The Responses to Comments Chapter includes responses to each of the comment letters submitted regarding the Timberline at Auburn Draft EIR. Each bracketed comment letter is followed by numbered responses to each bracketed comment. Any text changed as a result of the responses to comments is shown in **bold** for added text and in *strikethrough* for removed text.
Letter 1

November 29, 2010

File No.: 220.12336.11784.SCH#2008082117

Mr. George Rosasco
Placer County Planning Department
3091 County Center Drive
Auburn, CA 95603

Dear Mr. Rosasco:

Recently, the California Highway Patrol (CHP) Auburn Area had the opportunity to review the Notice of Completion for the Timberline at Auburn Executive Summary chapter of the Draft Environmental Impact Report SCH#2008082117. We believe the growth discussed will have a moderate impact the mission of the CHP of providing safety and service to the public as they use the highway transportation system within Placer County. The project as outlined will moderately increase traffic volume and impact the State highways and roadways within the eastern portion of Placer County, primarily Interstate 80 (I-80), State Route 49 (SR-49), Bell Road, Atwood Road and Dry Creek Road.

The effect this project will have on the Auburn CHP Area would be moderate in the number of residents it will attract. The proposed plan encompasses approximately 118 acres of land currently surrounded by existing or approved residential, commercial and open space in the incorporated area of eastern Placer County. The plan calls for the construction of a continuing care retirement community, a commercial center and a loop trail. The proposed project would include up to 858 residential units, of which 780 would be located in the continuing care retirement community and the remaining 78 units would be second and third lofts above commercial and office spaces. This project will contribute a moderate amount of traffic volume on regional roadways and intersections that could exceed their current capacity.

The Auburn CHP Area office is responsible for more than 800 square miles of area in west Placer County, which includes I-80, SR-49, SR-193, SR-65, and over 1,100 miles of county roadways. We currently have 29 Road Patrol Officers assigned to the Auburn CHP Area office to patrol these roadways 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. We are committed to providing the maximum amount of service and traffic enforcement allowable with our current staffing levels. There are no immediate plans to augment the workforce in the Auburn CHP Area Office, nor are there any major roadway projects to significantly increase the traffic capacity of I-80 or SR-49.
We thank you for allowing our comments regarding the Timberline at Auburn Executive Summary chapter of the Environmental Impact Report SCH#2008082117. Through cooperative partnerships with local, county and State entities the CHP will continue to monitor the growth within eastern Placer County and the surrounding cities for its impact on the CHP’s mission.

Sincerely,

\[Signature\]

W. L. DONOVAN, Captain
Commander
Auburn Area

cc: Assistant Chief M. S. Champion, Valley Division
R. M. Nannini, SSM III, Commander, Special Projects Section
LETTER 1: DONOVAN, W.L., DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

Response to Comment 1-1

The comment expresses general concerns regarding an increase to traffic volumes and impacts to State highways and roadway within the eastern portion of Placer County. Traffic related impacts are addressed in Chapter 7 of the Draft EIR, *Transportation and Circulation*.

Response to Comment 1-2

The comment expresses general concerns regarding an increase in traffic on regional roadways and intersections. Traffic related impacts, including roadways and intersections, are addressed in Chapter 7 of the Draft EIR, *Transportation and Circulation*. The Draft EIR determined with implementation of mitigation measures, all impacts to roadways and intersections would be less-than-significant, with the exception of the roadway segment of Atwood Road from Richardson Drive to SR 49, which would remain significant and unavoidable.

Response to Comment 1-3

The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR, but will be forwarded to the decision-makers for their consideration.
December 22, 2010
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George Rosasco
Placer County, Planning Department
3091 County Center Drive
Auburn, CA 95603

Dear Mr. Rosasco:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Timberline at Auburn project. This project is located west of State Route (SR) 49 at the intersection of Bell Road and Richardson Drive. This proposed project totals 95 acres and consists of a proposed Continuing Care Retirement Community (CCRC), commercial center, and a loop trail. Our Comments are as follows:

- We concur with the list of locations for which improvements are needed and the proposed payment of mitigation funds to Placer County as described in mitigation measure 7-2(d) on page 7-58.

- All work proposed and performed within the State Highway right-of-way must be in accordance with Caltrans’ standards and will require a Caltrans Encroachment Permit prior to commencing construction. For more information on encroachment permits, requirements, and the application form, please visit our web page at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/developserv/permits/, or contact Caltrans District 3 Office of Permits at (530) 741-4403.

Please provide our office with copies of any further action(s) related to this project. If you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact the Placer County Intergovernmental Review Coordinator, Chad Riding, by e-mail at chad_riding@dot.ca.gov or by phone at (530) 741-4543.

Sincerely,

RICHARD HELMAN, Chief
Office of Transportation Planning – East

c: State Clearinghouse

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"
LETTER 2:  HELMAN, RICHARD, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Response to Comment 2-1

The comment concurs with the list of transportation improvements and payment of mitigation funds as described in Mitigation Measure 7-2(d) on page 7-58 of the Draft EIR.

Response to Comment 2-2

The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Prior to commencing any construction within the State Highway right-of-way the project applicant would obtain an encroachment permit from the Department of Transportation.
November 23, 2010

George Rosasco  
Placer County Planning Department  
30901 County Center Drive  
Auburn, CA 95603

RE: SCH# 2008082117 Timbering at Auburn: Placer County.

Dear Mr. Rosasco:

The Native American Heritage Commission has reviewed the Notice of Completion (NOC) regarding the above referenced project. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) states that any project that causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource, which includes archeological resources, is a significant effect requiring the preparation of an EIR (CEQA guidelines 15064(b)). To adequately comply with this provision and mitigate project-related impacts on archaeological resources, the Commission recommends the following actions be required:

3-1

✓ Contact the appropriate Information Center for a record search to determine:
  - If a project or all of the area of project effect (APE) has been previously surveyed for cultural resources.
  - If any known cultural resources have already been recorded on or adjacent to the APE.
  - If the probability is low, moderate, or high that cultural resources are located in the APE.
  - If a survey is required to determine whether previously unrecorded cultural resources are present.

3-2

✓ If an archaeological inventory survey is required, the final stage is the preparation of a professional report detailing the findings and recommendations of the records search and field survey.
  - The final report containing site forms, site significance, and mitigation measures should be submitted immediately to the planning department. All information regarding site locations, Native American human remains, and associated funerary objects should be in a separate confidential addendum, and not be made available for public disclosure.
  - The final written report should be submitted within 3 months after work has been completed to the appropriate regional archaeological Information Center.

3-3

✓ Contact the Native American Heritage Commission for:
  - A Sacred Lands File Check. Sacred Lands File check completed, no sites indicated.
  - A list of appropriate Native American Contacts for consultation concerning the project site and to assist in the mitigation measures. Native American Contacts List attached.

3-4

✓ Lack of surface evidence of archeological resources does not preclude their subsurface existence.
  - Lead agencies should include in their mitigation plan provisions for the identification and evaluation of accidentally discovered archeological resources, per California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) §15064.5(f). In areas of identified archeological sensitivity, a certified archeologist and a culturally affiliated Native American, with knowledge in cultural resources, should monitor all ground-disturbing activities.
  - Lead agencies should include in their mitigation plan provisions for the disposition of recovered artifacts, in consultation with culturally affiliated Native Americans.
  - Lead agencies should include provisions for discovery of Native American human remains in their mitigation plan. Health and Safety Code §7050.5, CEQA §15064.5(e), and Public Resources Code §5097.58 mandates the process to be followed in the event of an accidental discovery of any human remains in a location other than a dedicated cemetery.

Sincerely,

Katy Sanchez  
Program Analyst
(916) 653-4040

CC: State Clearinghouse
## Native American Contact List
Placer County
November 22, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Tribe</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians</td>
<td>P.O. Box 1340, Shingle Springs, CA 95682</td>
<td>Miwok, Maidu</td>
<td>(530) 676-8010, (530) 676-8033 Fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Tayaba, Vice Chairperson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Enos</td>
<td>15310 Bancroft Road, Auburn, CA 95603</td>
<td>Maidu, Washoe</td>
<td>(530) 878-2378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria</td>
<td>10720 Indian Hill Road, Auburn, CA 95603</td>
<td>Maidu, Miwok</td>
<td>530-883-2364, 530-883-2320 Fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Keyser, Chairperson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Valley Miwok-Maidu Cultural Foundation</td>
<td>PO Box 1490, Foresthill, CA 95631</td>
<td>Miwok, Maidu</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tvmmcf@foothill.net">tvmmcf@foothill.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Suehead, Cultural Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria</td>
<td>10720 Indian Hill Road, Auburn, CA 95603</td>
<td>Maidu, Miwok</td>
<td>530-883-2390, 530-883-2380 Fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory S. Baker, Tribal Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Fonseca, Chairperson</td>
<td>P.O. Box 1340, Shingle Springs, CA 95682</td>
<td>Miwok, Maidu</td>
<td>(530) 676-8010, (530) 676-8033 Fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria</td>
<td>10720 Indian Hill Road, Auburn, CA 95603</td>
<td>Maidu, Miwok</td>
<td>530-883-2364, 530-883-2320 Fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcos Guerrero, Tribal Preservation Committee</td>
<td>10720 Indian Hill Road, Auburn, CA 95603</td>
<td>Maidu, Miwok</td>
<td>mg <a href="mailto:guerrero@auburnrancheria.com">guerrero@auburnrancheria.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April Wallace Moore</td>
<td>19630 Placer Hills Road, Colfax, CA 95713</td>
<td>Nisenan - So Maidu, Konkow, Washoe</td>
<td>530-637-4279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7650.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed SCH# 2006052117 Timberline at Auburn, Placer County.

---

Chapter 3 – Responses to Comments
LETTER 3:  SANCHEZ, KATY, NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION

Response to Comment 3-1

Page 1-3 in Chapter 1, Introduction, of the Draft EIR states that an archaeological and historical investigation was prepared for the 95-acre portion of the project site. In addition, page 1-4 of the Draft EIR states that the Archaeological and Historical Investigations Report for the 24-acre ARD Property was prepared in March 2008. A record search at the North Central Information Center was conducted for each of the reports.

The Archeological and Historical Investigations for the Timberline at Auburn Project report prepared by PMC in 2007, included a record search within the Area of Potential Effects (APE). The APE was previously surveyed by Peak & Associates in 1979 and 1982, Supernowicz in 1993, and Foothill Archaeological Services in 1995. In addition, the report indentified three recorded sites, CA-PLA-296 that consists of lithic scatter and bedrock mortars, CA-PLA-1368-H that consists of building foundations, and CA-PLA-963-H that is a segment of the Combie Ophir Canal. The record search also identified 16 previous surveys within 0.5 miles of the APE boundaries and two prehistoric sites and three historic sites within 0.5 miles of the APE. Additional details are included in the archaeological and historical investigations prepared for the project site.

Response to Comment 3-2

See Response to Comment 3-1. The cultural resources reports prepared for the project site have been submitted to the Placer County Planning Department and subsequently reviewed.

Response to Comment 3-3

See Response to Comment 3-1. A Sacred Land File Check was prepared by Katy Sanchez, Program Analyst of the Native American Heritage Commission, on September 11, 2007 and included in the archaeological and historical reports for the project site. In addition, copies of the consultation letters and phone logs with Native American groups are included in the reports. These reports are available through the Placer County Environmental Coordination Services Department located at 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603.

Response to Comment 3-4

Page 1-3, Chapter 1, Introduction, of the Draft EIR states that in the event of the discovery of previously unidentified archaeological resources, human remains, or paleontological resources, all construction work shall be halted and the Placer County Planning Department and appropriate specialists shall be contacted. More specifically, page 1-3 of the Introduction chapter provides the County’s standard conditions of approval that will be required for this project, which state:

“If any archaeological artifacts, exotic rock (non-native), or unusual amounts of shell or bone are uncovered during any on-site construction activities, all work must stop immediately in the area and a County approved archaeologist will be retained to evaluate
the deposit. The Placer County Planning Department and Department of Museums must also be contacted for review of the archaeological find(s). If the discovery consists of human remains, the Placer County Coroner and Native American Heritage Commission must also be contacted. Work in the area may only proceed after authorization is granted by the Placer County Planning Department. A note to this effect will be provided on the improvement plans for the project. Following a review of the new find and consultation with appropriate experts, if necessary, the authority to proceed may be accompanied by the addition of development requirements which provide protection of the site and/or additional mitigation measures necessary to address the unique or sensitive nature of the site.”

This standard requirement would decrease potential cultural resources impacts to a less-than-significant level.
Letter 4

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Governor's Office of Planning and Research
State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit

December 27, 2010

George Rosasco
Placer County, Planning Department
3091 County Center Drive
Auburn, CA 95603

Subject: Timberline at Auburn (PEIR T200801399)
SCH#: 2008082117

Dear George Rosasco:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Draft EIR to selected state agencies for review. On the enclosed Document Details Report please note that the Clearinghouse has listed the state agencies that reviewed your document. The review period closed on December 24, 2010, and the comments from the responding agency (ies) is (are) solicited. If this comment package is not in order, please notify the State Clearinghouse immediately. Please refer to the project’s ten-digit State Clearinghouse number in future correspondence so that we may respond promptly.

Please note that Section 21104(c) of the California Public Resources Code states that:

"A responsible or other public agency shall only make substantive comments regarding those activities involved in a project which are within an area of expertise of the agency or which are required to be carried out or approved by the agency. Those comments shall be supported by specific documentation."

These comments are forwarded for use in preparing your final environmental document. Should you need more information or clarification of the enclosed comments, we recommend that you contact the commenting agency directly.

This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. Please contact the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-5613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan
Director, State Clearinghouse

Enclosures
cc: Resources Agency

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95812-3044
Toll Free: 1-800-776-0133 - Tel: (916) 445-0613 - Fax: (916) 323-3018 - www.qpr.ca.gov
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Final EIR
Timberline at Auburn
March 2011
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SCH# 2008082117
Project Title Timberline at Auburn (PEIR T20080139)
Lead Agency Placer County

Type EIR Draft EIR
Description The proposed project is composed of a continuing care retirement community (CCRC), a commercial center, and a loop trail to be developed on the ARD parcel to the northeast. The proposed project would include up to 236 residential units, of which 760 would be located in the continuing care retirement community (CCRC) and the remaining 78 units would be second and third story lofts above commercial and office spaces. The commercial portion of the project would include three multi-story buildings with 28,000 square feet (sq/ft) of commercial space and 5,000 sq/ft of office space, five multi-story medical office and office professional buildings, 19 residential units that would occupy the second and third stories of the retail building and one of the residential office buildings, an RV/Boat storage facility, and two 23,500 sq/ft commercial buildings. In addition, the project applicant would construct a trail and mitigation wetlands on the undeveloped Auburn Recreation Park District lands to the northeast.

Lead Agency Contact
Name George Rosasco
Agency Placer County, Planning Department
Phone (530) 745-3065
Fax
Email
Address 3091 County Center Drive
City Auburn
State CA Zip 95603

Project Location
County Placer
City Auburn
Region
Lat/Long 38° N / 121° 11' 09" W
Cross Streets Bell Road/Richardson Drive
Parcel No. 061-180-008,009-051-140-056, and -057
Township 13N
Range SE
Section 29
Base MDB&M

Proximity to:
Highways SR 49
Airports Auburn Municipal
Railways UPRR
Waterways
Schools Auburn Union High
Land Use
The site is currently vacant. The Placer County General Plan and Auburn Bowman Community Plan Designate: Open Space, Mixed Use, High Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, Low Density Residential.
Z: Residential Single Family with density limitation, Residential Multi-Family with density limitation, Residential Agriculture, Office & Professional & Residential Multi-Family combining Design Corridor, Office Professional Combining Design Corridor, and Open Space.

Project Issues
Aesthetic/Visual; Air Quality; Biological Resources; Drainage/Absorption; Flood Plain/Flooding;
Geologic/Seismic; Minerals; Noise; Public Services; Schools/Universities; Soil
Erosion/Compaction/Grading; Traffic/Circulation; Water Quality; Water Supply; Wetland/Riparian;
Landuse

Note: Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewing Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resources Agency; Department of Fish and Game, Region 2; Cal Fire; Department of Parks and Recreation; Department of Water Resources; Caltrans, Division of Aeronautics; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 3; Air Resources Board, Transportation Projects; Regional Water Quality Control Bd., Region 5 (Sacramento); Native American Heritage Commission; Public Utilities Commission; Department of Housing and Community Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Received</th>
<th>Start of Review</th>
<th>End of Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Note: Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.
LETTER 4: MORGAN, SCOTT, GOVERNOR’S OFFICE OF PLANNING AND RESEARCH

Response to Comment 4-1

The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR, but rather states that Placer County, acting as lead agency for the Timberline at Auburn project, has “complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.”
MEMORANDUM
DEPARTMENT OF FACILITY SERVICES
COUNTY OF PLACER

To: MAYWAN KRACH, ECS
From: CHRIS HANSON, WPWMA
Subject: TIMBERLINE AT AUBURN (PEIR T200800139)

Date: December 28, 2010

Thank you for the opportunity to review the above mentioned Draft EIR. It is our understanding that the Timberline at Auburn project proposes an age-restricted community consisting of a total of 858 residential units (attached units, duplexes, and detached units), and up to 331,500 square feet of medical office, retail, and commercial space near Bell Road and Richardson Drive in unincorporated Placer County.

Placer County Facility Services, Environmental Engineering Division operates and maintains the County’s solid waste programs and provides staffing for the Western Placer Waste Management Authority (WPWMA). The WPWMA is a regional agency comprised of Placer County and the Cities of Roseville, Rocklin and Lincoln that provides recycling and waste disposal opportunities to those communities as well as the City of Auburn and the Town of Loomis. Our comments are as follows:

General

First and foremost, we appreciate that the EIR incorporated much of the information and comments provided by us early in the process. Our remaining comments are provided mainly for clarity and to promote consistency among environmental documents; overall, we do not disagree with the findings in the EIR as related to solid waste impacts.

Section 1.7 Placer County General Plan Goals and Policies

In addition to the goals mentioned under Landfills, Transfer Stations, and Solid Waste Recycling, the County general plan has the following solid waste related goals and policies that may be applicable to the proposed project and provide a fuller picture of the County’s solid waste related commitments:

- 4.G.1. The County shall require waste collection in all new urban and suburban development.
- 4.G.2. The County shall promote maximum use of solid waste source reduction, recycling, composting, and environmentally-safe transformation of wastes.
Letter 5
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• 4.G.8. The County shall encourage the development of regional and community-based recycling facilities in heavy commercial and industrial areas.

Chapter 12 - Public Services and Utilities

1. Section 12-2 – Regulatory Setting

a. In addition to the California Integrated Waste Management Act mentioned in the EIR, the State has the following solid waste related regulations:

i. The Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act (AB 1327, 1991) requires jurisdictions to adopt ordinances requiring development projects to provide adequate storage area for collection and removal of recyclable materials.

ii. The California Medical Waste Management Act contains requirements for the proper handling and disposal of medical waste.

iii. SB 1305 amended the Medical Waste Management act to prohibit the disposal in trash of home-generated sharps waste.

b. Pursuant to AB 1327 mentioned above, the Placer County Code also requires recycling collection areas for new developments in Section 8.16.080.

2. Section 12-3 – Impacts and Mitigation Measures (Solid Waste), Standards of Significance:

The EIR states a significant impact could occur if the project is “served by landfill with insufficient permitted capacity”. A significant impact could also occur if the increase in waste will impact the lifespan of the WRS,L, the processing capabilities of the MRF, and the permitted capacity of the MRF.

3. Section 12-5 – Impacts to Solid Waste Disposal:

a. Correction: The EIR states the WRS,L has been expanded to 800 acres; the permitted acreage of the landfill is 291 acres.

b. As stated in our May 26, 2010 comment letter on the administrative draft EIR, although we agree the project will likely not have a significant impact on the WPWMA facilities, we would like to see the EIR “determine if the increase in waste will significantly shorten the lifespan of the WRS,L or affect the processing capabilities of the MRF,” specifically:

i. Available physical capacity / lifespan of the WRS,L – The EIR finds that the project does not have a significant impact based on the total capacity of the landfill; it is more appropriate to look at the available remaining capacity. The WRS,L has an available remaining capacity of 25,094,157 cubic yards (as of July 2010) and projected lifespan to 2042. The EIR should demonstrate how much of the available
capacity will be required by the project (percentage) and whether the project will significantly shorten the life of the landfill (years).

ii. WRSL permitted capacity – e.g., the WRSL is permitted to accept 1,900 tons per day and currently receives an average of 824 tons per day; the EIR should also demonstrate whether the estimated waste generated from the project, during construction and once completed (estimated tons per day), would exceed the WRSL’s remaining permitted capacity.

iii. MRF capacity – the MRF has a processing capacity of 2,200 tons per day and permitted capacity of 1,750 tons per day and 1,014 vehicles per day; for the period of July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2010, the average weekday tonnage received at the MRF was 815 tons and the average weekday vehicle count at the MRF was 532. The EIR should demonstrate whether the waste generated, either during construction or once built, would exceed the MRF’s available processing or permitted capacity.

4. General – Medical Waste

The following comments were not included in earlier comment letters; however there is ever increasing concern with pharmaceuticals and other constituents of concern threatening the environmental and human health.

a. If a project’s waste stream is estimated to differ greatly from a typical waste stream profile (e.g., generate large volumes of hazardous materials), it should be explained in an EIR. The proposed project has the potential to generate medical-related waste, sharps, and pharmaceutical waste.

Such waste has the potential to threaten public and environmental health, as well as endanger landfill and MRF worker safety, when disposed in the garbage or down the drain; these wastes should be collected by an appropriate service provider or disposed at an appropriate Household Hazardous Waste Collection Facility.

b. As a potential generator or medical, sharps, and pharmaceutical waste, the project should ensure proper disposal of such waste by implementing the following:

i. Medical waste generators (medical offices, clinics, etc) should subscribe to the appropriate collection service for disposal of medical waste, sharps, and unused or expired pharmaceuticals.

ii. Residents should be educated about the proper disposal of home-generated sharps and unused or expired pharmaceuticals.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment. Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (530) 886-4965 or chrason@placer.ca.gov.
LETTER 5: HANSON CHRIS, WESTERN PLACER WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY

Response to Comment 5-1

The comment is an introductory statement which notes they do not disagree with the findings in the Draft EIR related to solid waste impacts.

Response to Comment 5-2

For clarification purposes, page 1-22, Chapter 1, *Introduction*, of the Draft EIR is revised as follows:

**Landfills, Transfer Stations, and Solid Waste Recycling**

**Goal 4.G** To ensure the safe and efficient disposal or recycling of solid waste generated in Placer County.

**Policy 4.G.1.** The County shall require waste collection in all new urban and suburban development.

**Policy 4.G.2.** The County shall promote maximum use of solid waste source reduction, recycling, composting, and environmentally-safe transformation of wastes.

**Policy 4.G.4.** The County shall ensure that solid waste disposal facilities do not contaminate surface or groundwater in violation of state standards.

The above revisions are for clarification purposes only and do not alter the conclusions of the Draft EIR. In addition, the project would be consistent with Policy 4.G.1 and 4.G.2.

Regarding 4.G.8., this policy is not applicable to the project because it pertains to heavy commercial and industrial areas, none of which are proposed for the project.

Response to Comment 5-3

For clarification purposes, page 12-13, Chapter 12, *Public Services and Utilities*, of the Draft EIR, is revised as follows:

**California Integrated Waste Management Act**

To minimize the amount of solid waste that must be disposed of in landfills, the State Legislature passed the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB 939), effective January 1990. According to AB 939, all cities and counties are required to divert 25 percent of all solid waste from landfill facilities by January 1, 1995 and 50 percent by January 1, 2000. Solid waste plans are required
to explain how each city’s AB 939 plan will be integrated with the County plan. In order of priority, the plans must promote source reduction, recycling and composting, and environmentally safe transformation and land disposal. In 2006, the unincorporated County had a diversion rate of approximately 68 percent, which exceeded State requirements.

Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act (AB 1327, 1991)

This act requires jurisdictions to adopt ordinances requiring development projects to provide adequate storage area for collection and removal of recyclable materials. Pursuant to AB 1327, the Placer County Code also requires recycling collection areas for new developments in Section 8.16.080.

The California Medical Waste Management Act

The California Medical Waste Management Act was enacted in 2007 to establish the legal requirements for handling medical waste. The act gives authority to the Department of Public Health to regulate all aspects of medical waste, including the initial generation of waste, proper handling, and disposal of medical waste.

SB 1305

SB 1305 amended the Medical Waste Management Act to prohibit the disposal in trash of home-generated sharps waste.

The additional text is for clarification purposes only and does not alter the conclusion of the Draft EIR.

Response to Comment 5-4

For clarification purposes, the “Standards of Significance” section on page 12-17, Chapter 12, Public Services and Utilities, of the Draft EIR, is revised as follows:

- Be served by a landfill or material recovery facility with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs in compliance with all applicable laws, significantly decrease the lifespan of the landfill, or exceed the processing capacity of the material recovery facility.

The above change is for clarification purposes only and does not alter the conclusion of the Draft EIR.
Response to Comment 5-5

Page 12-49, Impact 12-5, Chapter 12, Public Services and Utilities, of the Draft EIR, is revised as follows:

The WRSL serves the Auburn-Foothills, which includes the proposed project. The WRSL has been expanded to 291 permitted acres and has a total available remaining capacity of 25,094,157 cubic yards (as of July 2010). Under current land use and development conditions, the life expectancy of the landfill is projected to extend to year 2042. According to CalRecycle the Placer County Department of Facility Services, the WRSL receives an average of 824 tons per day, which would equate to 300,760 tons of waste in 2010, which is less than approximately two percent of total remaining capacity. The Material Recovery Facility (MRF) has a processing capacity of 2,200 tons per day and a permitted capacity of 1,750 tons per day and 1,014 vehicles per day. The average tonnage received at the MRF for the period of July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2010 is approximately 815 tons and the average vehicle count is 532.

Tables 12-17 and 12-18 include estimates of the solid waste that would be created during construction and operation of the proposed project. As shown in Table 12-17, construction of the project would create a total of approximately 3,131 tons of solid waste. In addition, as shown in Table 12-18, implementation of the project would result in the creation of approximately 1,765 tons of solid waste per year, 4.8 tons per day. Development of the proposed project would increase the average daily waste received at the WRSL to approximately 829 tons per day (current rate of 824 tons per day + 4.8 tons per day for the project), well below the current permitted capacity of 1,900 tons per day. In addition, the average tonnage received at the MRF would increase from 815 tons to 820 tons, also well below the 1,750 tons per day permitted capacity and 2,200 ton processing capacity. As discussed above, the WRSL has a total remaining capacity of 25,094,157 cubic yards (30,630,000 tons). The proposed project yearly solid waste generation would be approximately 0.008 percent of the remaining capacity, and would decrease the lifespan of the landfill by approximately 0.09 years. Therefore, the WRSL and MRF would be able to support the solid waste disposal that would be necessary for the proposed project and impacts related to increased demand for solid waste disposal services would be less-than-significant.

The above changes are for clarification purposes only and do not alter the conclusions of the Draft EIR.

Response to Comment 5-6

See Response to Comment 5-5.
Response to Comment 5-7

See Response to Comment 5-5.

Response to Comment 5-8

See Response to Comment 5-5.

Response to Comment 5-9

The California Department of Public Health Medical Waste Management Program enforces the California Medical Waste Management Act and related regulations. Medical waste is generally regulated in the same manner as hazardous waste, except that special provisions apply to storage, disinfections, containment, and transportation. Requirements place “cradle-to-grave” responsibility for hazardous waste disposal on hazardous waste generators. Generators must ensure that their wastes are disposed of properly, and legal requirements dictate the disposal requirements for many waste streams. As medical waste generators, the medical offices would be required to comply with the regulations established in the Medical Waste Management Act.

Specific medical office operators have not been identified; however, the following operations and procedures are typical of the industry. Chemical wastes are collected for off-site disposal by a licensed contractor who disposes of the appropriately packaged waste at a certified disposal facility. Chemotherapeutic wastes would be handled and labeled for incineration, and any radioactive waste would be handled subject to a Nuclear Regulatory Commission License. General medical wastes would be collected and disposed of in conformance with the approved Medical Waste Management Plan. Medical wastes include clothing and towels soiled with blood, blood and other bodily fluids, and materials with sharp edges. Body parts and organs, if applicable, would be referred to a certified pathology laboratory for analysis and proper disposal.

Response to Comment 5-10

See Response to Comment 5-9. The dispensers of home-generated sharps and unused or expired pharmaceuticals are responsible for educating patients on proper disposal.
December 29, 2010

Maywan Krach, Environmental Coordination Services
Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190
Auburn, CA 95603

RE: Airport Land Use Commission Comments — Timberline at Auburn
Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) SCH# 2008082117

Dear Ms. Krach,

Thank you for opportunity to review the DEIR for the proposed Timberline at Auburn project. I realize that I missed the December 27 deadline for submitting comments. I would appreciate you considering the following Airport Land Use Commission comments on the DEIR.

Airport Land Use Compatibility Background

Since 2007, ALUC staff worked with the applicant and Placer County Planning staff on the proposed project’s airport land use compatibility issues. We focused on assisted living use/facilities, residential lofts, and mixed use (residential/commercial/office) density/use intensity calculations.

A key conclusion was that assisted living facilities are not consistent with the Placer County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (PCALUCP). The ALUC staff, without full Commission direction, cannot find the assisted living part of the proposal to be consistent with the PCALUCP. The PCALUCP cites Policy 4.2.3 — Land uses of particular concern, in which occupants have reduced effective mobility or are unable to respond to emergencies. Nursing homes are included in this category. They are prohibited in all airport compatibility zones except Zone D.

On June 6, 2008, ALUC staff found the Timberline at Auburn proposal to be consistent with the Placer County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (PCALUCP) subject to several conditions. This review is included in the DEIR — Appendix A.
On September 22, 2008, ALUC staff provided Notice of Preparation (NOP) comments for the proposed DEIR. These are also contained in DEIR Appendix A. The NOP cited the following:

- The site plan was not the same one used for the June 2008 review. The NOP site plan illustrated/detailed two buildings for assisted living uses.

- The June 2008 review did not consider assisted living use/buildings. In April 2008, the applicant was informed that an assisted living use was not consistent with the PCALUCP. If the proposal included this use, it would have to be referred to the entire Commission for a consistency determination. The applicant said the site plan would be revised – deleting the assisted living buildings and replacing them with independent living ones. As a future option, the applicant indicated he might go to the Commission for a determination on the assisted living use.

On September 30, 2008, the applicant requested the county staff to remove the assisted living use from the NOP project description and to replace it with independent living residential units. See the enclosed email from John Margowski to Maywan Krach.

**DEIR Comments**

1. Please clarify the proposed project’s description. The June 2008 ALUC staff consistency determination did not evaluate assisted living uses. The NOP project description was revised – deleting reference to two assisted living buildings. The DEIR project description (among a number of uses) cites “two assisted living or independent living buildings”. The DEIR’s project description is not the same one used for the June 2008 ALUC staff consistency determination.

   If the assisted living use is now a part of the proposed project, the June 2008 ALUC review is no longer valid. Before the County can take action on the proposed project, a PCALUCP consistency determination will be required, via a noticed public hearing, by the Commission.

2. Confirm the DEIR’s remaining project description and site plan are the same as the ones used for the June 2008 ALUC staff PCALUCP consistency determination. If different, further ALUC work may be required before the County can take action on the proposal.
Again, thank you in advance, for considering these ALUC comments. PCTPA appreciates Placer County’s airport land use compatibility coordination for proposed development around the Auburn Municipal Airport. If you have any questions, please contact me at 530.823.4033.

Sincerely,

Stan Tidman, Senior Planner

Enclosure -- September 30, 2008 email from John Margowski to Maywan Krach

Copies: Celia McAdams, PCTPA Executive Director (Placer County ALUC Secretary)  
George Rosasco, Supervising Planner, Placer County CRDA  
Ivan Karnezis, Auburn Municipal Airport Manager  
Will Wong, Auburn Community Development Director  
Ron Bolyard, Caltrans – Division of Aeronautics
John – thanks for the update on the Timberline project description adjustment – to remove the ‘assisted living’ part of the proposal and replace it with independent living residential units...

And, we’ve had some email woes over the past couple weeks. My email address is now – sttdman@petps.net (vs .org).

Stan — PLACER COUNTY TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY — 299 Nevada St, Auburn, CA 95603 — 530.823.4033 — www.ptps.net

From: John Margowski [mailto:jmargowski@westerncare.biz]
Sent: Tuesday, September 30, 2008 5:30 PM
To: Stan Tidman
Subject: FW: Timberline ALUC Comment Letter 09-22-08

Stan,

For some reason the first attempt was undeliverable.

John

From: John Margowski
Sent: Tuesday, September 30, 2008 5:11 PM
To: ‘Maywan Krach’
Cc: ‘Stan Tidman’; ‘George Rosasco’; Nick Pappani
Subject: Timberline ALUC Comment Letter 09-22-08

Maywan,

Please remove the assisted living use from our Project Description, and replace with independent living residential units. We will supply a new site plan exhibit to show this.

Thank you,

John Margowski

Western Care Construction Company
LETTER 6: TIDMAN, STAN, PLACER COUNTY TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY

Response to Comment 6-1

The comment is an introductory statement and does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.

Response to Comment 6-2

The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR, but rather provides relevant background information concerning the ALUC’s prior review of the Timberline at Auburn project.

Response to Comment 6-3

Chapter 3, Project Description, of the Timberline at Auburn Draft EIR does not contain any reference to “assisted living uses” as these specific use types are not included in the project. However, upon further scrutiny, a few inadvertent references to “assisted living uses” were found throughout the technical chapters of the Draft EIR. As a result, for clarification purposes, the following instances of the terminology “assisted living facilities” are hereby removed from the Draft EIR:

Page 6-18, Chapter 6, Visual Resources, of the Draft EIR:

As depicted in Figures 6-2 and 6-7, development of the proposed project, would block views through the site to the north from Richardson Drive. The view would be blocked by the proposed assisted independent living buildings, commercial buildings, and medical office buildings. However, the view along Bell Road would be minimally impacted as existing residential, skilled nursing, and assisted living facilities buildings block a majority of the existing view. In addition, as shown in the proposed project conceptual landscape plan, the proposed project includes additional screening trees and street frontage trees.

Page 7-24, Chapter 7, Transportation and Circulation, of the Draft EIR:

395 CCRC dwelling units – includes three independent living buildings C1, C2 and C3 (180 units), 95 villas and one Assisted Independent living building K2 (120 units). Service common buildings J1, B1 (partial) and A would also be constructed.

Page 9-26, Chapter 9, Noise, of the Draft EIR:

The proposed project would include a central plant, which would house the HVAC “chillers” for the multi-story Independent Living and Assisted Living residential buildings.
Page 9-35, Chapter 9, *Noise*, of the Draft EIR:

The traffic analysis indicates that the PM peak hour trip generation for the commercial uses is 113 trips. Assuming that approximately one-third of those trips result in parking lot movements in the “Additional Commercial” parking lot east of the Independent Assisted Living Building “K2”, the peak hour Leq value can be calculated as follows:

The above revisions are for clarification purposes only and do not alter the conclusions in the Draft EIR.

**Response to Comment 6-4**

The project description (i.e., Chapter 3) and site plan included in the Draft EIR are the same as those used for the 2008 ALUC consistency determination.