



**COUNTY OF PLACER**  
**Community Development Resource Agency**

**ENVIRONMENTAL  
COORDINATION  
SERVICES**

Michael J. Johnson, AICP  
Agency Director

E. J. Ivaldi, Coordinator

**NOTICE OF INTENT  
TO ADOPT A NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

The project listed below was reviewed for environmental impact by the Placer County Environmental Review Committee and was determined to have no significant effect upon the environment. A proposed Negative Declaration has been prepared for this project and has been filed with the County Clerk's office.

PROJECT: Placer County Targeted General Plan Amendment (PGPA 20120356)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project proposes a limited number of targeted amendments to its 1994 General Plan, which mostly consist of edits, corrections, status updates, revised figures, and several new programs and policies necessary to comply with new State and Federal laws and associated requirements.

PROJECT LOCATION: County-wide, Placer County

APPLICANT: Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, 3091 County Center Drive, Suite 180, Auburn, CA 95603 (530)745-3076

The comment period for this document closes on **February 14, 2013**. A copy of the Negative Declaration is available for public review at the Community Development Resource Agency public counter, the County's public libraries, and the County's web site below: (A copy of the proposed targeted amendments can also be found at the same link.)

<http://www.placer.ca.gov/Departments/CommunityDevelopment/EnvCoordSvcs/NegDec.aspx>


Additional information may be obtained by contacting the Environmental Coordination Services, at (530)745-3132, between the hours of 8:00 am and 5:00 pm, at 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603.

Published in Sacramento Bee on Wednesday, January 16, 2013

# GENERALIZED LAND USE

Figure 1-1

**DRAFT**





**COUNTY OF PLACER**  
**Community Development Resource Agency**

**ENVIRONMENTAL  
COORDINATION  
SERVICES**

Michael J. Johnson, AICP  
Agency Director

E. J. Ivaldi, Coordinator

**NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

In accordance with Placer County ordinances regarding implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, Placer County has conducted an Initial Study to determine whether the following project may have a significant adverse effect on the environment, and on the basis of that study hereby finds:

- The proposed project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment; therefore, it does not require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report and this **Negative Declaration** has been prepared.
- Although the proposed project could have a significant adverse effect on the environment, there will not be a significant adverse effect in this case because the project has incorporated specific provisions to reduce impacts to a less than significant level and/or the mitigation measures described herein have been added to the project. A **Mitigated Negative Declaration** has thus been prepared.

The environmental documents, which constitute the Initial Study and provide the basis and reasons for this determination are attached and/or referenced herein and are hereby made a part of this document.

**PROJECT INFORMATION**

<b>Title: Placer County Targeted General Plan Amendment</b>	<b>Plus#</b> PGPA 20120356
<b>Description:</b> The project proposes a limited number of targeted amendments to its 1994 General Plan, which mostly consist of edits, corrections, status updates, revised figures, and several new programs and policies necessary to comply with new State and Federal laws and associated requirements.	
<b>Location:</b> County-wide, Placer County	
<b>Project Applicant:</b> Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, 3091 County Center Drive, Suite 180, Auburn, CA 95603	
<b>County Contact Person:</b> Christopher Schmidt	530-745-3076

**PUBLIC NOTICE**

The comment period for this document closes on **February 14, 2013**. A copy of the Negative Declaration is available for public review at the Community Development Resource Agency public counter, the County's public libraries, and the County's web site below: (A copy of the proposed targeted amendments can also be found at the same link.) <http://www.placer.ca.gov/Departments/CommunityDevelopment/EnvCoordSvcs/NegDec.aspx>

Additional information may be obtained by contacting the Environmental Coordination Services, at (530)745-3132 between the hours of 8:00 am and 5:00 pm at 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603. For Tahoe projects, please visit our Tahoe Office, 775 North Lake Blvd., Tahoe City, CA 96146.

If you wish to appeal the appropriateness or adequacy of this document, address your written comments to our finding that the project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment: (1) identify the environmental effect(s), why they would occur, and why they would be significant, and (2) suggest any mitigation measures which you believe would eliminate or reduce the effect to an acceptable level. Regarding item (1) above, explain the basis for your comments and submit any supporting data or references. Refer to Section 18.32 of the Placer County Code for important information regarding the timely filing of appeals.



**COUNTY OF PLACER**  
**Community Development Resource Agency**

**ENVIRONMENTAL  
COORDINATION  
SERVICES**

Michael J. Johnson, AICP  
Agency Director

3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190 • Auburn • California 95603 • 530-745-3132 • fax 530-745-3003 • www.placer.ca.gov/planning

## INITIAL STUDY & CHECKLIST

This Initial Study has been prepared to identify and assess the anticipated environmental impacts of the following described project application. The document may rely on previous environmental documents (see Section C) and site-specific studies (see Section I) prepared to address in detail the effects or impacts associated with the project.

This document has been prepared to satisfy the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.) CEQA requires that all state and local government agencies consider the environmental consequences of projects over which they have discretionary authority before acting on those projects.

The Initial Study is a public document used by the decision-making lead agency to determine whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment. If the lead agency finds substantial evidence that any aspect of the project, either individually or cumulatively, may have a significant effect on the environment, regardless of whether the overall effect of the project is adverse or beneficial, the lead agency is required to prepare an EIR, use a previously-prepared EIR and supplement that EIR, or prepare a Subsequent EIR to analyze the project at hand. If the agency finds no substantial evidence that the project or any of its aspects may cause a significant effect on the environment, a Negative Declaration shall be prepared. If in the course of analysis, the agency recognizes that the project may have a significant impact on the environment, but that by incorporating specific mitigation measures the impact will be reduced to a less than significant effect, a Mitigated Negative Declaration shall be prepared.

### A. BACKGROUND:

Project Title: <b>Placer County Targeted General Plan Amendment</b>	Plus# PGPA 20120356
Entitlements: General Plan Amendment	
Site Area: Countywide	APN: Various
Location: Unincorporated Placer County	

### Project Description:

The County of Placer (County) is proposing a limited number of targeted amendments to its 1994 General Plan. Targeted General Plan Amendments mostly consist of edits, corrections, status updates, revised figures, and several new programs and policies necessary to comply with new State and Federal laws and associated requirements. The 2009 Housing Element has been incorporated into the new General Plan document.

This project consists of proposed changes to the General Plan. It does not include any specific development projects, does not modify General Plan land use designations, the land use map or capital improvement program.

**Project Site:** County-wide

### B. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

The project affects those portions of unincorporated Placer County that are under the jurisdiction of the County. It does not include land under federal jurisdiction, such as within Tahoe National Forest. Placer County is a geographically diverse county. While the western portion of the County contains suburbs of the Sacramento region, the eastern portion lies within the Lake Tahoe Basin and region. Placer County is one of the fastest growing counties in the California. Between 2000 and 2010, the County's population grew from 248,399 to 348,432.

### **C. PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT:**

The County has determined that an Initial Study shall be prepared in order to determine whether the potential exists for unmitigatable impacts resulting from the proposed project. Relevant analysis from the existing County-wide General Plan and associated environmental document, and other studies and reports that have been generated to date, were used as the database for the Initial Study. The decision to prepare the Initial Study utilizing the analysis contained in the General Plan and Specific Plan Certified EIRs, and project-specific analysis summarized herein, is sustained by Sections 15168 and 15183 of the CEQA Guidelines.

Section 15168 relating to Program EIRs indicates that where subsequent activities involve site-specific operations, the agency should use a written checklist or similar device to document the evaluation of the site and the activity, to determine whether the environmental effects of the operation were covered in the earlier Program EIR. A Program EIR is intended to provide the basis in an Initial Study for determining whether the later activity may have any significant effects. It will also be incorporated by reference to address regional influences, secondary effects, cumulative impacts, broad alternatives, and other factors that apply to the program as a whole.

The following documents serve as Program-level EIRs from which incorporation by reference will occur:

- ➔ Placer County General Plan EIR
- ➔ Community Plans
- ➔ Local Hazard Mitigation Plan and EIR

Section 15183 states that “projects which are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified shall not require additional environmental review, except as may be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or site.” Thus, if an impact is not peculiar to the project or site, and it has been addressed as a significant effect in the prior EIR, or will be substantially mitigated by the imposition of uniformly applied development policies or standards, then additional environmental documentation need not be prepared for the project solely on the basis of that impact.

The above stated documents are available for review Monday through Friday, 8am to 5pm, at the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603. For Tahoe projects, the document will also be available in our Tahoe Division Office, 775 North Lake Boulevard, Tahoe City, CA 96145.

### **D. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

The Initial Study checklist recommended by the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines is used to determine potential impacts of the proposed project on the physical environment. The checklist provides a list of questions concerning a comprehensive array of environmental issue areas potentially affected by the project (see CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G). Explanations to answers are provided in a discussion for each section of questions as follows:

- a) A brief explanation is required for all answers including “No Impact” answers.
- b) “Less Than Significant Impact” applies where the project’s impacts are insubstantial and do not require any mitigation to reduce impacts.
- c) “Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less than Significant Impact.” The County, as lead agency, must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level (mitigation measures from earlier analyses may be cross-referenced).
- d) “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- e) All answers must take account of the entire action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts [CEQA Guidelines, Section 15063(a)(1)].
- f) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, Program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration [CEQA Guidelines, Section 15063(c)(3)(D)]. A brief discussion should be attached addressing the following:
  - ➔ **Earlier analyses used** – Identify earlier analyses and state where they are available for review.
  - ➔ **Impacts adequately addressed** – Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of, and adequately analyzed in, an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards. Also, state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

- ➔ **Mitigation measures** – For effects that are checked as “Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- g) References to information sources for potential impacts (i.e. General Plans/Community Plans, zoning ordinances) should be incorporated into the checklist. Reference to a previously-prepared or outside document should include a reference to the pages or chapters where the statement is substantiated. A source list should be attached and other sources used, or individuals contacted, should be cited in the discussion.

**I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (PLN)				X
2. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, within a state scenic highway? (PLN)				X
3. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (PLN)				X
4. Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (PLN)				X

**Discussion- All Items:**

The overall population of the county is not expected to change as a result of the General Plan amendments, nor will development expand beyond those areas already identified for future development in the current General Plan. The proposed amendments will not affect any text in the General Plan relative to design or aesthetics. Where scenic vistas within the county are identified, policies are already in place to protect them and this proposal would not change any existing provisions. The project will not substantially damage scenic resources including trees, rock outcroppings and historic buildings with a state scenic highway. The project would not degrade the existing visual character of the county or its surroundings. The project will not adversely affect day or nighttime views. Therefore, there is no impact to aesthetics associated with this project.

**II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? (PLN)				X
2. Conflict with General Plan or other policies regarding land use buffers for agricultural operations? (PLN)				X
3. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? (PLN)				X
4. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland (including livestock grazing) to non-agricultural use? (PLN)				X

**Discussion- All Items:**

The project does not intensify or change the growth pattern or projections anticipated by the 1994 plan. The existing General Plan contains policies to protect agricultural operations from incompatible land uses. The proposed project will not change these policies. No rezoning is proposed as part of this project and would therefore not result in the conversion of existing farmland nor result in the loss of any existing property with an existing Williamson Act contract. No impact would occur.

**III. AIR QUALITY – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (APCD)				X
2. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (APCD)				X
3. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (APCD)				X
4. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (APCD)				X
5. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (APCD)				X

**Discussion- All Items:**

The General Plan update does not make modifications to the General Plan policies concerning air quality and objectionable odor. The project does not revise, replace or attempt to supersede existing standards and procedures to ensure compliance with State and County codes and policies that pertain to Air Quality. It does not include any provisions that would supersede or otherwise conflict with rules and procedures governing assessment or control of air pollutant emissions. The project does not propose any construction and no change in density is proposed. Future development projects will be subject to Placer County Air Pollution Control District rules, monitoring, and best management practices. No additional development potential or new land uses not currently allowed would be allowed as a result of the project. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish & Game or U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service? (PLN)				X
2. Substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number of restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species? (PLN)				X
3. Have a substantial adverse effect on the environment by converting oak woodlands? (PLN)				X
4. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations or by the California Department of Fish & Game or U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service? (PLN)				X
5. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.)				X

through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (PLN)				
6. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? (PLN)				X
7. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (PLN)				X
8. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (PLN)				X

**Discussion- All Items:**

The proposed project will not impact existing zoning and land use designations and does not involve development activity. Therefore, it is not expected to create any new action that could have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or sensitive natural community, or have a substantial adverse effect on any native resident or migratory fish, wildlife corridors or wildlife species. Future development projects will be subject to all applicable County codes and policies including General Plan and Community Plan policies such as the Tree Preservation Ordinance that discourages development in environmentally sensitive areas and protect significant ecological areas, habitat resources, watersheds and riparian vegetation. There are no impacts to biological resources as a result of this project.

**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Substantially cause adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5? (PLN)				X
2. Substantially cause adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5? (PLN)				X
3. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (PLN)				X
4. Have the potential to cause a physical change, which would affect unique ethnic cultural values? (PLN)				X
5. Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? (PLN)				X
6. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (PLN)				X

**Discussion- All Items:**

The proposed project does not involve a change in density, changes of use, or specific development project and therefore is not expected to have foreseeable and foreseeable impacts on archaeological or historical resources or an impact to paleontological resources or unique geologic features. The Recreational and Cultural Resources Element of the General Plan contains policies to conserve historic, cultural, archeological and paleontological resources and to ensure the protection of known resources. There are no substantial changes to these policies.

Site-specific projects will be required to submit environmental documentation with a planning application. Adherence to applicable County, State, and Federal standards and guidelines related to the protection/preservation of cultural resources will be implemented when a future project is proposed. State regulations requiring the reporting and proper

handling of human remains uncovered during construction projects remain unchanged. Therefore, there are no impacts to cultural resources.

**VI. GEOLOGY & SOILS** – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Expose people or structures to unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures? (ESD)				X
2. Result in significant disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcrowding of the soil? (ESD)				X
3. Result in substantial change in topography or ground surface relief features? (ESD)				X
4. Result in the destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features? (ESD)				X
5. Result in any significant increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site? (ESD)				X
6. Result in changes in deposition or erosion or changes in siltation which may modify the channel of a river, stream, or lake? (ESD)				X
7. Result in exposure of people or property to geologic and geomorphological (i.e. Avalanches) hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards? (ESD)				X
8. Be located on a geological unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse? (ESD)				X
9. Be located on expansive soils, as defined in Chapter 18 of the California Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property? (ESD)				X

**Discussion- All Items:**

No specific development projects are being proposed as part of the General Plan update. The proposed project does not expose people or structures to additional potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death. Future developments will be subject to all applicable County codes and policies for residential, commercial and other projects, including existing General Plan policies and standard requirements under the California Building Code designed to reduce risk from geologic activity to acceptable levels. There are no impacts to geology and soils resulting from this project.

**VII. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS** – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine handling, transport, use, or disposal of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials? (EHS)				X
2. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (EHS)				X

3. Emit hazardous emissions, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (APCD)				X
4. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (EHS)				X
5. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (PLN)				X
6. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing in the project area? (PLN)				X
7. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? (PLN)				X
8. Create any health hazard or potential health hazard? (EHS)				X
9. Expose people to existing sources of potential health hazards? (EHS)				X

**Discussion- All Items:**

The proposed project consists of an update to a regulatory and policy document and will not directly result in any new construction. There are no substantive modifications to the General Plan policies concerning hazards and hazardous materials. Future development in the county will be subject to hazardous materials regulations and would be required to meet fire safe guidelines. The proposed project is a policy document. Project-specific health hazards will be evaluated at the time a specific development proposal is made. Therefore, there is no impact to hazards and hazardous materials.

**VIII. HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Violate any potable water quality standards? (EHS)				X
2. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lessening of local groundwater supplies (i.e. the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? (EHS)				X
3. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area? (ESD)				X
4. Increase the rate or amount of surface runoff? (ESD)				X
5. Create or contribute runoff water which would include substantial additional sources of polluted water? (ESD)				X
6. Otherwise substantially degrade surface water quality?(ESD)				X

7. Otherwise substantially degrade ground water quality? (EHS)				X
8. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? (ESD)				X
9. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area improvements which would impede or redirect flood flows? (ESD)				X
10. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? (ESD)				X
11. Alter the direction or rate of flow of groundwater? (EHS)				X
12. Impact the watershed of important surface water resources, including but not limited to Lake Tahoe, Folsom Lake, Hell Hole Reservoir, Rock Creek Reservoir, Sugar Pine Reservoir, French Meadows Reservoir, Combie Lake, and Rollins Lake? (EHS, ESD)				X

**Discussion- All Items:**

The proposed project does not involve any development activity nor will it change permitted land uses. Therefore, it will not involve ground disturbance or any discharges to water bodies. All future development will be subject to County and other agencies' runoff/stormwater and floodplain regulations, permit and approvals, including Placer County's Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance, Stormwater Management Manual, and NPDES Municipal Stormwater Permit, and will comply with all applicable County policies related to hydrology and water quality. No impact is anticipated as a result of the General Plan update.

**IX. LAND USE & PLANNING – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Physically divide an established community? (PLN)				X
2. Conflict with General Plan/Community Plan/Specific Plan designations or zoning, or Plan policies adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (EHS, ESD, PLN)				X
3. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan or other County policies, plans, or regulations adopted for purposes of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects? (PLN)				X
4. Result in the development of incompatible uses and/or the creation of land use conflicts? (PLN)				X
5. Affect agricultural and timber resources or operations (i.e. impacts to soils or farmlands and timber harvest plans, or impacts from incompatible land uses)? (PLN)				X
6. Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)? (PLN)				X
7. Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area? (PLN)				X
8. Cause economic or social changes that would result in significant adverse physical changes to the environment such as urban decay or deterioration? (PLN)				X

**Discussion- All Items:**

The proposed project does not modify current zoning, subdivision regulations, grading ordinance or other related County standards. No specific development projects are being proposed as part of the General Plan update. Density and intensity factors proposed under the 1994 plan remain in place.

The proposed project does not amend or conflict with any applicable conservation plan nor does it divide and established community or result in increased development in sensitive ecological areas. No impact is anticipated as a result of the General Plan update.

**X. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project result in:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. The loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (PLN)				X
2. The loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? (PLN)				X

**Discussion- All Items:**

The proposed project would not change any land use designations or zones that would otherwise allow mineral resource recovery and will not result in the loss of the availability of mineral resources, particularly mineral (minerals include several different types of aggregate that are used for purposes other than petroleum) resources. All future development will be subject to all applicable County codes and policies, including existing General Plan and Community Plan policies that protect known mineral resources reserves from encroachment of incompatible land uses. Therefore, there is no impact to mineral resources resulting from the project.

**XI. NOISE – Would the project result in:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local General Plan, Community Plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (PLN)				X
2. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (PLN)				X
3. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (PLN)				X
4. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (PLN)				X
5. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (PLN)				X

**Discussion- All Items:**

The proposed project does not propose any substantive change to existing General Plan noise policies. The project does not involve zone changes or changes to the existing land use designations that could affect density or noise levels in residential, commercial or industrial neighborhoods. The County’s existing Noise Ordinance (Article 9.36 of the County Code) and standards would apply to proposed future developments. The project would not subject new populations to excessive noise levels resulting from a nearby airstrip. There is no impact resulting from the project.

**XII. POPULATION & HOUSING – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (i.e. by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (i.e. through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (PLN)				X
2. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (PLN)				X

**Discussion- All Items:**

The proposed project would not change any existing land use designations or result in an increase in new home construction beyond the existing capacity. The population assumptions used in the General Plan remain unchanged. The existing General Plan accounts for increased growth and includes policies to reduce potential growth related impacts. The project will not review any of these policies. No aspect of the project involves the displacement of existing housing. Therefore, there is no impact to population and housing resulting from updating the General Plan.

**XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES – Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental services and/or facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services?**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Fire protection? (EHS, ESD, PLN)				X
2. Sheriff protection? (EHS, ESD, PLN)				X
3. Schools? (EHS, ESD, PLN)				X
4. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads? (EHS, ESD, PLN)				X
5. Other governmental services? (EHS, ESD, PLN)				X

**Discussion- All Items:**

The proposed project will not change residential land use designations within the Land Use Element of the Placer County General Plan and / or Community Plans and, therefore, would not in and of itself cause an increase in demand for public services. No specific development projects are proposed, therefore, the project is expected to result in any increase in population density that would generate the need to require additional infrastructure or other governmental services. Therefore, there is no impact to public services.

**XIV. RECREATION – Would the project result in:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? (PLN)				X
2. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? (PLN)				X

**Discussion- All Items:**

The proposed project does not involve any development activity. It will not change residential land use designations in the Land Use Element of the Placer County General Plan and, therefore, would not cause an increase in demand for recreational facilities. The project does not include facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. The policies of the current General Plan’s Recreational and Cultural Resources Element regarding park facilities remain in place. Therefore, there is no impact to recreation resulting from the General Plan update.

**XV. TRANSPORTATION & TRAFFIC – Would the project result in:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. An increase in traffic which may be substantial in relation to the existing and/or planned future year traffic load and capacity of the roadway system (i.e. result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? (ESD)				X
2. Exceeding, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County General Plan and/or Community Plan for roads affected by project traffic? (ESD)				X
3. Increased impacts to vehicle safety due to roadway design features (i.e. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (ESD)				X
4. Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses? (ESD)				X
5. Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site? (ESD, PLN)				X
6. Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists? (ESD)				X
7. Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (i.e. bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? (ESD)				X
8. Change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? (ESD)				X

**Discussion- All Items:**

The proposed project will not directly result in any new construction and as such, will not directly result in the generation of vehicle trips. It will not directly affect transportation facilities or traffic conditions and does not alter any existing

standards or requirements related to transportation and traffic. A new goal and associated policy in the Transportation and Circulation Element calls for integrating Complete Streets infrastructure and design features into street design and construction to create safe and inviting environments for all users. Adoption of the Complete Street guidelines is not expected to impact population growth or capacity. Vehicular traffic congestion would not be impacted because the project does not involve any zone changes or changes to existing land use designations that would increase population or employment densities. Adopted policies, plans and programs that support alternative modes of transportation remain in place. The Circulation Diagram has been updated. There are no impacts to transportation or increases in traffic resulting from the General Plan update.

**XVI. UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (ESD)				X
2. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater delivery, collection or treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (EHS, ESD)				X
3. Require or result in the construction of new on-site sewage systems? (EHS)				X
4. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (ESD)				X
5. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (EHS)				X
6. Require sewer service that may not be available by the area's waste water treatment provider? (EHS, ESD)				X
7. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs in compliance with all applicable laws? (EHS)				X

**Discussion- All Items:**

The proposed project does not involve any development activity and is not expected to result in an increase in the potential for new construction or a redirection of population growth. It does not propose development that would directly affect utilities and service systems. The update does not change the planned locations of future growth or the overall level of future growth and demand for services. Future development would be evaluated at the time of application submittal and will continue to be subject to health and safety regulations including water, wastewater, storm water drainage and solid waste disposal. Therefore, there is no impact to utilities and service systems.

**XVII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant and/or cumulative impact on the environment? (PLN AQ)				X
2. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? (PLN AQ)				X

**Discussion- Items:**

The proposed project does not grant entitlements for any projects. Since no development is called for, the specific effects to greenhouse gas emissions would be speculative at this time. Future development shall comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulation related to greenhouse gas emissions. Site-specific projects will be required to submit environmental documentation, including an evaluation of greenhouse emissions, with a planning application. There is no impact to greenhouse gas emissions.

**E. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:**

Environmental Issue	Yes	No
1. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially impact biological resources, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		<b>X</b>
2. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)		<b>X</b>
3. Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		<b>X</b>

**F. OTHER RESPONSIBLE AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES** whose approval is required:

<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Fish and Game	<input type="checkbox"/> Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Forestry	<input type="checkbox"/> National Marine Fisheries Service
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Health Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Toxic Substances	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Army Corp of Engineers
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
<input type="checkbox"/> California Integrated Waste Management Board	<input type="checkbox"/> _____
<input type="checkbox"/> California Regional Water Quality Control Board	<input type="checkbox"/> _____

**G. DETERMINATION –** The Environmental Review Committee finds that:

The proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

**H. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE** (Persons/Departments consulted):

Planning Services Division, Christopher Schmidt, Chairperson  
 Engineering and Surveying Division, Rebecca Taber  
 Facility Services, Environmental Engineering Division, Wastewater, Janelle Heinzler  
 Department of Public Works, Transportation Division, Andrew Gaber  
 Environmental Health Services, Laura Rath  
 Flood Control Districts, Andrew Darrow  
 Facility Services, Parks, Andy Fisher  
 Placer County Fire/CDF, Bob Eicholtz/Brad Albertazzi



Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date January 14, 2013  
 E.J. Ivaldi, Environmental Coordinator

**I. SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:**

The following public documents were utilized and site-specific studies prepared to evaluate in detail the effects or impacts associated with the project. This information is available for public review, Monday through Friday, 8 am to 5 pm, at the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, Environmental Coordination Services, 3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190, Auburn, CA 95603. For Tahoe projects, the document will also be available in our Tahoe Division Office, 775 North Lake Boulevard, Tahoe City, CA 96145.

<b>County Documents</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community Plan(s)
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environmental Review Ordinance
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Plan
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grading Ordinance
	<input type="checkbox"/> Land Development Manual
	<input type="checkbox"/> Land Division Ordinance
	<input type="checkbox"/> Stormwater Management Manual
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tree Ordinance
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2009 Housing Element