development activities incorporate effective measures to minimize dust emissions and the emissions of pollutants by motorized construction equipment and vehicles. Mitigation Measure 4.8a requires that the Project incorporate mitigation measures, including the use of best management practices ("BMPs"), that reduce the impact from potentially significant to less than significant.

Explanation: The Project would comply with Town policy in implementing BMPs to control dust emissions during project construction. The BMPs included in Mitigation Measure 4.8a require the minimization dust emissions and emissions of pollutants by construction equipment. Furthermore, the Project would comply with the Town's policy on using landscaping to reduce air contaminants, as trees would be planted throughout the Project site, and the majority of the existing trees in the central riparian corridor would be retained. Therefore, the impact would be reduced to less than significant.

Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR**.** To the extent the mitigation measures require efforts from other agencies, including, but not necessarily limited to PCAPCD, the Town Council finds the changes or alterations have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

Impact 4.8-3: The Project could result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project area is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including the release of emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors).

The project site is included within the Sacramento Federal Nonattainment Area for ozone (O_3) and particulate matter. Ongoing development and operation of new land uses would generate additional emissions of O_3 precursors (ROG and NO_x) and particulate matter, which may adversely affect the ability of the region to achieve attainment with the applicable air quality standards. Modifications to the Project approved by the Town Council have decreased the density of the Project from 418 residential units to 391 units, and increased total public open space by approximately five acres, to 16.7 acres. Although these modifications have the potential to decrease the Project's contribution of pollutants to air pollutants, nevertheless, this would be a significant cumulative impact. Project changes required under Mitigation Measure 4.8d, which requires the project applicant to contribute to the PCAPCD emissions offset program or implement a site-specific mitigation program to reduce the Project's contribution to the cumulative impact, would reduce the Project's impact in the cumulative scenario to a less-than-significant level.

Explanation: Because the Project would impact the region's ability to reach a federal attainment status, Mitigation Measure 4.8d will either require that a site-specific plan to reduce its cumulative impact be created or a monetary contribution to a regional air pollution reduction plan. The creation of a site-specific plan or contribution to a regional reduction plan will reduce the Project's cumulative impact to a less-than-significant level by reducing or compensating for the Project's air pollutant emissions.

Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR**.** To the extent the mitigation measures require efforts from other agencies, including, but not necessarily limited to PCAPCD, the Town Council finds the changes or alterations have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

Geology and Soils

Impact 4.10-1: Project implementation could expose people or structures to substantial seismic risk.

The Project includes construction within the existing 100-year floodplain as mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency. Alluvial soils could present hazards related to seismic stability, thus the Project would have a significant impact related to seismic risk. Project changes are required under Mitigation Measure 4.10a which mandates that a geotechnical investigation of development areas within the existing 100-year floodplain be completed, and that recommendations of that focused geotechnical investigation be implemented, during project construction. Further, all new structures constructed on the project site are required to conform to building standards specified by the CBC, including specifications for seismic force resistance and structural integrity. Compliance with Mitigation Measure 4.10a and the IBC/CBC standards would ensure that impacts related to seismic events with potential to occur on the project site would be less than significant.

Explanation: The project site is located approximately 15 miles west of portions of the Foothills Fault System. This system has been characterized as having the potential to produce earthquakes with a magnitude up to 6.5, although it is not designated as an active fault zone. The project site is not located in an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. Adherence to CBC standards would ensure that buildings on the site will be constructed to withstand seismic ground accelerations that may occur at the project site. This will reduce the risk that seismic events could result in personal injury or property damage. Mitigation Measure 4.10a requires preparation of a geotechnical analysis and implementation of any of the recommendations of the geotechnical engineer to ensure that development in an area of alluvial soils does not pose any seismic risks. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.10a will reduce the Project's impact to a less-than-significant level.

Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Impact 4.10-2: The project site could be located on an unstable geologic unit or soil, which could expose people to hazardous conditions.

The site supports three soil types, one of which is associated with the 100-year floodplain. Development within the alluvial soils in the floodplain could be subject to hazards associated with unstable geologic units or soils. Changes required in the Project under Mitigation Measure 4.10a mandates that a geotechnical investigation of development areas within the existing 100-year floodplain be completed and that recommendations of that focused geotechnical investigation be implemented during project construction, would ensure that the potential for hazards is reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Explanation: There are three soil types within the project site: Xerorthents, Andregg, and Caperton-Andregg. The Xerorthents soil type is associated with soils within the 100-year floodplain, and the majority of the floodplain on site is proposed to remain in open space, although 14 residential lots would encroach on the eastern portion. As required in Mitigation Measure 4.10a and by the Town of Loomis Municipal Code sections 14.20.040 and 12.04.310, a geotechnical investigation must be prepared for any development areas that would encroach into the existing 100-year floodplain to ensure the stability of those soils. This focused geotechnical investigation would identify the existing soil conditions in the area, evaluate the capability of the soil to support the proposed development, and identify specific design and construction measures that would ensure soil stability post-development. These measures may include recommendations regarding excavation of soil and replacement with engineered soil, maximum cut and fill bank slopes, and use of retaining walls. With preparation of a focused geotechnical investigation and implementation of the recommended design and construction measures, the Project will have less than significant impacts related to unstable geologic units or soils.

Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR**.**

Impact 4.10-3: Project construction could result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

Due to the volume of material that will be moved within the site, there is potential for soil erosion to occur, which could lead to sedimentation of on-site and nearby waterways as well as deposition of soil on neighboring properties and public rights-of-way. Modifications to the Project approved by the Town Council since the Final EIR was completed will reduce residential density from 418 units to 391 units, and increase parkland and open space to approximately 16.7 acres. These changes may require less removal of topsoil, and thus have the potential to slightly decrease the volume of topsoil required to be removed at the site. Nevertheless, this would remain a significant impact during construction of the Project. Mitigation Measure 4.10b requires changes in the Project to ensure that the impacts associated with soil erosion during construction will be reduced to less than significant by implementing BMPs during construction and for post-construction conditions.

Explanation: Chapter 12.04, Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control, of the Town's Municipal Code provides that grading permits issued by the Town include conditions of approval requiring incorporation of measures necessary to ensure that soil erosion is minimized during and following construction. Although modifications to the Project approved

by the Town Council since the Final EIR was completed have the potential to slightly decrease the volume of level of grading required at the site, this would remain a significant impact. Consistent with these requirements, Mitigation Measure 4.10b requires that the grading permit application for the project site include an erosion and sediment control plan that stipulates implementation of BMPs to control erosion during grading. Erosion and sediment control plans must comply with the Town's Stormwater Management Plan, the California Stormwater Quality Association BMP Handbook, and requirements of other responsible agencies. The Project will be required to comply with the requirements and conditions of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit issued by the Regional Water Quality Control Board, and would be required to prepare a stormwater pollution prevention plan that must be implemented during construction of the Project. The stormwater pollution prevention plan will include permanent BMPs to control soil erosion, including revegetation of disturbed areas, use of vegetated swales to filter runoff to detention basins, detached downspouts, and landscape strips to promote infiltration of stormwater. This will ensure that the Project does not result in substantial soil erosion or associated sedimentation throughout project operation and this impact will be less than significant.

Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Impact 4.11-2: Project implementation could result in flooding as a result of increased stormwater runoff volumes or rates that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater infrastructure.

Development of roads, buildings, and other paved and impermeable surfaces would reduce the amount of stormwater that currently infiltrates into the ground and could increase the volume and rate of runoff leaving the project site. A significant impact would occur if post-development stormwater runoff rates are not reduced to levels below the pre-development runoff rates. Project changes required under Mitigation Measure 4.11a, which mandates preparation of a final drainage report demonstrating that stormwater runoff for the 2-year, 10-year, and 100-year storms is reduced to 90% of the pre-development runoff rates, will ensure that this impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level. Modifications to the Project approved by the Town Council since the Final EIR was completed, which reduce the residential density of the Project from 418 units to 391 units, and increase the total public open space to approximately 16.7 acres, have the potential to slightly decrease the level of stormwater runoff site. Nevertheless, this will remain a significant impact.

Explanation: The final drainage report must demonstrate that stormwater runoff for the 2-year, 10-year, and 100-year storms is reduced to 90% of the pre-development runoff rates. Impacts will be reduced to less-than-significant with the use of stormwater retention and detention mechanisms, such as the proposed detention basins. Compliance with Mitigation Measure 4.11a will ensure that the Project will not increase the rate of stormwater runoff and that increases in stormwater runoff volume will not result in on-site or downstream flooding as a result of the Project.

Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR**.**

Impact 4.11-3: Placement of fill or structures in the 100-year floodplain could result in on- or off-site flooding hazards.

The FEMA-designated 100-year floodplain occurs through the central portion of the project site, surrounding the unnamed drainage in this area. The FEMA-designated floodplains were mapped based on regional topography and drainage data and do not reflect site-specific conditions. The Project will develop lots within the currently-mapped 100-year floodplain, which could result in significant impacts related to on- and off-site flooding. However, changes to the Project required under Mitigation Measure 4.11b will ensure that development on-site does not contribute to on- or off-site flooding hazards by requiring the project applicant to obtain a Letter of Map Revision from FEMA to verify that project grading and construction will not occur within the post-development floodplain and would not contribute to on- and off-site flooding hazards. After implementation of changes to the Project required under Mitigation Measure 4.11b, this impact would be reduced to less than significant.

Explanation: Recognizing that the FEMA-designated floodplain may not be accurate, FEMA provides property owners with a process to have the FEMA floodplain maps revised based on site-specific data. In this process, prior to finalizing the Project's improvement plans, the project applicant would support the Town in preparing and submitting an application for a Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR). While the Project will place grading and structures within the mapped 100-year pre-development floodplain, the site would be engineered, through grading and construction of retaining walls, to ensure that no development would be located within the post-development floodplain. This will ensure that the Project is consistent with General Plan requirements to preclude development within the post-development floodplain. Mitigation Measure 4.11b requires that the project applicant obtain a CLOMR prior to improvement plan approval to ensure that modifications to the floodplain designation will not result in adverse effects related to flooding on-site or off-site. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.11b to ensure that the FEMA-designated floodplain is revised consistent with the development, there will be no structures placed within the post-development 100-year floodplain and the Project would not contribute to on-site and/or off-site flooding. After implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.11b, this impact will be reduced to less than significant.

Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR**.** To the extent the mitigation measures require efforts from other agencies, including, but not necessarily limited to FEMA, the Town Council finds the changes or alterations have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

Public Services and Utilities

Impact 4.12-3: Exceed existing treatment, collection, and disposal facilities, resulting in the need for expansion or new wastewater infrastructure.

Under current conditions, the Lower Loomis Trunk Line will not have adequate capacity to serve the Project. Modifications to the Project approved by the Town Council since the Final EIR was completed have decreased the density of the Project from 418 units to 391 units, however, this remains a potentially significant impact. However, the South Placer Municipal Utility District (SPMUD) is proceeding with a project to increase capacity in the system by constructing the Loomis Diversion Line. Mitigation Measure 4.12a requires a change in the Project by mandating that a will-serve letter confirming there is adequate capacity for the Project be obtained from SPMUD prior to construction of any new residences or non-residential buildings.

Explanation: SPMUD is proceeding with a project to construct the Loomis Diversion Line, which is part of SPMUD's adopted master plan. In July 2015, SPMUD published a Diversion Pipeline Project MND for the expansion of the sewer system in the area; the document was approved by the Town Council on August 11, 2015. Construction of the Loomis Diversion Line began in 2017 and could be completed within the next year. The Loomis Diversion Line would have adequate capacity to serve the Project as well as other locations in the Town and surrounding vicinity. Mitigation Measure 4.12a requires that the project applicant submit written communication from SPMUD which confirms sufficient wastewater collection and conveyance capacity is available to serve the development prior to recordation of the final map for the Project. This will reduce the Project's impact to less than significant by ensuring that wastewater service is available to the project site prior to construction of any new residences or non-residential buildings.

Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR**.** To the extent the mitigation measures require efforts from other agencies, including, but not necessarily limited to SPMUD, the Town Council finds the changes or alterations have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Impact 4.13-1: Expose construction workers and/or the environment to hazardous materials due to an accidental release during construction.

Hazardous materials may be used and stored at the project site during construction, including paints, solvents, greases, motor oil, gasoline diesel fuels, and other construction-related materials. The use of these materials may also generate hazardous waste. No acutely hazardous materials will be used during construction of the Project. In addition, materials handled would not pose a significant risk to off-site residents or construction workers because they will be used and stored in accordance with existing laws and regulations. All construction equipment and materials will be temporarily stored on-site during construction. Potential adverse impacts associated with use of these types of materials involve the exposure of construction workers and/or the environment to hazardous materials from an accidental release during construction. Project changes required under Mitigation Measure 4.13a, which stipulates requirements for use and storage of hazardous materials and requirements for disposal of hazardous waste, will ensure that potential impacts from accidental releases are less than significant.

Explanation: The project applicant is required to comply with the Town's General Plan Safety Element policies which requires the implementation of state and local requirements

for interim storage of hazardous and flammable materials during all construction activities. Although not anticipated, if quantities of fuel or oil greater than or equal to 1,320 gallons are stored on the project site during construction, a Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure Plan must be prepared in accordance with Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, section 112. Mitigation Measure 4.13a defines additional requirements for use and storage of hazardous materials and for disposal of hazardous waste to ensure that if a spill should occur, it will be contained and reported to the Placer County Environmental Health Department immediately. Compliance with Mitigation Measure 4.13a will ensure potential impacts from accidental releases are less than significant.

Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR**.** To the extent the mitigation measures require efforts from other agencies, including, but not necessarily limited to the Placer County Environmental Health Department, the Town Council finds the changes or alterations have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

Impact 4.13-7: Creation of or exposure to health hazards.

The Project would have a significant impact related to health hazards if the proposed detention basins and any other water quality devices provide mosquito breeding habitat. Project changes required under Mitigation Measures 4.13b, 4.13c, and 4.13d will ensure that this impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level by ensuring that water quality devices are maintained and managed to avoid creation of mosquito habitat.

Explanation: Mosquitoes can carry and transmit various human diseases. Siltation traps installed in conjunction with catch basins and other drainage devices can hold water for several days and provide mosquito breeding habitat. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.13b, 4.13c, and 4.13d require management of on-site water quality devices and facilities to minimize the potential for the project site to support mosquito populations. This will ensure that this impact is reduced to less than significant.

Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR**.** To the extent the mitigation measures require efforts from other agencies, the Town Council finds the changes or alterations have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

IX. FINDINGS FOR SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The Town Council agrees with the characterization in the Final EIR that there are six significant and unavoidable impacts of the Project. These include the Project's direct and indirect impacts related to cultural and visual resources, air quality, and greenhouse gas emissions, as well as the Project's contribution to cumulative impacts in biological resources, and transportation and traffic.

Biological Resources

Impact 4.3-6*:* Contribute to a cumulative loss of habitat for common and special-status wildlife species.

The project site represents one of the largest undeveloped tracts within the Town. Although changes to the Project required in Mitigation Measures 4.3a through 4.3f will reduce and/or provide compensation for the Project's direct impacts to sensitive habitats and special-status species, the Project will result in the permanent loss of most of the natural habitat on site. This is considered a cumulatively considerable contribution to the cumulative loss of habitat in the region and, therefore, a significant and unavoidable project impact. Modifications to the Project approved by the Town Council since the Final EIR was completed have decreased the residential density of the Project from 418 units to 391 units, and increased total public open space to approximately 16.7 acres. This increase in open space and decrease in density has the potential to be more environmentally protective than the project as originally designed, but impacts would remain cumulatively significant and unavoidable.

Explanation: The geographic area for consideration of cumulative impacts to wildlife species is the Town of Loomis. The cumulative scenario for this analysis is buildout of the Town of Loomis General Plan and construction of the approved and proposed projects within the Town, as described in Draft EIR Section 4.1, Land Use. The Project would contribute to the buildout scenario envisioned in the General Plan. The project site represents one of the largest undeveloped tracts within the Town. Construction and operation of the Project will result in the loss of habitat which provides foraging and nesting value to special-status raptor species and the loss of sensitive natural communities. Although implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.3a through 4.3f will reduce and/or provide compensation for the Project's direct impacts to sensitive habitats and special-status species, the Project will result in the permanent loss of most of the natural habitat on site. This is considered a cumulatively considerable contribution to the cumulative loss of habitat in the region and, therefore, a significant and unavoidable Project impact.

Significance After Mitigation: Significant and Unavoidable.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. To the extent the mitigation measures require efforts from other agencies, including but not necessarily limited to CDFW, the Corps, and USFWS, the Town Council finds the changes or alterations have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. To the extent that this significant adverse impact will not be substantially lessened or avoided, the Town Council finds that specific economic, social, policy-based, and other considerations identified in the Statement of Overriding Considerations support approval of the Project.

Cultural Resources

Impact 4.4-1: Project construction could cause a substantial adverse change in historical resources.

Two existing residences within the project site are considered potentially eligible for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources. The Project will demolish these buildings. This will destroy the physical characteristics that convey their historical significance. Therefore, the Project will cause a significant impact to a historic resource. Changes will be incorporated in the

Project as required by Mitigation Measure 4.4a, but it will not be feasible to preserve the buildings, thus the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Explanation: Two of the on-site residences were determined potentially eligible for listing on the CRHR: 3616 Laird Street and 5901 Horseshoe Bar Road. Both of these residences will be demolished to accommodate the Project. The cultural report found that these two residences are potentially eligible for the CRHR because they are associated with the early settlement and residential development of the Town and because they exemplify the Late Victorian Queen Anne architectural style. Specifically, they are considered eligible for listing on the CRHR under Criterion 1 (association with the early settlement and residential development of Loomis at the turn of the century) and Criterion 3 (as examples of modest, yet elegant, Late Victorian Queen Anne architecture). The cultural resources analysis noted that the two properties were most likely built by the same architect due to the extreme similarity in the design, with one home having undergone remodeling that reduces its significance and the other remaining truer to its original construction.

The cultural resources analysis (Historic Resource Associates 2015) recognized that "the importance or significance of the subject properties is only at the local level. The subject properties represent an extremely common architectural style found throughout the Sierra foothills down through the Sacramento Valley. Neither of the subject properties is in above average or exceptional condition or integrity, either for the time period or architectural style. Furthermore, there are 12 other properties in the immediate vicinity in Loomis that would likely meet Criterion 1 and/or 3 which are equal or superior to the subject properties as examples of the referenced criteria." The 12 properties, which were identified through a vehicle survey of old town Loomis, were all of Late Victorian or transitional Victorian and have been maintained better than the two properties on the project site.

The cultural resources analysis determined that neither of the properties meets the criteria for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Based on the buildings' potential eligibility for listing on the CRHR, these two residences are considered historic resources. Demolition of these buildings will destroy the physical characteristics that convey their historical significance. Therefore, the Project will cause a significant impact to a historic resource. Although changes to the Project under Mitigation Measure 4.4a, requiring photographic recordation of the buildings, will reduce the impact, the Project will result in demolition of two buildings that have been determined potentially eligible for listing on the CRHR. The loss of the resources cannot be reduced to a less than significant level through mitigation; therefore, the impact will remain significant and unavoidable. Further changes to the Project that would result in retention of the historic buildings would not be feasible due to the buildings' location along the western boundary of the project site, where a commercial/mixed-use district is proposed.

Significance After Mitigation: Significant and Unavoidable.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. To the extent that this significant adverse impact will not be substantially lessened or avoided, the Town Council finds that specific economic, social, policy-based, and other considerations identified in the Statement of Overriding Considerations support approval of the Project.

Visual Resources

Impact 4.5-2: Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the project area and its surroundings.

The Project will permanently alter the visual environment of the project site, which is visible from off-site locations within the Town of Loomis and from I-80. The Project will eliminate the majority of the native woodland, grassland, and topography on site. Modifications to the Project approved by the Town Council since the Final EIR was completed have decreased the residential density of the Project from 418 units to 391 units, and increased total public open space to approximately 16.7 acres. This increase in open space and decrease in density has the potential to be more environmentally protective of aesthetic resources than the originally proposed project, but impacts will remain significant and unavoidable. It is not feasible to further alter the Project in a way that would retain sufficient natural vegetation and topography to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, this impact is significant and unavoidable.

Explanation: The Project incorporates retention of natural vegetation and topography through the center of the site, with creation of an approximately 10-acre open space area encompassing some grassland, woodland, and riparian habitat. Landscaped open space areas will preserve some of the openness currently on the site but nevertheless, will alter the existing visual character of the project site by developing a residential and commercial Town Center on land that is predominantly undeveloped. Construction of the Project will result in a transition from views of natural topography, foothill oak woodland, and grassland to primarily developed uses and related infrastructure. Reducing or avoiding these impacts would require greater preservation of the existing vegetation on-site. This is not considered a feasible mitigation measure because it would require a substantial redesign of the Project to effectively reduce these impacts. Thus, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

Significance After Mitigation: Significant and Unavoidable.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. To the extent that this significant adverse impact will not be substantially lessened or avoided, the Town Council finds that specific economic, social, policy-based, and other considerations identified in the Statement of Overriding Considerations support approval of the Project.

Transportation and Traffic

Impact 4.6-8: Contribute to a cumulative increase in traffic that conflicts with adopted policies and plans related to intersection and roadway segment function, including consideration of LOS and ADT.

This finding and explanation address only the locations where the Project's contribution to cumulative traffic impacts could not be reduced to less than significant and would remain significant and unavoidable. The Project's contribution to cumulative traffic impacts that will be reduced to a less-than-significant level are discussed in Section IX. Although modifications to the Project approved by the Town Council since the Final EIR was completed have decreased the residential density of the Project from 418 units to 391 units, and this decrease in density has the potential cause less impacts to traffic and LOS, impacts would remain cumulatively

significant and unavoidable. The traffic generated by the Project, in combination with the background growth in traffic volumes in the cumulative scenario, would result in reduced LOS through intersections and along roadway segments. The changes that have been incorporated in the Project through the requirements expressed in Mitigation Measures 4.6a-h, which include fair share contributions towards necessary improvements, would reduce the Project's effects on traffic operations in the area to the extent feasible, but do not lessen impacts on I-80 itself. Caltrans has not identified any improvements for that stretch of I-80 to reduce impacts; therefore, the Project's impacts would remain significant and unavoidable in one location, as discussed in the following explanation.

Explanation: Under the Cumulative No Project condition, several of the study area intersections would operate at unacceptable LOS (D or worse), as shown in Draft EIR Table 4.6-7. The Project will exacerbate conditions at some of these locations. As discussed in Section VIII, these impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level in two locations. However, the Project will result in the following significant and unavoidable impact:

1. Interstate 80 would carry traffic volumes that are indicative of LOS F with and without the project. Caltrans considers that any increase in traffic volumes on facilities that fail to meet adopted minimum standards is a significant impact. Under Project, volumes on I-80 will increase by 1,730 vehicles for the segment of I-80 between Sierra College Boulevard and Horseshoe Bar Road. Therefore the Project will result in a significant and unavoidable impact to this segment of I-80. The Traffic Impacts Analysis indicates that volumes on the segment of I-80 between Horseshoe Bar Road and Penryn Road will decrease by 1,380 vehicles with implementation of the Project.

Significance After Mitigation: Significant and Unavoidable on the segment of I-80 between Sierra College Boulevard and Horseshoe Bar Road.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. To the extent the mitigation measures require efforts from other agencies, including but not necessarily limited to Caltrans, the Town Council finds the changes or alterations have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. To the extent that this significant adverse impact will not be substantially lessened or avoided, the Town Council finds that specific economic, social, policy-based, and other considerations identified in the Statement of Overriding Considerations support approval of the Project.

Air Quality

Impact 4.8-1: Generate air pollutant emissions that would cause or contribute to a localized exceedance of any ambient air quality standard or exceed PCAPCD's emission thresholds.

This finding applies only to construction of the Project. The Project's less-than-significant impact to air quality during operation is discussed in Section VIII. Modifications to the Project approved by the Town Council since the Final EIR was completed have decreased the residential density of the Project from 418 units to 391 units, and increased total public open space to approximately 16.7 acres. This increase in open space and decrease in density has the potential to be more environmentally protective than the originally proposed project, by potentially requiring a shorter time period for construction, but impacts will remain significant and unavoidable. During two of the anticipated construction phases, and particularly when construction phases overlap, emissions of air pollutants would exceed the PCAPCD standards.

Project changes have been required under Mitigation Measures 4.8a and 4.8b to reduce all levels of pollutants except for oxides of nitrogen (NO_x). Further reductions in NOx emissions during construction would not be feasible. Thus the impact will remain significant and unavoidable.

Explanation: During periods in which construction phases overlap, NO_x emissions were modeled to range between 82.10 and 144.43 pounds per day. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.8a and 4.8b will reduce these levels by requiring the Project to implement standard emissions reduction measures recommended by PCAPCD and to use a construction equipment fleet for grading that achieves a 20% reduction in NOx emissions, compared to the statewide fleet average. However, emissions would periodically exceed the PCACPD standards during portions of the construction process. The identified mitigation measures would provide the maximum feasible reduction in project construction air pollution emission. This results in a significant and unavoidable impact to air quality during construction.

Significance After Mitigation: Significant and Unavoidable during construction.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. To the extent the mitigation measures require efforts from other agencies, including but not necessarily limited to PCAPCD, the Town Council finds the changes or alterations have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. To the extent that this significant adverse impact will not be substantially lessened or avoided, the Town Council finds that specific economic, social, policy-based, and other considerations identified in the Statement of Overriding Considerations support approval of the Project.

Greenhouse Gas

Impact 4.9-1: Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.

The Project will have a significant impact related to GHG emissions. Modifications to the Project approved by the Town Council since the Final EIR was completed have decreased the residential density of the Project from 418 units to 391 units, and increased total public open space to approximately 16.7 acres. This increase in open space and decrease in density has the potential to be more environmentally protective than the originally proposed project, by generating fewer GHG emissions, but impacts will remain significant and unavoidable. Project changes required under Mitigation Measure 4.9 will reduce this impact by ensuring that buildings constructed on-site have improved energy efficiency, but it would not be feasible to reduce emissions to less than 1,100 tons per year, and the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Explanation: The Project will generate more than 1,100 tons per year of GHG emissions during the first construction year and throughout project operation and the Project has incorporated design measures to minimize GHG emissions. Mitigation Measure 4.9 establishes requirements to ensure that compliance with the California Building Code 2014 Title 24 requirements, use of energy-efficient lighting, installation of energy-efficient appliances, installation of solar panels for residences, and provisions to reduce water demand are implemented during project construction in order to increase the energy efficiency of residential and non-residential buildings constructed on-site. While Mitigation

Measure 4.9 will reduce GHG emissions associated with the Project, the Project's emissions will remain above 1,100 tons per year. The majority of GHG emissions associated with the Project will come from motor vehicle traffic to and from the site, and there are no feasible changes to the Project that would substantially reduce these emissions.

Significance After Mitigation: Significant and Unavoidable.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. To the extent that this significant adverse impact will not be substantially lessened or avoided, the Town Council finds that specific economic, social, policy-based, and other considerations identified in the Statement of Overriding Considerations support approval of the Project.

Impact 4.9-2: Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emission of greenhouse gases.

Finding: The Project will have a significant impact related to GHG emissions. Project changes required under Mitigation Measure 4.9 will reduce this impact by ensuring that buildings constructed on-site have improved energy efficiency, but it would not be feasible to reduce emissions to less than 1,100 tons per year, and the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Explanation: The Town has not adopted any plans or policies for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. Because PCAPCD's thresholds for GHG emissions were developed in concert with other Air Pollution Control Districts with the intention of reducing GHG emissions to meet state and federal requirements, compliance with the PCAPCD's, GHG threshold of 1,100 tons per year is considered compatible with regulations related to GHG emissions reductions for a project-level analysis. The Project will generate more than 1,100 tons per year of GHG emissions during the first year of project construction and throughout project operation; the Project has incorporated design measures to minimize GHG emissions. Mitigation Measure 4.9 establishes requirements to ensure that compliance with the Californian Building Code 2014 Title 24 requirements, use of energy-efficient lighting, installation of energy-efficient appliances, installation of solar panels on residences, and provisions to reduce water demand are implemented during project construction to increase the energy efficiency of the residential and non-residential buildings constructed on-site. While Mitigation Measure 4.9 will reduce GHG emissions associated with the Project, the Project's emissions will remain above 1,100 tons per year. The majority of GHG emissions associated with the Project will come from motor vehicle traffic to and from the site, and there are no feasible project changes that would substantially reduce these emissions.

Significance After Mitigation: Significant and Unavoidable.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. To the extent that this significant adverse impact will not be substantially lessened or avoided, the Town Council finds that specific economic, social, policy-based, and other considerations identified in the Statement of Overriding Considerations support approval of the Project.

X. GROWTH INDUCEMENT FINDINGS

Finding: A project could indirectly induce growth by reducing or removing barriers to growth or by creating a condition that attracts additional population or new economic activity. The Project's potential to induce growth in the project area is discussed in the Draft EIR, section 4.2, Population and Housing. In that analysis, the Project was found to have a less-than-significant potential to induce growth in the region.

Explanation: This increase in population will result in an impact that is less than significant because the population growth expected from the Project is consistent with the growth anticipated by, and accommodated, in the Town's General Plan. Specifically, the General Plan envisioned population growth from 6,100 residents in 2000 to 9,700 residents by 2015. Based on the average annual growth rate, the population in 2019 would be 6,808 without the proposed project and 8,068 with implementation of the project. The Project is expected to bring the Town's total population to approximately 7,938 (6,808 + 1,130) in the year 2019. Additionally, the Project will be located adjacent to existing commercial, residential, and public service land uses, and is generally consistent with the development anticipated for the project site under the Town's General Plan.

XI. ENERGY CONSUMPTION FINDINGS

Impact 6-1: Cause a temporary increase in wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary energy consumption due to construction.

Finding: The Project would not cause a temporary increase in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary energy consumption due to construction.

Explanation: Impact 6-1 of the Draft EIR discusses the Project's anticipated temporary energy consumption associated with construction. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-10 to 6-12.) As the Draft EIR concluded, the energy consumption during project construction would be commensurate with typical construction projects and would not use energy wastefully or inefficiently. Construction would comply with all relevant energy-related regulations by conserving energy and natural resources to the extent feasible. The energy demands due to diesel and gasoline use during construction would be small relative to statewide and local demands for fuel use, as discussed in the Draft EIR's discussion of Impact 6-1. The temporary short-term construction energy consumptions impacts due to the Project's construction are considered less than significant.

Impact 6-2: Cause a permanent increase in wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary energy consumption or fail to comply with state and federal energy standards.

Finding: The Project would not cause a permanent increase in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary energy consumption and would comply with state and federal energy standards.

Explanation: Impact 6-2 of the Draft EIR discusses and quantifies the Project's total annual energy demands. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-12 to 6-15.) Project's energy demands would be consistent with the anticipated level of economic development and growth in the region. The demand for local energy and commercial spaces in the project area demonstrate that the energy consumption of these facilities would not be unnecessary. Impacts related to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary energy consumption would be less than significant.

Impact 6-3: The Project objectives could be achieved through a feasible alternative that would substantially reduce the amount of energy required over the life of the Project or through a feasible alternative that would include use of alternative fuels or energy systems.

Finding: There are no feasible alternatives to the Project that would substantially reduce the energy demands associated with the Project or that would include greater use of alternative fuels or energy systems.

Explanation: The analysis of project alternatives provided in Chapter 5 of the EIR includes consideration of whether any of the project alternatives would substantially reduce the amount of energy required over the life of the Project and finds that each of the alternatives would result in reduced overall energy consumption compared to the originally proposed Project and the Modified Transportation Alternative evaluated in the Final EIR. None of the alternatives would result in a more efficient use of energy.

XII. PROJECT ALTERNATIVES FINDINGS

Public Resources Code section 21002 provides that "public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such project[s]." When a lead agency finds, even after the adoption of all feasible mitigation measures, that a project will still cause one or more significant environmental effects that cannot be substantially lessened or avoided, it must, prior to approving the project as mitigated, first determine whether there are any project alternatives that are feasible and that would substantially lessen or avoid the project's significant impacts. An alternatives analysis was completed and included in the Final EIR.

Although an EIR must evaluate a range of *potentially* feasible alternatives, an agency decision-making body may ultimately conclude that a potentially feasible alternative is actually infeasible. (*California Native Plant Society v. City of Santa Cruz* (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 957, 1001-1002.) CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6, subdivision (f)(1) provides that among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are "site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site."

Grounds for a conclusion of infeasibility might be the failure of an alternative to fully satisfy project objectives deemed to be important by decision-makers, or the fact that an alternative fails to promote policy objectives of concern to such decision-makers. (*California Native Plant Society v. City of Santa Cruz*, *supra*, *177* Cal.App.4th at pp. 992, 1000-1003.) It is well established under CEQA that an agency may reject alternatives based on economic infeasibility. (*Foundation for San Francisco's Architectural Heritage v. City and County of San Francisco* (1980) 106 Cal.App.3d 893, 913-914; *San Franciscans Upholding the Downtown Plan v. City and County of San Francisco* (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 656, 774; *Association of Irritated Residents v. County of Madera* (2003) 107 Cal.App.4th 1383, 1399-1400; *Sierra Club v. County of Napa* (2004) 121 Cal.App.4th 1490, 1510.) In addition, the definition of feasibility encompasses "desirability" to the extent that an agency's determination of infeasibility represents a reasonable balancing of competing economic, environmental, social, and technological factors supported by substantial evidence. (*City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 410, 417.) Thus, even if a project alternative will avoid or substantially

lessen any of the significant environmental effects of a project as mitigated, the decision-makers may reject the alternative for such reasons.

CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6, subdivision (f) states that the range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a "rule of reason" which requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. Further, CEQA Guidelines section 15126, subdivision (a) requires that an EIR describe a reasonable range of alternatives that would "feasibly obtain most of the basic project objectives" but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant environmental effects of the project and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. Thus, the project objectives presented in the EIR provide the framework for defining the possible alternatives. The project applicant has set forth the following objectives for the Project:

1. To use this infill location and its proximity to the Loomis Town Center for the construction of a residential mixed-use development, thereby improving the jobs/housing balance and reducing vehicle miles traveled within the Town of Loomis;

2. To create a pedestrian-friendly, walkable neighborhood that includes varied streetscapes, well-designed and safe alleys, abundant tree canopy, and sensitive transitions from the existing surrounding neighborhoods;

3. To connect the existing street network by extending existing street patterns and selectively introducing new street connections that improve vehicular and pedestrian connectivity;

4. To maintain an overall residential density that respects and responds to the surrounding neighborhood and is appropriate for the site's physical and environmental conditions;

5. To provide unique, varied, high-quality housing opportunities consistent with and complementary to the overall character of the adjacent neighborhoods in design;

6. To provide a diverse mixture of open space areas and parks that are easily accessible to pedestrians and provide multi-generational recreational opportunities;

7. Provide a mix of land uses that integrate housing, office, and neighborhood-serving retail on a single project site with public open space, naturalized environments, and park land. Implement "smart growth" principles of concentrating growth in a compact walkable urban center to avoid sprawl, providing a mix of uses that are pedestrian and bicycle-friendly, are close to neighborhood schools and shopping, and offer a range of housing choices;

8. Provide for increased residential densities on a site within the Town currently planned for urban growth with accessible infrastructure, in furtherance of the vision identified in the Loomis Town Center Implementation Plan;

9. Provide for the construction of the Boyington Road Extension (Doc Barnes Drive) from Horseshoe Bar Road to King Road consistent with the Transportation System Improvements identified in the Town's General Plan; and

10. Provide for implementation of applicable portions of the Town's Trails Master Plan and the Bicycle Transportation Plan.

Based on the guidance contained in the CEQA Guidelines, applicable case law, and the project objectives, the Draft EIR considered seven alternatives to the Village at Loomis Project.

Since the Transportation Alternative, as modified by the applicant in response to the feedback received during the Project's review (see Section III, above), has become the approved Project, the Transportation Alternative is not listed below. The other project alternatives, which were evaluated at a comparative level of detail, are described below. The Draft EIR also gave preliminary consideration to several other alternatives that were rejected from further analysis because they were determined to be infeasible or incapable of reducing or avoiding the Project's significant impacts.

The Town Council finds that a good-faith effort was made to evaluate a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives in the EIR that are reasonable alternatives to the Project and could feasibly obtain most of the basic objectives of the Project, even when the alternatives might impede the attainment of the project's objectives and might be more costly.

Alternative 1a: No Project/No Build. This alternative assumes no development would occur and the site would remain unchanged from its current condition.

Finding: This alternative is infeasible and rejected for the following reasons:

While this alternative would avoid all of the impacts of the Project, it would meet none of the project objectives and would not be consistent with the discussions in the General Plan that specifically address development of the project site.

Alternative 1b: No Project/Existing Designations. This alternative assumes development would occur under the existing General Plan and Zoning designations for the project site. The existing general plan designations for the site provide for 23.6 acres of Residential – Medium Density, 29.7 acres of General Commercial, 5.3 acres of Central Commercial/, and 7.8 acres of Office Professional development.

Finding: This alternative is infeasible and rejected for the following reasons:

This alternative would not avoid or substantially reduce any of the Project's significant effects and would result in increased impacts in the areas of land use, transportation and traffic, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and energy consumption. Environmental reasons thus render this alternative infeasible. Additionally, this alternative would not meet all of the objectives identified for the Project.

Alternative 3a: Reduced Density. This alternative assumes development of 371 residences—246 single-family units and up to 125 multiple-family units—50,000 square feet of commercial space, and 22,500 square feet of office uses. The commercial and office space omitted under this alternative, and some of the residences omitted under this alternative, would be replaced with both passive and active park space. This alternative reduces the residential land uses sufficient to achieve an average single-family density of seven dwelling units per acre (compared to the originally proposed project's average single-family density of 7.7 dwelling units per acre) while also meeting the requirements for park space identified in the Town of Loomis General Plan and under the Quimby Act. This alternative would provide for 35.14 acres of single-family residential development and 5.36 acres of active park space on site. Development would occur within the same general footprint as the Project and with the same road alignment as proposed.

Alternative 3b: Reduced Density/Transportation. This alternative assumes development at the same levels as Alternative 3a, but relies upon the road alignment described for Alternative 2.

As modified, the Project is substantially similar to Alternative 3b. Alternatives 3a and 3b have 10 fewer proposed residences than the Project proposed for approval. Like Alternatives 3a and 3b, the Project's proposed commercial space has been reduced and the amount of active park on site has been increased. As compared to Alternatives 3a and 3b, the Project would provide more acres of active park. Alternatives 3a and 3b would likely very slightly reduce impacts to biological resources by retaining additional amounts of natural vegetation on-site, however, the impacts to biological resources would be remain significant and unavoidable. The project proposed for approval would likely have similar or slightly reduced traffic impacts than Alternative 3a and 3b, due to the reduction if commercial uses and the elimination of the proposed office. However, all this impact would remain significant and unavoidable. Alternative 3a would avoid demolition of the two historic residences on-site, thus it would eliminate the Project's significant and unavoidable impact to cultural resources. Alternative 3b would not avoid demolition of these resources and the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. Alternatives 3a and 3b would result in a significant and unavoidable noise impacts. Under the Project, noise impacts are reduced to less than significant with mitigation. These alternatives, although similar to the Project as proposed for approval, would not achieve the following project objectives to as great of a degree as the Project proposed for approval:

- To provide unique, varied, high-quality housing opportunities consistent with and complementary to the overall character of the adjacent neighborhoods in design;

- Provide for increased residential densities on a site within the Town currently planned for urban growth with accessible infrastructure, in furtherance of the vision identified in the Loomis Town Center Implementation Plan.

Finding: Alternatives 3a and 3b are infeasible and rejected for the following separate and independent reasons:

Alternatives 3a and 3b would not meet the objectives identified above to the same degree as would the Project. Further, Alternatives 3a and 3b would not provide as many housing opportunities as would the Project. The 2014 Town of Loomis Housing Element recognizes the Village at Loomis project site as appropriate for higher density housing, based on such factors as its proximity to transit and services, its compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood character, its ability to accommodate numerous units, the availability of sites greater than one acre, its interested owner, its availability of infrastructure, its location within a master plan area, and the limited trees and wetland issues on the project site. (Town of Loomis, 2014.) As a matter of state policy, CEQA requires balancing environmental goals and the need for housing. (See, e.g., Pub. Resources Code, §§ 21000, subd. (g), 21159.26.) Alternatives 3a and 3b would not help achieve the state's housing goals to the same degree as the Project.

Alternative 3a is also infeasible because it would not help implement, and would be inconsistent with, the Town's Circulation Element Update.

Alternative 4a: Reduced Footprint. This alternative assumes a reduced development footprint and increased amounts of open space, while keeping development densities generally the same as the Project. This alternative contemplates development of 366 residential units (including 125 multiple-family units), 45,000 square feet of commercial space, 10,000 square feet of office

uses, and 5.69 acres of active and passive parks. A conceptual layout for this alternative is provided in Figure 5-2.

This alternative anticipates realignment of the proposed extension of Doc Barnes Drive to provide a setback from the project site's southern boundary to enable retention of trees along the project site frontage on Interstate 80 (I-80) to reduce the Project's visual impacts. The alternative also incorporates a 50-foot setback from the wetlands and floodplain in the central portion of the project site. Creating this setback required eliminating some proposed residential lots and shifting the park site proposed for the northern side of Library Drive to the west. This alternative also includes elimination of two proposed residential units along Laird Street to preserve the historic building at 3616 Laird Street and reconfiguration of the proposed mixed-use district on Horseshoe Bar Road to preserve the historic building at 5901 Horseshoe Bar Road.

Alternative 4b: Reduced Footprint/Transportation. This alternative assumes development at the same levels as Alternative 4a, but relies upon the road alignment described for Alternative 2.

Both Alternatives 4a and 4b would slightly reduce impacts to biological resources by retaining additional amounts of natural vegetation on-site, however the impacts to biological resources would remain significant and unavoidable. These alternatives would also provide slight reductions in impacts to transportation, air quality, and greenhouse gases associated with the residential component of the Project by reducing the total amount of new traffic trips associated with the Project, however all of these impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Alternative 4a would avoid demolition of the two historic residences on-site, thus it would eliminate the Project's significant and unavoidable impact to cultural resources. Alternative 4b would not avoid demolition of these resources, and the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. Alternatives 4a and 4b would result in a significant and unavoidable noise impact. Under the Project, noise impacts are reduced to less than significant with mitigation.

These alternatives would impair achievement of the following project objectives:

- To create a pedestrian-friendly, walkable neighborhood that includes varied streetscapes, well-designed and safe alleys, abundant tree canopy, and sensitive transitions from the existing surrounding neighborhoods;

- To provide unique, varied, high-quality housing opportunities consistent with and complementary to the overall character of the adjacent neighborhoods in design.

Finding: Alternatives 4a and 4b are infeasible and rejected for the separate and independent reasons:

Alternatives 4a and 4b would not meet the objectives identified above to the same degree as would the Project. Further, Alternative 4a and 4b would not provide as many housing opportunities as would the Project. The 2014 Town of Loomis Housing Element recognizes the Village at Loomis site as appropriate for higher density housing based on such factors as its proximity to transit and services, its compatibility with neighborhood character, its ability to accommodate numerous units, the availability of sites greater than one acres, its interested owner, it availability of infrastructure, its location within a master plan area, and the limited trees and wetland issues on the project site. (Town of Loomis, 2014.) While Alternatives 4a and 4b would provide housing to help meet the Town's obligations set forth by the RHNA, they would not increase the amount of residential units in the Town as much as the Project. Alternatives 4a

and 4b, while offering some environmental benefits over the Project, would not provide as many new housing units as would the Project, and would thus not help achieve the state's housing goals to the same degree as would the Project. As a matter of state policy, CEQA requires balancing environmental goals and the need for housing. Alternatives 4a and 4b would not help achieve the state's housing goals to the same degree as the Project.

Alternative 4a is also infeasible because it would not help implement, and would be inconsistent with, the Town's Circulation Element Update.

XIII. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

The Village at Loomis EIR concluded that there are six significant and unavoidable impacts of the Project. CEQA provides that a lead agency may approve a project that has significant and unavoidable impacts, after adopting proper findings, if the agency first adopts a statement of overriding considerations setting forth the specific reasons why the agency found that the specific economic, legal, social, technological or other benefits of the project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15093, subd. (a).) The California Supreme Court has stated, "[t]he wisdom of approving . . . any development project, a delicate task which requires a balancing of interests, is necessarily left to the sound discretion of the local officials and their constituents who are responsible for such decisions. The law as we interpret and apply it simply requires that those decisions be informed, and therefore balanced." (*Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Barbara* (1990) 52 Cal.3d 553,576.) CEQA requires the lead agency to support, in writing, the specific reasons for considering a project acceptable when significant impacts are not avoided or substantially lessened. Those reasons must be based on substantial evidence in the Final EIR or elsewhere in the administrative record. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15093, subd. (b).)

In accordance with the requirements of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the Town finds that the mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR and the MMRP when implemented will avoid or substantially lessen virtually all of the significant effects identified in the Final EIR for the Project. However, certain significant impacts of the Project are unavoidable even after incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures. These significant unavoidable impacts are related to biological resources, cultural resources, visual resources, transportation and traffic, air quality, and greenhouse gas emissions (see Section IX above).

The Town finds that all feasible mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR that are within the purview of the Town will be implemented with the Project, and that those mitigation measures that may be within another agency's discretion, have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency. As identified below, the Town further finds that the remaining significant unavoidable effects are outweighed and are found to be acceptable due to the following specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, based upon the facts set forth above, the Final EIR, and the record.

The Town Council finds that any one of the benefits set forth below is sufficient by itself to warrant approval of the Project. This determination is based on the findings herein and the evidence in the record. Having balanced the unavoidable adverse environmental impacts against each of the benefits, the Town Council hereby adopts this Statement of Overriding Considerations for the following reasons.

Economic Considerations and Job Creation

The Project would contribute funding to regional infrastructure improvements which is necessary to ensure continued provision of adequate public services to existing and future Town residents. Project construction and maintenance would also generate jobs and economic input. The Town would be unable to construct these improvements without approval of the Project. The Project will construct approximately $14 million of circulation improvements included in the General Plan Circulation Element Update, including extending Doc Barnes Drive from Horseshoe Bar Road to King Road with traffic signal at each intersection; a roundabout at the new Horseshoe Bar Road-Library Drive-Webb Street intersection; the extension of Webb Street to the new intersection. The Project is also consistent with long-standing Town revitalization policies. Finally, the Project will contribute funds to the Loomis Union and Placer Union School Districts.

Social and Policy Benefits

The Project would construct the planned extension of Doc Barnes Drive (Boyington Road) through the project site, consistent with the Town's General Plan. The Project would also replace conventional intersections on Gates Streets with roundabouts, also consistent with the General Plan's Circulation Update.

The Project would help provide for development of housing in accordance with state policy and consistent with the Town's Housing Element. The Project directs growth to an infill site.

The Project would implement applicable portions of the Town's Trails Master Plan and the Bicycle Transportation Plan.

By implementing the Modified Transportation Alternative analyzed in the EIR (as modified in response to the Project's environmental review and approval process), the Project would help implement the Town's recently-adopted General Plan Circulation Element Update.

The Project would provide for increased residential densities on a site within the Town currently planned for urban growth with accessible infrastructure, in furtherance of the vision identified in the Loomis Town Center Implementation Plan.

The Project provides a mix of land uses that integrate housing and neighborhood-serving retail on a single project site with public open space, naturalized environments, and park land. The Project would implement "smart growth" principles of concentrating growth in a compact, walkable, urban center to avoid sprawl, providing a mix of uses that are pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly, are close to neighborhood schools and shopping, and offer a range of housing choices.

The Project would further provide a diverse mixture of open space areas and parks that are easily accessible to pedestrians and provide multi-generational recreational opportunities, including those provided in the Project's approximately 5.69 acres of active parkland and trails.

The Project would connect the existing street network by extending existing street patterns and selectively introducing new street connections that improve vehicular and pedestrian connectivity. The modifications to the Project made in response to the Planning Commission workshop and public hearings, and modifications approved by the Town Council, further enhance pedestrian connectivity through the addition of pedestrian connections to the Raley's Center at Doc Barnes Drive/Gates Drive, and the addition of a trail gateway at Sun Knoll Drive and other trail enhancements.

Environmental Benefits

The Project has been designed to preserve over ten acres of land containing the most significant natural environmental resources, including the drainage way through the central portion of the site and the associated riparian and woodland habitats.

Prominent rock outcroppings would be preserved to retain some of the rural qualities of the project site and community.

The Project would result in fewer environmental impacts than would occur under existing General Plan and zoning designations for the site. (See Final EIR, Chapter 5.)

XIV. CONCLUSION

The mitigation measures listed in conjunction with each of the findings set forth above, as implemented through the MMRP, will eliminate or reduce to a less-than-significant level most of the adverse environmental impacts of the Project. The significant and unavoidable impacts of the Project would be rendered acceptable by the specific economic and social benefits identified in Section XIII.

Taken together, the Final EIR, the mitigation measures, and the MMRP provide an adequate basis for approval of the Village at Loomis Project.