

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This document is a draft environmental impact report (DEIR) on the proposed North Fork American River Trail Project (proposed project). It has been prepared by Placer County (County) in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations [CCR] Section 15000 et seq.). As specified in Section 15367 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the public agency that has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project is the lead agency for CEQA compliance. The County is the lead agency under CEQA, because it has the principal responsibility for approving and carrying out the project, has the first discretionary action of the proposed project, and is the primary source of funding and grant recipient for funding of the proposed project. The County Board of Supervisors is responsible for certifying and approving the EIR for the proposed project. This document has been prepared in accordance with the Placer County Planning Department format for DEIRs (Placer County 2006).

1.1 TYPE AND PURPOSE OF THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

1.1.1 TYPE OF EIR

In accordance with Section 15161 of the State CEQA Guidelines, this document is a project EIR that examines the environmental impacts of a specific proposed project. As a project EIR, this document examines the potential environmental effects of all phases of the project: planning, construction, and operation.

1.1.2 PURPOSE OF THIS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

A state or local public agency must comply with CEQA when it undertakes an activity that may cause a direct physical change in the environment or a reasonably foreseeable indirect change in the environment. The County has prepared this DEIR to meet the requirements of CEQA. An EIR is an informational document used to inform agency decision-makers and the general public of any significant environmental effects of a project, identify feasible ways to mitigate the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project that can reduce environmental impacts. As required by CEQA, the County will consider the information presented in the EIR when determining whether to approve the proposed project.

1.2 SCOPE OF THE DEIR AND EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

1.2.1 SCOPE AND ORGANIZATION OF THIS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Pursuant to CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines, a lead agency shall focus an EIR's discussion on significant environmental effects and may limit discussion on other effects to brief explanations about why they are not significant (PRC Section 21002.1, State CEQA Guidelines Section 15143). Furthermore, indication of the manner in which significant impacts can be mitigated or avoided is included among the purposes of an EIR. A determination of which impacts would be potentially significant was made for this project based on review of the information presented in the 2004 initial study/environmental assessment (IS/EA) prepared for the project, on comments received as part of the public review process for the project, additional research and analysis of relevant project data, and analysis by environmental professionals.

SCOPE OF THIS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

This DEIR analyzes a range of environmental impact topics associated with implementation of the proposed project. The County has determined that the proposed project has the potential to result in environmental impacts on the following resources that are addressed in detail in this DEIR:

- ▶ Land Use (Chapter 4.0)
- ▶ Biological Resources (Chapter 5.0)
- ▶ Cultural Resources (Chapter 6.0)
- ▶ Visual Resources (Chapter 7.0)
- ▶ Transportation and Circulation (Chapter 8.0)
- ▶ Air Quality (Chapter 9.0)
- ▶ Noise (Chapter 10.0)
- ▶ Soils, Geology, and Seismicity (Chapter 11.0)
- ▶ Hydrology and Water Quality (Chapter 12.0)
- ▶ Public Services (Chapter 13.0)
- ▶ Recreation (Chapter 14.0)
- ▶ Hazardous Materials and Hazards (Chapter 15.0)

ORGANIZATION OF THIS DOCUMENT

This DEIR is organized as follows:

Chapter 1.0, “Introduction,” summarizes the purpose, need, objectives, and scope of the proposed project; describes the purpose of the EIR and provides an overview of the environmental review process for the project; discusses agency roles and authorities; and provides details on project scoping.

Chapter 2.0, “Summary,” summarizes the conclusions of the environmental analysis.

Chapter 3.0, “Project Description,” includes a description of the project location; a discussion of the background and history of the project; a description of the project objectives; and descriptions of the components and features of the proposed project, including construction techniques and schedule.

Chapter 4.0, “Land Use,” includes the environmental setting, regulatory setting, and impacts of the proposed project on land use and planning, as well as mitigation measures for those effects.

Chapter 5.0, “Biological Resources,” includes the environmental setting, regulatory setting, and impacts of the proposed project on biological resources, as well as mitigation measures for those effects.

Chapter 6.0, “Cultural Resources,” includes the environmental setting, regulatory setting, and impacts of the proposed project on cultural resources, as well as mitigation measures for those effects.

Chapter 7.0, “Visual Resources,” includes the environmental setting, regulatory setting, and impacts of the proposed project on aesthetics and visual resources, as well as mitigation measures for those effects.

Chapter 8.0, “Transportation and Circulation,” includes the environmental setting, regulatory setting, and impacts of the proposed project on traffic and transportation, as well as mitigation measures for those effects.

Chapter 9.0, “Air Quality,” includes the environmental setting, regulatory setting, and impacts of the proposed project on air quality, as well as mitigation measures for those effects.

Chapter 10.0, “Noise,” includes the environmental setting, regulatory setting, and impacts of the proposed project related to noise, as well as mitigation measures for those effects.

Chapter 11.0, “Soils, Geology, and Seismicity,” includes the environmental setting, regulatory setting, and impacts of the proposed project on geology and soils, as well as mitigation measures for those effects.

Chapter 12.0, “Hydrology and Water Quality,” includes the environmental setting, regulatory setting, and impacts of the proposed project on hydrology and water quality, as well as mitigation measures for those effects.

Chapter 13.0, “Public Services,” includes the environmental setting, regulatory setting, and impacts of the proposed project on public services, as well as mitigation measures for those effects.

Chapter 14.0, “Recreation,” includes the environmental setting, regulatory setting, and impacts of the proposed project on recreation, as well as mitigation measures for those effects.

Chapter 15.0, “Hazardous Materials and Hazards,” includes the environmental setting, regulatory setting, and impacts of the proposed project on hazardous materials and hazards, as well as mitigation measures for those effects.

Chapter 16.0, “Other CEQA-Required Sections,” describes the alternatives considered and eliminated for the proposed project; alternatives selected for the proposed project, and the evaluation of the environmental effects of those alternatives; significant unavoidable effects on the environment; irreversible or irretrievable commitments of resources; growth-inducing effects; and cumulative impacts.

Chapter 17.0, “Report Preparers,” lists individuals who participated in the preparation of the EIR, organized by organization and agency.

Chapter 18.0, “References and Persons Consulted,” lists the sources of information cited throughout this EIR.

1.2.2 EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

Based on previous environmental review of the project, it was determined that the proposed project would not result in significant impacts in the several resource areas. Therefore, the following resource areas do not require further analysis in this DEIR:

- ▶ Agricultural Resources
- ▶ Population, Employment, and Housing
- ▶ Mineral Resources
- ▶ Public Utilities and Service Systems

These resource areas are described briefly below.

AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Although agricultural uses are compatible with the zoning of the project area, the lands within the project area are not currently being used for agricultural purposes. Because of the existing topography, the area does not possess high value for agriculture and it is not expected to be used for farming or grazing in the future. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of any agricultural resources or the conversion of farmland to nonagricultural uses. Given these findings, implementation of the proposed project would have no effect on this topic; therefore, the impact of the proposed project on agricultural resources will not be discussed further in this DEIR.

POPULATION, EMPLOYMENT, AND HOUSING

The proposed project would not involve the construction of new homes or businesses or the extension of roads or infrastructure serving residential or job forming uses. It would not involve the displacement of any existing housing, including affordable housing. The proposed project would not result in the disruption or division of an established community, including low-income or minority communities. Implementation of the proposed project would occur in stages, and the work would be performed by one or more crews from the California Conservation Corps, inmate crews, licensed contractors, volunteers, and/or County staff. These activities would generate short-term employment opportunities; however, the work would be temporary and occur over a 3-year period with certain activities starting and stopping for shorter durations within this time period. Because of the limited number and type of new jobs that would be generated and the temporary nature of those jobs, the proposed project would have very little effect on employment in the region. The proposed project would have little to no effect on population, employment, or housing; therefore, the impact of the proposed project on these resources will not be discussed further in this DEIR.

MINERAL RESOURCES

The proposed project would not result in the loss of any known mineral resources as identified by the California Geological Survey or the California Division of Mines and Geology (CDMG 1988, California Geological Survey 2004). (It should be noted that the California Division of Mines and Geology changed its name to the California Geological Survey in 2002.) The proposed project would not impede or interfere with the establishment or continuation of existing mineral extraction operations. It would not result in the loss of available known mineral resources that would be of value to the region or residents of the state, and the site is not delineated as a locally important recovery site in the *Placer County General Plan*, the *Weimar-Applegate-Clipper Gap General Plan*, *Foresthill Divide Community Plan*, or the *Auburn State Recreation Area Interim Resource Management Plan*. Given these findings, implementation of the proposed project would have no effect with regard to mineral resources; therefore, the impact of the proposed project on mineral resources will not be discussed further in this DEIR.

PUBLIC UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

The proposed project does not have components that would require electricity, communication, wastewater treatment, sewer, septic, or water supply systems. The proposed project would provide local stormwater drainage for the staging areas. Solid waste materials created by the proposed project are expected to be minimal and would be collected and disposed of by the current solid waste collection contractor that serves the Auburn State Recreation Area (SRA) (Fisher, pers. comm., 2004). Therefore, the proposed project would have a negligible effect on public utilities and service systems. Given these findings, the impact of the proposed project on public utilities and service systems will not be discussed further in this DEIR.

1.3 DEFINITION OF BASELINE

According to Section 15125 of the State CEQA Guidelines, baseline conditions are defined as the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the project as they exist at the time that the notice of preparation (NOP) is published. Therefore, for the purposes of this document the baseline conditions are defined as the conditions that existed in the project vicinity as of November 2005. This baseline condition was used as the basis for determining the level of significance of impacts of the proposed project.

1.4 SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

Significance criteria were determined based on the Placer County CEQA Checklist and the environmental checklist found in Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines. Significance criteria for each resource area are listed under the impacts heading in each chapter (Chapters 4.0 through 15.0).

1.5 PROJECT BACKGROUND AND HISTORY

1.5.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

The County is proposing to construct a multiple-use trail along the southern slope of the North Fork American River canyon in Placer County, approximately 40 miles northeast of Sacramento. The proposed trail would begin near Foresthill Road and the North Fork/Middle Fork American River confluence, and it would end at the Ponderosa Bridge, approximately 14.2 miles upstream. The trail would be located primarily on land owned by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) in the Auburn SRA, which is managed by the California Department of Parks and Recreation (State Parks). Meetings between the County, Reclamation, and State Parks resulted in agreements on issues related to trail planning and management. The decision to establish a trail along the North Fork American River as a stand-alone multiple-use trail with adequate parking and staging facilities, and with connections to existing trails, was among the topics of agreement between the County and State Parks.

The Auburn SRA has an established network of trails throughout the American River canyon that provide a variety of recreational opportunities. As the population of Placer County continues to grow, the demand for recreational facilities will continue to increase, and expansion of the trail network in this area has emerged as a priority for the County to accommodate residents and visitors alike.

The proposed project is based, in part, on the proposed *North Fork American River Trail, Trail Plan* (Placer County 2003a), which was prepared by North Fork Associates on behalf of the County, in conjunction with State Parks. The trail plan has provided the County with a working document that has been used to determine a proposed trail alignment, identify the obstacles and challenges of implementation, and provide guidelines for successful implementation. As part of the work required to identify the location and proposed alignment for a trail, the County convened a Trail Advisory Group (TAG) that is composed of local citizens and stakeholders such as equestrians, hikers, mountain bikers, and environmental organizations (Table 1-1). The TAG was instrumental in helping to identify a proposed trail alignment and in facilitating discussions among interested groups related to trail planning issues and areas of controversy. The TAG may continue to assist with aspects of the proposed project during the environmental review and construction phases. Should the project be approved and constructed, volunteers from various interest groups may also help with trail maintenance.

**Table 1-1
Trail Advisory Group Members and Affiliations**

Name	Activity	Affiliation
John Krogsrud	Runner, Canyon Scramble	Sierra Club
Janet Peterson	Equestrian	Meadow Vista Trails Association
Sherri Osborn	Runner, Hiker	Foresthill Trails Alliance
Tom McMahan	Hiker	Sierra Club
Jim Ferris	Hiker	PARC, Canyon Keepers
Joe Larkin	Equestrian, Runner	Western States Trail Foundation
Bill Wauters	Hiker, River User	PARC, Sierra Club
Russ Stein	Mountain Biker	FATRAC
Eric Peach	Hiker, River User	PARC, Sierra Club
Terry Davis	Hiker, River User	Sierra Club, PARC
Jill Dampier		California State Parks
Jim Michaels		California State Parks

Source: Placer County 2003a

The TAG and the County agreed on a set of evaluation criteria for use in identifying a suitable route for a stand-alone trail along the North Fork of the American River. These criteria have been expanded to serve as objectives for this proposed project, as follows:

- ▶ Provide access to the North Fork American River canyon within the Auburn SRA to a wide variety of users.
- ▶ Route the trail to discourage informal connections to the river/lake.
- ▶ Allow multiple nonmotorized uses along the trail.
- ▶ Reduce visibility of trail from the river/lake.
- ▶ Minimize environmental impacts of trail construction, including the avoidance of sensitive areas.
- ▶ Promote safe and sustainable grades and safe alignments.
- ▶ Connect to staging termini (Foresthill Road and Ponderosa Way).
- ▶ Provide connections to existing trails.
- ▶ Ensure emergency access to trail.
- ▶ Minimize conflicts with private property.
- ▶ Design alignment to minimize conflicts with trail users.

1.5.2 HISTORY OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

In 2003–2004, the County initiated the environmental review process for the proposed trail project. A public scoping meeting was held on February 19, 2004, to present the project and to receive public comments. Because the project has been proposed on federally owned land, the County and Reclamation prepared a joint environmental document in 2004 to assess potential impacts of the project. An initial study/mitigated negative declaration (IS/MND) was prepared to satisfy the requirements of CEQA, and an Environmental Assessment (EA) to satisfy the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Parts 1500–1508) and associated federal guidelines. Because Reclamation was the lead agency under NEPA, the EA was prepared in accordance with Reclamation’s *NEPA Handbook* (Reclamation 2000).

Section 15064(f)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines provides that a lead agency may prepare an MND under the following conditions:

If the lead agency determines there is substantial evidence in the record that the project may have a significant effect on the environment but the lead agency determines that revisions in the project plans or proposals made by, or agreed to by, the applicant would avoid the effects or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effect on the environment would occur and there is not substantial evidence in light of the whole record before the public agency that the project, as revised, may have a significant effect on the environment then a mitigated negative declaration shall be prepared.

Substantial evidence may include expert opinion based on facts, technical studies, or reasonable assumptions based on facts. The analysis conducted by the County resulted in the conclusion that no aspect of the proposed trail project, either individually or cumulatively, would result in a significant effect on the environment with inclusion of mitigation measures that were agreed to by the applicant (the County) and incorporated as part of the project to avoid or reduce potential adverse environmental effects of the project to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, the County prepared an MND for the project.

The County and Reclamation initiated the environmental review process for the proposed trail project that culminated in the IS/EA in 2003. A public scoping meeting was held on February 19, 2004, to present the project and to receive public comments regarding the project. The previously prepared joint environmental document was circulated for public review and comment on May 5, 2004. The County and Reclamation prepared responses to comments and issued the Final IS/EA on June 17, 2004 (Placer County and Reclamation 2004). The County approved the MND and filed a Notice of Determination pursuant to CEQA on August 24, 2004 (State

Clearinghouse No. 2004052021), and Reclamation adopted a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) pursuant to NEPA on August 2, 2004.

The Draft IS/EA was circulated for a 30-day public review and comment period that began on May 5, 2004. During the public review period for the IS/EA, members of the public provided comments expressing their views on potential environmental effects of the proposed project. The County and Reclamation prepared responses to comments and issued the Final IS/EA on June 17, 2004. Some comment letters were received following the close of the 30-day public review period. All of the comments received are considered part of the public record related to the previous environmental review process for the project.

In order to further evaluate a number of issues raised by the public, the County decided on May 10, 2005, to prepare an EIR for the project pursuant to CEQA and to vacate its earlier approval of the MND. The County decision did not affect the FONSI for the proposed project adopted by Reclamation. The County held a public scoping meeting for the EIR on August 31, 2005, to present the project and solicit comments and initiate the environmental review process for the EIR. The County released a CEQA Notice of Preparation (NOP) on November 10, 2005. This DEIR addresses issues raised by the public and provides a more comprehensive environmental review of topics that the County has determined should be subject to additional analysis beyond the information presented in the IS/MND. Comments on the North Fork American River Trail EIR NOP were presented verbally at the scoping meeting held in August 2005, and were submitted in writing during the 30-day public review period for the NOP (Appendix A).

The County held a public scoping and informational meeting on August 31, 2005, in Auburn, California. The County issued the NOP on November 10, 2005, to inform public agencies and the general public of its intention to prepare an EIR on the North Fork American River Trail Project. The NOP included a brief project description, a summary of the scoping and public review process, and an outline of the probable environmental impacts of the proposed project. The comments presented at the meeting were used by the County in determining the scope and content of the EIR. Appendix A of this DEIR contains a copy of the NOP, copies of the sign-in sheets and the scoping meeting notes, and a summary table of comments received during the NOP scoping process.

COMMENTS AND AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

The following are the main topics raised during the IS/EA and NOP scoping processes, and the chapters of this DEIR where these issues are addressed:

- ▶ Potential impacts of use of Sweco¹ trail dozer (Chapters 4.0 through 15.0)
- ▶ Potential damage to trail by bicyclists and equestrians (Chapter 14.0, “Recreation”)
- ▶ Potential effects on Wild and Scenic eligibility of the river (Chapter 7.0, “Visual Resources”)
- ▶ Potential degradation of streams from construction of bridges and retaining walls (Chapter 5.0, “Biological Resources”; and Chapter 12.0, “Hydrology and Water Quality”)
- ▶ Potential introduction of nonnative and invasive plant species (Chapter 5.0, “Biological Resources”)
- ▶ Potential conflicts among recreational users and between recreational users and wildlife (Chapter 14.0, “Recreation”)
- ▶ Use of existing trails versus creating a new trail (Section 16.1, “Alternatives,” in Chapter 16.0, “Other CEQA-Required Sections”)

¹ The Sweco is a trail building machine with a narrow track and blade that is used to build and compact trail features.

- ▶ Potential impacts on soil erosion and water quality (Chapter 11.0, “Soils, Geology, and Seismicity”; and Chapter 12.0, “Hydrology and Water Quality”)
- ▶ Potential impacts on visual resources (Chapter 7.0, “Visual Resources”)
- ▶ Potential conflicts with *Auburn State Recreation Area Interim Resource Management Plan* (Chapter 4.0, “Land Use”)
- ▶ Need to address relationship to Cap-to-Cap Trail (Section 16.5, “Cumulative Impacts,” in Chapter 16.0, “Other CEQA Sections”)
- ▶ Adequacy of lines of sight for safety purposes (Chapter 3.0, “Project Description”)
- ▶ Potential noise impacts (Chapter 10.0, “Noise”)
- ▶ Potential impacts on vegetation and wildlife (Chapter 5.0, “Biological Resources”)
- ▶ Potential traffic impacts on Ponderosa Way and at the proposed Ponderosa Way Staging Terminus (Chapter 8.0, “Transportation and Circulation”)
- ▶ Potential increase in illegal activities and degradation of the area, including illegal camping, vandalism, littering, and illegal use of the trail by motorized vehicles (Chapter 14.0, “Recreation”)
- ▶ Potential impacts on cultural resources (Chapter 6.0, “Cultural Resources”)
- ▶ Potential issues related to consistency of land uses along the trail section between Upper Lake Clementine and Ponderosa Bridge (Chapter 4.0, “Land Use”)

Visual simulations of the proposed trail were prepared to address concerns about potential visual/aesthetic impacts of the trail project and whether the trail could be visible from other parts of the canyon. These visual simulations are included in Chapter 7.0, “Visual Resources,” of this DEIR. A geotechnical report was also prepared to address the potential effects of the project related to erosion and soils and geology. A discussion of the geotechnical study is presented in Chapter 11.0, “Soils, Geology, and Seismicity,” of this DEIR and the geotechnical report is included as Appendix B.

Some comments presented at the scoping meeting and during the NOP review and comment period were focused on the cost of the trail and availability of funding for maintenance and patrol of the trail. As provided in law, CEQA analyses focus on the physical environmental effects of a project, not the social or economic effects, unless the social and economic effects lead indirectly to a physical change in the environment (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064[e]). The analyses included in Chapters 4.0 through 15.0 of this DEIR address both direct and indirect effects related to the potential physical effects of the project. Comments that address management issues (e.g., risks related to forest fires, vandalism, littering, and the potential use of motorized vehicles on the trail) are discussed in Chapter 3.0, “Project Description.” Issues regarding funding for trail maintenance, repair, and policing are not addressed in this DEIR because they are not subject to the environmental review process. These are separate policy issues to be addressed by State Parks and the County.

1.6 DEFINITION OF TERMS

The DEIR uses several standard terms as follows:

- ▶ *North Fork American River Trail Project* is the proposed project, which would involve construction and maintenance of a multiple-use recreational trail along the southern slope of the North Fork American River canyon on land owned primarily by Reclamation and managed by State Parks under a cooperative agreement between State Parks and Reclamation.
- ▶ *Project area* is the 14.2-mile proposed trail alignment and the immediate vicinity, including the proposed staging termini.
- ▶ *No impact* means no change from existing conditions.
- ▶ *Less-than-significant impact* means no substantial adverse change in the physical environment (no mitigation needed).
- ▶ *Potentially significant impact* means a potential effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the environment (mitigation is recommended because potentially significant impacts are treated in the same way as significant impacts in the CEQA process).
- ▶ *Significant impact* means a substantial adverse change in the physical environment (consideration of feasible mitigation is required).
- ▶ *Significant and unavoidable impact* means a substantial adverse change in the physical environment that cannot feasibly be avoided, even with the implementation of mitigation.

1.7 PROJECT REVIEW AND CEQA PROCESS

1.7.1 AGENCY REVIEW AND CEQA PROCESS

This EIR will be used by the County and other agencies to fulfill the requirements of CEQA. It will also be used as an informational document by other federal, state, and local agencies that may have a direct interest in the project. The County has the principal responsibility for approving and carrying out the project, and for ensuring that the requirements of CEQA have been met; therefore, it is the lead agency under CEQA. The County is also the agency with the first discretionary action of the proposed project and is the primary source of funding.

A CEQA responsible agency is a state agency, board, or commission or any local or regional agency, other than the lead agency, that has a legal responsibility for reviewing, carrying out, or approving aspects of a project. Responsible agencies must actively participate in the lead agency's CEQA process, review the lead agency's CEQA document, and use the document when making a decision on project elements. State Parks has discretionary approval power over the project based on its role as land manager in the Auburn SRA (where the proposed project is located) under a cooperative agreement with Reclamation; therefore, State Parks is a responsible agency for the proposed trail project. The proposed trail would cross land owned by Reclamation and would require a right-of-entry permit; therefore, Reclamation is a responsible agency for the project. In addition, Reclamation is the NEPA lead agency for the proposed project.

Other federal responsible agencies that would issue permits on the proposed project or review the proposed project include U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Potential state responsible agencies that would issue permits on or review the proposed project include the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Air Resources Board, State Office of Historic Preservation, California Department of Boating and Waterways, California Department of Conservation, California Department of

Forestry and Fire Protection, California Department of Transportation, California Department of Water Resources, California Highway Patrol, California Resources Agency, California State Lands Commission, Native American Heritage Commission, and State Water Resources Control Board. Local responsible agencies that are responsible for issuing permits or approvals for the project include the County Board of Supervisors, City of Auburn, and County Department of Public Works.

CEQA defines certain trustee agencies as those that have state-mandated responsibilities for natural resources that are held in trust for the people of the State of California (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15386). In addition to its role as a responsible agency for streambed alteration agreements, the California Department of Fish and Game is a trustee agency that has jurisdiction over natural resources in the state that could be affected by the project, including the state's fish and wildlife resources and designated rare or endangered native plants.

1.7.2 PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD

This DEIR is being distributed to agencies and individuals to ensure that interested parties have an opportunity to express their concerns about the potential environmental effects of the proposed project, and to ensure that information pertinent to project approval is provided to agency decision makers. The DEIR is being distributed for a 45-day review period through September 24, 2007. Comments on the DEIR should be sent to the following address no later than 5 p.m. on September 24, 2007:

Mr. Andy Fisher
Placer County Department of Facility Services
Parks and Grounds Division
11476 C Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603
(530) 889-6819

Comments may also be submitted by e-mail to <afisher@placer.ca.gov>. If comments are provided via e-mail, please include the project title in the subject line, attach comments in Microsoft Word format, and include the commenter's U.S. Postal Service mailing address.

The DEIR is available in electronic format on the Placer County Web site, <<http://www.placer.ca.gov/>>. Hard copies of the document are also available for review at the County office at the address listed above, and at the Auburn Library at the following address:

Auburn Library (Placer County Library District)
350 Nevada Street
Auburn, CA 95603