APPENDIX A.2

NOTICE OF PREPARATION

TO: State Clearinghouse
Responsible Agencies
Trustee Agencies
Interested Parties

SUBJECT: **Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report**

LEAD AGENCY: Placer County Planning Department
11414 "B" Avenue, Auburn, CA 95603
(530) 889-7470 (530) 889-7499 FAX

CONTACT: Lori Lawrence, Environmental Review Clerk

The Placer County Planning Department will be the Lead Agency and will prepare an Environmental Impact Report for the project identified below. We need to know the views of your agency as to the scope and content of the environmental information which is germane to your agency's statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project. Your agency will need to use the EIR prepared by our agency when considering your permit or other approval for the project.

The project description, vicinity map, project site plan and/or elevations, brief description of the probable environmental effects, project application, and Initial Study are contained in the attached materials.

Due to the time limits mandated by State law, your response must be sent at the earliest possible date but **not later than January 28, 2002.**

Please send your response to **Lori Lawrence, Placer County Planning Department** at the address indicated above. We request the name of a contact person for your agency.

Project Title: **Forest Ranch (EIAQ-3656)**

Project Applicant: **Forest Ranch Associates, c/o Don Ryan, et al**

Date: 12/20/01 Signature: Dean Prijmore

Title: Asst. Director of Planning

Reference: *California Code of Regulations, Title 14 (CEQA Guidelines) Sections 15082(a), 15103, 15375*

PLACER COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT
11414 "B" Avenue, Auburn, CA 95603
(916) 889-7470 FAX (916) 889-7499

RECEIVED
NOV 01 2001
PLANNING DEPT.

INITIAL PROJECT APPLICATION

Accepted by RE ---OFFICE USE ONLY--- File #'s EIAQ-3656
Current Zoning TPZ, RFBX160AC, Z.MAP# 21, 35B, 35A
Applicable General/Community Plan: FCP
G.P. Designation PUBLIC, R.R.
Geographical Area CENTRAL
Environmental Determination:
___ Categorically Exempt Exemption Section #_____
___ Negative Declaration
___ EIR Name of EIR _____ SCH #_____
Date Project Application Accepted as Complete _____
Date Filed 11/1/01
Hearing Body PC
Sphere of Influence NO
Tax Rate Area 011 002 012
Notes: Taxes ok (Senior citizen post-government) OVERFLIGHT NO

TO BE COMPLETED BY THE APPLICANT

1. Project Name (current and previous): **Forest Ranch**
2. Property Owner: **Don Ryan, et.al**

   Address: **1735 Crockett Lane, Hillsborough, CA 94010**

   Telephone Number **(650) 344-6123** Fax Number: **(650) 344-2047**
3. Applicant: **Forest Ranch Associates**
   Address: **1735 Crockett Lane, Hillsborough, CA 94010**
   E-Mail Address:

   City State Zip

   Telephone Number: **(650) 344-6123** Fax Number: **(650) 344-2047**
4. Size of Property (acreage or square footage): **2615±AC.**
5. Assessor's Parcel Number(s): **See attached list**
6. Project Location: **North and East of Foresthill**
   (Be specific: cross streets, distance and direction from nearest intersection, etc.)
7. What actions, approvals, or permits by Placer County does the proposed project require?
   - __X__ General Plan Amendment *
   - __X__ Rezoning
   - _____ Conditional Use Permit
   - _____ Minor Use Permit
   - _____ Variance
   - _____ Certificate of Compliance
   - _____ Extension of Time
   - _____ Other Explain:
   - _____ Major Subdivision (Tentative Map Approval)
   - _____ Minor Subdivision (Parcel Map Approval)
   - _____ Design Review
   - _____ Administrative Review Permit
   - _____ Project Undertaken by County
   - _____ Minor Boundary Adjustments
   - _____ Additional Building Site

   ***Amend the 1981 Foresthill General Plan**
8. Does the proposed project need approval by other governmental agencies?
   ____Yes __XX__ No. If so, which agencies?
9. Which agencies, utility companies provide the following services?
   IMPORTANT! - THIS INFORMATION MUST BE ACCURATE.
   Electricity: **P G & E** Natural Gas: **N/A**
   Fire Protection: **CDF & Foresthill Volunteer F.D.** Water: **Foresthill P.U.D.**

   Sewer: Telephone: **Foresthill Telephone Co.
   High School: **Placer Union High School District** Elementary School: **Foresthill Union Elementary S.D.**

   ****Current method of sewage disposal would be by on-site septic systems. With ultimate development, project will provide community treatment system.**

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

10. Describe the project in detail so that a person unfamiliar with the project would understand the purpose, size, phasing, duration, and construction activities associated with the project. In response to this question, please attach additional pages if necessary.

SEE ATTACHED PROJECT DESCRIPTION

11. Owner Authorization

I hereby authorize the above-listed applicant to make application for project approvals by Placer County, to act as my agent regarding the above-described project, and to receive all notices, correspondence, etc. from Placer County regarding this project.

Signature(s) of Owner(s) — Please Print

Forest Hill Associates — DON RYAN

If Boundary Line Adjustment, signature of both transferring and acquiring property owners are needed. Boundary Line Adjustments shall not be used to create new parcels.

Signature of Transferring Property Owner — Please Print

Signature of Acquiring Property Owner — Please Print

As owner, I will be acting as applicant: _____

NOTICE: This project may be subject to fees imposed by the Department of Fish and Game. (Fish and Game Code, Section 711.4 et. seq.; Public Resources Code, Section 10005) Unless a project is denied, no action which requires payment of fees shall be deemed final until such fees are paid (Section 21089(b) of the Public Resources Code).

NOTE: Pursuant to the policy of the Board of Supervisors, the Planning Department cannot accept applications on tax delinquent property. Applications submitted on properties which contain zoning violations may also be rejected by the County.

---OFFICE USE ONLY---

Date: Notes/Comments

RECEIVED
NOV 01 2001
PLANNING DEPT.

FOREST RANCH

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Forest Ranch project is a planned residential development on 2,615 acres located north and east of the Community of Foresthill. This area is proposed as a recreation and residential development. With adoption of the proposed General Plan amendment and rezoning requests, the Forest Ranch project would generally include the following features.

Residential Uses:	2213 residential units, of which approximately 1700 would be age restricted (55 years of age and older). Approximately 524 units of the 2213 units are currently accommodated under the existing Foresthill General Plan and Zoning Regulations. A mixture of housing options will be provided from town homes to rural residential parcels. Affordable housing units will be provided in accordance with County policy.
Recreational Uses:	An 18-hole golf course, clubhouse and other recreational facilities generally associated with a golf course/retirement community (eg. Restaurants, meeting rooms, swimming pool, driving range,etc.).
Office and Professional:	Approximately 5 acres will be set aside for office and professional uses.
Recreational Vehicle Park:	A 100-unit recreational vehicle park.
Equestrian Center:	An equestrian center to provide for the boarding of horses and a staging area for project's equestrian trail system.
Open Space:	Approximately 1,128 acres, 43% of the project site, will be maintained as open space areas to protect sensitive habitats and slopes and to provide project buffering.

Major infrastructure improvements including a wastewater treatment facility (built and operated to California State Water Resources Control Board Standards), water system and road improvements will be constructed by the project.

General Plan Amendment and Rezoning

In conjunction with the update of the Foresthill General Plan, the Forest Ranch property owner proposes land use and zoning designations to accommodate the Forest Ranch project. Rezoning action related to properties currently zoned TPZ would take place in 2003.

Proposed General Plan and zoning designations are shown on the attached exhibits.

7872-01
TLT/kk
10/23/01

(TPZ PARCELS)	ACREAGE
007-010-05	145.70
007-020-03	165.20
007-020-14 (POR.)	94.20
007-020-15	43.10
007-030-03	74.30
007-200-02	310.80
007-210-01	5.10
007-210-15	141.10
007-220-54	4.10
064-090-15	118.70
064-090-17	4.50
064-090-81	803.60
064-280-11	114.50
Sub-Total TPZ Acreage (APX)	**2024.90**

(NON-TPZ PARCELS)	
007-010-03	3.70
007-020-04	0.80
007-030-08	2.50
007-080-04	2.40
007-090-01	0.84
007-190-01	252.14
007-200-03	9.20
007-210-06	1.00
007-210-16	2.40
007-210-18	150.70
007-220-05	1.91
007-220-07	23.10
007-220-55	57.70
064-090-19	37.40
064-090-33	1.00
064-090-34	6.30
064-280-12	21.60
254-010-02	16.00
Sub-Total Non-TPZ Acreage (APX)	**590.69**

TOTAL ACREAGE	**2615.59**

7872-01
TLT/kk
10-31-01

PLACER COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

11414 B Avenue/Auburn, California 95603/Telephone (530) 889-7470/FAX (530) 889-7499
Web Page: http://www.placer.ca.gov/planning E-Mail: ljlawren@placer.ca.gov

INITIAL STUDY

In accordance with the policies of the Placer County Board of Supervisors regarding implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, this document, combined with the attached "Environmental Analysis" discussion form and supporting data, constitutes the Initial Study on the proposed project. This Initial Study provides the basis for the determination whether the project may have a significant effect on the environment. If it is determined that the project may have a significant effect on the environment, an Environmental Impact Report will be prepared which focuses on the areas of concern identified by this Initial Study.

I. BACKGROUND

Title of Project: **Forest Ranch** EIAQ #3656

II. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

A. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers.

B. "Less Than Significant Impact" applies where the project's impacts are negligible and do not require any mitigation to reduce impacts.

C. "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" 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 Section IV, EARLIER ANALYSES, may be cross-referenced).

D. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is 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, Section 15063(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 [Section 15063(c)(3)(D)]. Earlier analyses are discussed in Section IV at the end of the checklist.

G. References to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., 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.

H. This checklist has been adapted from the form in Appendix I of the State CEQA Guidelines, as amended effective September 19, 1994.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES *(see attachments for information sources)*	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
1. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the proposal:				
a. Conflict with general plan/community plan/specific plan designation(s) or zoning, or policies contained within such plans?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by responsible agencies with jurisdiction over the project?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Be incompatible with existing land uses in the vicinity?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Affect agricultural and timber resources or operations (e.g., impacts to soils or farmlands and timber harvest plans, or impacts from incompatible land uses)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e. Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?	☐	☒	☐	☐
f. Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
2. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the proposal				
a. Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?	☐	☒	☐	☐
3. GEOLOGIC PROBLEMS. Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:				
a. Unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Significant disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcovering of the soil?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Substantial change in topography or ground surface relief features?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. The destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e. Any significant increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f. Changes in deposition or erosion or changes in siltation which may modify the channel of a river, stream, or lake?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g. Exposure of people or property to geologic and geomorphological (i.e. avalanches) hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards?	☐	☐	☐	☒
4. WATER. Would the proposal result in:				
a. Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Discharge into surface waters or other alterations of surface water quality (e.g., temperature, dissolved oxygen, or turbidity)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES *(see attachments for information sources)*	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
d. Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e. Changes in currents, or the course of direction of water movements?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f. Change in the quantity of groundwater, either through direct additions of withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations, or through substantial loss of groundwater recharge capability?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g. Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater?	☐	☒	☐	☐
h. Impacts to groundwater quality?	☐	☐	☐	☒
i. Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies?	☐	☒	☐	☐
j. Impacts to 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
5. AIR QUALITY. Would the proposal:				
a. Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c. Have the potential to increase localized carbon monoxide levels at nearby intersections in exceedance of adopted standards?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d. Create objectionable odors?	☐	☐	☒	☐
6. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. Would the proposal result in:				
a. Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Hazards to safety from design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e. Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f. Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g. Rail, waterborne, or air traffic impacts?	☒	☐	☐	☐
7. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal result in impacts to:				
a. Endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats (including, but no limited to plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Locally occurring natural communities (e.g., oak woodlands, mixed conifer, annual grasslands, etc.)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE

TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

Retirement Community

From a transportation point of view, the Forest Ranch active retirement community compliments the bedroom community nature of the of the Foresthill community. Similarly situated active retirement communities in Arizona have shown that retirees have only a 10% likelihood of traveling outside of the local community on any given trip. Not surprisingly, very few of those trips are made during the commute periods. For example, less than 3% of trips are initiated during the peak morning commute hour of 7AM to 8AM.[1]

Further mitigating the effect of the few additional vehicles during the peak periods are the re-designation of 11 of the 524 existing zoned units to age restricted and the fact that the retirement community will generate significant direct local employment. Without the possibility of local employment, these Foresthill residents would have to commute off the hill for work. The net impact of the Forest Ranch project is to remove traffic from the Auburn Foresthill road during peak periods.

While there may be an increase in traffic on the Auburn Foresthill road during the off peak period, there are no known off peak constraints.

Roughly half of all trips made by residents of the Forest Ranch retirement community can be expected to have both origination and destination points within the project zone. There will be an increase in the number of vehicles in the town of Foresthill as the retirees use local services. To the extent that the retirement community stimulates secondary commercial opportunities, residents of Todd Valley will also be encouraged to use the facilities in Foresthill rather than shopping off the hill (further reducing the use of the main Auburn Foresthill artery).

Golf Course

The presence of local employment will provide local residents with an alternative to commuting to Auburn. To the extent that these opportunities are taken, traffic on the Auburn Foresthill Road will be reduced (especially during peak commute periods).

Most golf course patrons will be local residents. Those who travel from outside the area are expected to have no impact on peak hour conditions on the Auburn Foresthill road.

Recreation Vehicle Park

A minor increase in recreational vehicle traffic can be expected on both the Auburn Foresthill Road and in the town of Foresthill. This traffic will tend to be seasonal (June-August), the months in which the Auburn Foresthill road experiences less peak hour congestion.[2]

1. "A Study of Travel Behavior for Retirement Communities Origin-Destination Surveys Volume I – Final Report" US Department of Commerce National Technical Information Service.
2. Data collected on Auburn-Foresthill road between mid-July and mid-September 2000 shows less peak hour traffic during the summer months.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES *(see attachments for information sources)*	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
c. Significant ecological resources including: 1) Wetland areas including vernal pools; 2) Stream environment zones; 3) Critical deer winter ranges (winter and summer), migratory routes and fawning habitat; 4) Large areas of non-fragmented natural habitat, including but not limited to to Blue Oak Woodlands, Valley Foothill Riparian, vernal pool habitat; 5) Identifiable wildlife movement zones, including but not limited to, non-fragmented stream environment zones, avian and mammalian routes, and known concentration areas of waterfowl within the Pacific Flyway; 6) Important spawning areas for anadramous fish?	☐	☐	☐	☒
8. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal				
a. Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and state residents?	☐	☐	☐	☒
9. HAZARDS. Would the proposal involve				
a. A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to, oil, pesticides, chemicals, or radiation)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d. Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e. Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees.?	☐	☐	☐	☒
10. NOISE. Would the proposal result in				
a. Increases in existing noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Exposure of people to noise levels in excess of County standards?	☐	☐	☐	☒
11. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered government services, in any of the following areas:				
a. Fire Protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Sheriff Protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e. Other governmental services?	☐	☐	☐	☒

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES *(see attachments for information sources)*	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
12. UTLITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities?				
a. Power or natural gas?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Communication systems?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Sewer, septic systems, or wastewater treatment and disposal facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e. Storm water drainage?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f. Solid waste materials recovery or disposal?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g. Local or regional water supplies?	☐	☐	☐	☒
13. AESTHETICS: Would the proposal				
a. Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Create adverse light or glare effects?	☐	☐	☐	☒
14. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the proposal				
a. Disturb paleontological resources?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Disturb archaeological resources?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Affect historical resources?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e. Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
15. RECREATION: Would the proposal				
a. Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Affect existing recreational opportunities?	☐	☐	☐	☒
III. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
A. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, 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, reduce the number or restrict the range of rare or endangered plants or animals, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☐	☐	☒
B. 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.)	☐	☐	☐	☒

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES *(see attachments for information sources)*	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
C. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☐	☒

IV. EARLIER ANALYSIS

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one of more effect have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration [State CEQA guidelines Section 15063(c)(3)(D)]. In this case a discussion should identify the following on attached sheets.

A. **Earlier analyses used.** Identify earlier analyses and state where they are available for review.

B. **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.

C. **Mitigation measures.** For effects that are checked as "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigiation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

Authority: Public Resources Code Sections 21083 and 21087.

Reference: Public Resources Code Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21082.1, 21083, 31083.3, 21093, 21094, 21151; *Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino*, 202 Cal. App. 3d 296 (1988); *Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors*, 222 Cal. App. 3d 1337 (1990).

V. OTHER RESPONSIBLE AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED

☒ California Department of Fish and Game
☒ California Department of Transportation (e.g. Caltrans)
☒ California Regional Water Quality Control Board
☒ California Department of Forestry
☒ U.S. Army Corp of Engineers
☒ U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
☒ Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)
☐ California Department of Health Services
☐ California Integrated Waste Management Board
☐ Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
☒ Foresthill PUD, Foresthill Elementary School District, Placer High School District, U.S. Forest Service, U.S. BLM, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation Ca. Dept. of Parks & Rec., Ca. Office of Historic Preservation, U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, Ca. Division of Mines and Geology

VI. DETERMINATION (to be completed by the Lead Agency)

A. I find that the proposed project is categorically exempt (Class ____) from the provisions of CEQA. ☐

B. I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared. ☐

C. I find that although the proposed project **COULD** have a significant effect on the environment, there **WILL NOT** be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared. ☐

D. I find that the proposed project is within the scope of impacts addressed in an previously adopted Negative Declaration, and that only minor technical changes and/or additions are necessary to ensure its adequacy for the project. An **ADDENDUM TO THE PREVIOUSLY-ADOPTED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared. ☐

E. I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required (i.e. Project, Program, or Master EIR). ☒

F. I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect(s) on the environment, and at least one effect has not beeen adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards. Potentially significant impacts and mitigation measures that have been adequately addressed in an eariler document are described on attached sheets (see Section IV above). An ☐

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT will be prepared to address those effect(s) that remain outstanding (i.e. focused, subsequent, or supplemental EIR).

G. I find that the proposed project is within the scope of impacts addressed in a peviously certified EIR, and that some changes and/or additions are necessary, but none of the conditions requiring a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR exist. An **ADDENDUM TO THE PREVIOUSLY-CERTIFIED EIR** will be prepared. ☐

H. I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, all potentially signficant effects: 1) have been adequately analyzed in an earlier Community Plan EIR pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to an earlier Community Plan EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project. The earlier Community Plan EIR adeqately analyzes that proposed project, so no additional EIR will be prepared. A **SITE SPECIFIC IMPACT STATEMENT (SSIS)** will be prepared to address project specific issues (see CEQA Section 21083.3). ☐

I. I find that the proposed project is within the scope of impacts addressed in a previously-certified Program EIR, and that no new effects will occur nor new mitigation measures are required. Potentially significant impacts and mitigation measures that have been adequately addressed in an earlier document are described on attached sheets, including applicable mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project (see Section IV above.) **NO FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT** will be prepared [see CEQA Guidelines, Section 15168(c)(2)]. ☐

VII. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE (Persons/Departments Consulted):

Dean Prigmore, Planning Department

David Price, Department of Public Works

Roger Davies, Environmental Health Services

Ann Hobbs, Air Pollution Control District

Signature: Dean Prigmore

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON

12/20/01

Date

T:\CMD\CMDP\EIAQ\3656\IS

PLACER COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT
11414 "B" Avenue, Auburn, CA 95603
(916) 889-7470 or 1-800-488-4308

RECEIVED
NOV 01 2001
PLANNING DEPT.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Required maps: 20
Required applications: 20

Receipt No. 74120
Filing Fee: 855+630(NOP)

Pursuant to the policy of the Board of Supervisors, the Planning Department cannot accept applications on tax delinquent property or property with existing County Code violations.

SEE FILING INSTRUCTIONS ON LAST PAGE OF THIS APPLICATION FORM

(ALL) 1. Project Name (same as on IPA) **Forest Ranch**

PLNG 2. What is the general land use category for the project (for example, residential, commercial, agricultural, or industrial, etc.)? **Residential, Office and Professional, Recreation and Open Space**

PLNG 3. What is the number of units or gross floor area proposed? **2213 Units (524 of the units are currently provided by existing General Plan and zoning designations).**

DPW 4. Are there existing facilities on-site (buildings, wells, septic systems, parking, etc.)?
Yes__X__ No____ If yes, show on site plan and describe: 2 wells

DPW 5. Is adjacent property in common ownership? Yes____ No__X__ Acreage_____
Assessor's Parcel Numbers See Attached

PLNG 6. Describe previous land use(s) of site over the last 10 years: **Timber Production**

GEOLOGY & SOILS

NOTE: Detailed topographic mapping and preliminary grading plans may be required following review of the information presented below.

DPW 7. Have you observed any building or soil settlement, landslides, slumps, faults, steep areas, rock falls, mud flows, avalanches or other natural hazards on this property or in the nearby surrounding area? Yes__X__ No____ If yes, describe:____
Some areas have slopes in excess of 30%

DPW 8. How many cubic yards of material will be imported? **N/A at this time, anticipate no import at ultimate buildout.**
Exported? **N/A at this time. Anticipate no export at ultimate buildout** Describe material sources or disposal sites, transport methods and haul routes: N/A

DPW 9. What is the maximum proposed depth and slope of any excavation? N/A

DPW 10. Are retaining walls proposed? Yes____ No__X__. If yes, identify location, type, height, etc.:

DPW 11. Would there be any blasting during construction? Yes_____ No__X__ If yes, explain: None anticipated

DPW 12. How much of the area is to be disturbed by grading activities? **N/A at this time; at ultimate buildout 18-22% of the project area may be disturbed by grading activities.**

PLNG 13. DEH Would the project result in the direct or indirect discharge of sediment into any lakes or streams? Yes_____ No_X_ If yes, explain:_____

DPW 14. Are there any known natural economic resources such as sand, gravel, building stone, road base rock, or mineral deposits on the property? Yes__XX__ No_____ If yes, describe: **Immature timber not viable for re-harvesting for 20-30 years.**

DRAINAGE & HYDROLOGY

NOTE: **Preliminary drainage studies may be required following review of the information presented below.**

DPW 15. Is there a body of water (lake, pond, stream, canal, etc.) within or on the boundaries of the property? Yes__X__ No_____ If yes, name the body of water here and show location on site plan: **Nick Walsh Springs and associated streams.**

DEH 16. If answer to #15 is yes, would water be diverted from this water body? Yes____ No_XX_

DEH 17. If yes, does applicant have an appropriative or riparian water right? Yes_____ No____ **N/A**

DEH 18. Where is the nearest off-site body of water such as a waterway, river, stream, pond, lake, canal, irrigation ditch, or year-round drainage-way? Include name if applicable. **North Fork American River**

What percentage of the project site is presently covered by impervious surfaces?__0__ After development? **Approximately 6-10%**

DPW 19. Would any run-off of water from the project enter any off-site canal/stream? Yes__X__ **Indirectly** No_____ If answer is yes, identify: **Forks of American River**

DEH 20. Will there be discharge to surface water of waste waters other than storm water run-off? Yes_____ No__XX__ If yes, what materials will be present in the discharge? What contaminants will be contained in stormwater run-off? **N/A**

DPW 21. Would the project result in the physical alteration of a body of water? Yes_____ No_XX_

If so, how?_____ **N/A**

Will drainage from this project cause or exacerbate any downstream flooding condition? Yes_____ No_XX__ If yes, explain:

DPW 22. Are any of the areas of the property subject to flooding or inundation? Yes__XX__ No__
If yes, accurately identify the location of the 100-year floodplain on the site plan. **N/A, no residential areas.**

DPW 23. Would the project alter drainage channels or patterns? Yes_____ No__XX__ If yes,
DEH explain:_____

VEGETATION AND WILDLIFE

NOTE: **Detailed studies or exhibits such as tree surveys and wetland delineations may be required following review of the information presented below. Such studies or exhibits may also be included with submittal of this questionnaire. (See Filing Instructions #8 and #9 for further detail.)**

PLNG 24. Describe vegetation on the site, including variations throughout the property: **Predominate vegetative habitats include coniferous forest, chaparral and montane hardwood associations.**

PLNG 25. Estimate how many trees of 6-inches diameter or larger would be removed by the ultimate development of this project as proposed: **None with GPA and rezoning action. Number at ultimate development is unknown at this time.**

PLNG 26. Estimate the percentage of existing trees which would be removed by the project as proposed: **N/A at this time, with ultimate development of the Forest Ranch project 15-20% of the site's trees may be removed.**

PLNG 27. What wildlife species are typically found in the area during each of the seasons? **Deer, black bear, mountain lion and various other small mammals, reptiles and bird species.**

PLNG 28. Are rare or endangered species of plants or animals (as defined in Section 15380 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines) found in the project area? **The FDCP Background Report notes that the CNDDB identifies nine special-status plant species for which suitable habitat exists in the FDCP area. In addition, 27 listed or special-status species potentially occur in the FDCP area. It should be noted that the FDCP encompasses greater area, elevation range and habitat types than the Forest Ranch project site.**

PLNG 29. Are any Federally listed threatened or endangered plants, or candidates for listing, present on the project site as proposed? If uncertain, a list is available in the Planning Department: **The FDCP Background Report notes that 3 plant species and 3 animal species which are threatened or endangered may potentially occur in the project area. It should be noted that the FDCP encompasses greater area, elevation range and habitat types than the Forest Ranch project area.**

PLNG 30. Will the project as proposed displace any rare of endangered species (plants/animals)? **Unknown. See #28 above.**

PLNG 31. What changes to the existing animal communities' habitat and natural communities will the project cause as proposed? **residential, equestrian, recreation vehicle park, office professional and golf course development will displace some natural habitat areas**

PLNG 32. Is there any rare, natural community (as tracked by the California Department of Fish and Game Natural Diversity Data Base) present on the proposed project? **Unknown See # 28 above.**

PLNG 33. Do wetlands or stream environment zones occur on the property (i.e., riparian, marsh, vernal pools, etc.)? Yes__XX__ No_____

PLNG 34. If yes, will wetlands be impacted or affected by development of the property?
Yes_____ No__XX__

PLNG 35. Will a Corps of Engineers wetlands permit be required? Yes_____ No_____**Unknown at this time.**

PLNG 36. Is a letter from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers regarding the wetlands attached?
Yes_____ No__XX__

FIRE PROTECTION

DPW 37. How distant are the nearest fire protection facilities? ¼ **miles**
Describe: **CDF station.**

DPW 38. What is the nearest emergency source of water for fire protection purposes? N/A
Currently closest are **American River and Sugar Pine Reservoir. Project development will include pressurized fire hydrants and pond/lakes.**
Describe the source and location: **Pressurized hydrant system will be constructed with ultimate project development.**

DPW 39. What additional fire hazard and fire protection service needs would the project create? **With ultimate development, additional structural fire protection services will be required.**
What facilities are proposed with this project? **To be determined with future project proposal.**
For single access projects, what is the distance from the project to the nearest through road? **N/A**

Are there off-site access limitations that might limit fire truck accessibility, i.e. steep grades, poor road alignment or surfacing, substandard bridges, etc.? Yes____ No__XX__
If yes, describe: **Ultimate project access will be developed pursuant to County and CDF Requirements.**

NOISE

NOTE: **Project sites near a major source of noise, and projects which will result in increased noise, may require a detailed noise study prior to environmental determination.**

DEH 40. Is the project near a major source of noise? __No__ If so, name the source(s):
_____

DEH 41. What noise would result from this project - both during and after construction?
No noise associated with GPA and rezoning actions. During and after ultimate project construction, noise will result from construction equipment, vehicles and power equipment. After project construction, normal noise associated with residential uses.

AIR QUALITY

NOTE: **Specific air quality studies may be required by the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (APCD). It is suggested that applicants with residential projects containing 20 or more units, industrial, or commercial projects contact the APCD before proceeding.**

APCD 42. Are there any sources of air pollution within the vicinity of the project? If so, name the source(s):__No__

APCD 43. What are the type and quantity of vehicle and stationary source (e.g. woodstove emissions, etc.) air pollutants which would be created by this project at full buildout? Include short-term (construction) impacts: **With ultimate development, air quality may be impacted by vehicles, use of wood stoves and small gasoline engines.**

AIR QUALITY (Continued)

APCD 44. Are there any sensitive receptors of air pollution located within one quarter mile of the project (e.g. schools, hospitals, etc.)? Yes Will the project generate any toxic/hazardous emissions? No

APCD45. What specific mobile/stationary source mitigation measures, if any, are proposed to reduce the air quality impact(s) of the project? Quantify any emission reductions and corresponding beneficial air quality impacts on a local/regional scale. **Potential mitigation measures for future development may include use of EPA-certified inserts, low-VOC coatings, exterior electrical outlets and other measures as may be agreed to with APCD.**

APCD46. Will there be any land clearing of vegetation for this project? Yes How will the vegetation be disposed? **Chipping, transport to landfill, burning subject to APCD permit.**

WATER

NOTE: **Based upon the type and complexity of the project, a detailed study of domestic water system capacity and/or groundwater impacts may be necessary).**

DPW 47. For what purpose is water presently used onsite? **None**
What and where is the existing source? **N/A**
Is it treated water intended for domestic use? **N/A**
What water sources will be used for this project?
Domestic: **Foresthill PUD** Irrigation: **Foresthill PUD, developed lakes, ponds & well water, underground disposal of treated wastewater.**
Fire Protection: **Foresthill PUD** Other:
What is the projected peak water usage of the project? **See below.** Is the project within a public domestic water system district or service area? **Yes, a portion**
If yes, will the public water supplier serve this project? **Yes**
What is the proposed source of domestic water? **Foresthill PUD**
What is the projected peak water usage of the project? **1.04 mgpd (0.906 mgpd over existing zoning designation).**

DEH 48. Are there any wells on the site? Yes If so, describe depth, yield, contaminants, etc.: **2 wells, each APX 250' deep, yielding approximately 15 gpm each.**

Show proposed well sites on the plan accompanying this application.

AESTHETICS

NOTE: **If the project has potential to visually impact an area's scenic quality, elevation drawings, photos or other depictions of the proposed project may be required.**

PLNG49. Is the proposed project consistent/compatible with adjacent land uses and densities? **Yes**

PLNG50. Is the proposed project consistent/compatible with adjacent architectural styles? **Yes, portions of the project will be subject to Design Review approval.**

PLNG51. Would aesthetic features of the project (such as architecture, height, color, etc.) be subject to review? Yes By whom? **Variously by Placer County and the Homeowners Association.**

PLNG52. Describe signs and lighting associated with the project: **No signage or lighting proposed at this time.**

PLNG53. Is landscaping proposed? Yes If so, describe and indicate types and location of plants on a plan. **Not applicable at this time period. Landscaping will be proposed with ultimate project development.**

ARCHAEOLOGY/HISTORY

NOTE: **If the project site is on or near an historical or archaeological site, specific technical studies may be required for environmental determination.**

PLNG54. What is the nearest historic site, state historic monument, national register district, or archaeological site? **Downtown Foresthill**

PLNG55. How far away is it? **¼ mile**

PLNG56. Are there any historical, archaeological or culturally significant features on the site (i.e. old foundations, structures, Native American habitation sites, etc.)? **None known.**

SEWAGE

NOTE: **Based upon the type and complexity of the project, a detailed analysis of sewage treatment and disposal alternatives may be necessary to make an environmental determination.**

DEH 57. How is sewage presently disposed of at the site? **N/A**

DEH 58. How much wastewater is presently produced daily? **N/A**

DEH 59. What is the proposed method of sewage disposal? **N/A at this time, with ultimate development sewage disposal will be by a community waste water treatment facility.**

Is there a plan to protect groundwater from wastewater discharges?
Yes XX No If yes, attach a draft of this plan. **Wastewater treatment facility will operate pursuant to Placer County and State Water Resources Control board standards.**

DEH 60. How much wastewater would be produced daily? **440,000 GPD (increase of 306,00 GPD over existing zoning designation)**

DEH 61. List all unusual wastewater characteristics of the project, if any. What special treatment processes are necessary for these unusual wastes? **None**

Will pre-treatment of wastewater be necessary? Yes No XX If yes, attach a description of pre-treatment processes and monitoring system.

DEH 62. Is the groundwater level during the wettest time of the year less than 8 feet below the surface of the ground within the project area? **No**

DEH 63. Is this project located within a sewer district? **No**

If so, which district? **N/A** Can the district serve this project?

DEH 64. Is there sewer in the area? **No**

DEH 65. What is the distance to the nearest sewer line? **N/A**

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Hazardous materials are defined as any material that, because of its quantity, concentration, or physical or chemical characteristics, poses a significant present or potential hazard to human health and safety or to the environment if released into the workplace or the environment. "Hazardous materials" include, but are not limited to, hazardous substances, hazardous waste, and any material which a handler or the administering agency has a reasonable basis for believing that it would be injurious to the health and safety of persons or harmful to the environment if released into the workplace or the environment (including oils, lubricants, and fuels).

DEH 66. Will the proposed project involve the handling, storage or transportation of hazardous materials? Yes_____ No__**XX**__

DEH 67. If yes, will it involve the handling, storage, or transportation at any one time of more than 55 gallons, 500 pounds, or 200 cubic feet (at standard temperature and pressure) of a product or formulation containing hazardous materials? Yes_____ No__**XX**__

DEH 68. If you answered yes to question #65, do you store any of these materials in underground storage tanks? Yes____ No__**XX**__ If yes, please contact the Environmental Health Division at (916) 889-7335 for an explanation of additional requirements. **Ultimate operation of the golf course may involve the use and storage of hazardous materials (i.e. gasoline, pesticides etc.). Any such storage and use will be subject to approval by appropriate local and state agencies.**

SOLID WASTE

DEH 69. What types of solid waste will be produced? **Presumably residential refuse.** How much? **APX 20,000 lbs./day.** How will it be disposed of? **Transport by franchisee to regional landfill site.**

PARKS/RECREATION

PLNG 70. How close is the project to the nearest public park or recreation area? **¼ mile** Name the area **Foresthill Park**

SOCIAL IMPACT

PLNG 71. How many new residents will the project generate?__**4400 (3060 new residents over existing zoning designation.)**__

PLNG 72. Will the project displace or require relocation of any residential units?__**No**__

PLNG 73. What changes in character of the neighborhood (surrounding uses such as pastures, farmland, residential) would the project cause? __**Additional residential, equestrian and recreation/golf course uses.**__

PLNG 74. Would the project create/destroy job opportunities?__**Create**__

PLNG 75. Will the proposed development displace any currently productive use?_____**No**__

TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

Note: **Detailed Traffic Studies prepared by a qualified consultant may be required following review of the information presented below.**

DPW 76. Does the proposed project front on a County road or State Highway? Yes__XX__ No_____ If yes, what is the name of the road? **Foresthill Road**

DPW 77. If no, what is the distance to the nearest County road?_____**N/A**_____
Name of road?_____

DPW 78. Would any non-auto traffic result from the project (trucks, trains, etc.)? Yes__XX__ No____ If yes, describe type and volume **With ultimate project development, small delivery and service vehicles.**

DPW 79. What road standards are proposed within the development? **Placer County standard road improvements.**
Show typical street section(s) on the site plan.

DPW 80. Will new entrances onto County roads be constructed? Yes__XX__ No_____
If yes, show location on the site plan.

DPW 81. Describe any proposed improvements to County roads and/or State Highways: **Subject to Placer County standards.**

DPW 82. How much additional traffic is the project expected to generate? (Indicate average daily traffic (ADT), peak hour volumes, identify peak hours. Use Institute of Transportation Engineers' (ITE) trip generation rates where project specific data is unavailable): **Please refer to attached supplemental response.**

DPW 83. Would any form of transit be used for traffic to/from the project site? **No**

DPW 84. What are the expected peak hours of traffic to be caused by the development (i.e., Churches: Sundays, 8:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.; Offices: Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m., and 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.)? **Combined peak hour 11A.M.-12 noon, secondary combined peak hour 10 A.M.-11A.M.. Westbound peak 11 A.M.-12 noon, eastbound peak 3:30-4:30 P.M.**

DPW 85. Will project traffic affect an existing traffic signal, major street intersection, or freeway interchange? Yes__X__ No____. If yes, explain **Highway 80 interchange – insignificant as impacts occur during off-peak hours.**

DPW 86. What bikeway, pedestrian, equestrian, or transit facilities are proposed with the project? **N/A at this time, such facilities will be included with the actual project proposal, subject to County policies and approvals.**

Name and title (if any) of person completing this Questionnaire:

Signature: _____ Date: 11/01/01

Title: GK1 CONSULTING ENGINEERS Telephone: (916) 723-0210

FOREST RANCH (EIAQ-3656)
PROBABLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Planning Department
The Project Description should include the same tables of land use designations and zone districts and the calculation of the number of dwelling units, acres and the percentage of the overall project in each [as is shown on the two exhibit maps included with the Initial Project Application (IPA) and the Environmental Impact Assessment Questionnaire (EIAQ)].

LAND USE AND PLANNING

Planning Department
The GPA and REA proposals would conflict with the current Foresthill General Plan (1981) as well as all of the preferred alternative (and all other Plan alternatives) that have been recommended by the FDCP Team. The majority of the property in question is designated for "Forestry" uses and is zoned Timberland Production (TPZ). While the California Board of Forestry and the Placer County Board of Supervisors have approved a Rezoning application that would re-designate the property from TPZ to Forestry (160-acre minimum lot size), that change does not become effective until 2003. At that time, the designated use of most of the land in question will remain "Forestry" rather than the residential, recreational and commercial land uses proposed by the applicants.

The Placer County General Plan (PCGP), the existing Foresthill General Plan (FGP), and the Foresthill Divide Community Plan (FDCP) [in progress] all contain goals and policies that favor the preservation of high capability soils for timber production as an important County resource. In addition, removal of more than 2,000 contiguous acres of high quality timber production lands from the inventory and in relatively close proximity to lumber processing facilities and areas where substantial construction and development is occurring increases the cost of building materials to the end user and reduces the availability of suitable lands for future timber production. Conversion of the property in question to residential/recreational uses will cause potential incompatibilities with adjacent timber-producing lands. While that portion of the property that is already zoned for residential use (±550 acres) meets many of the goals and policies of the FGP and the proposed FDCP (*i.e.* proximity to the historic downtown area of Foresthill, location on the north and east sides of the existing community, relatively gentle topography, etc.), the expansion of such uses to the rest of the property deviates from the stated objectives of both the FGP and the proposed FDCP.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

Planning Department
The GPA and REA proposals will cumulative exceed official regional and local population projections. The Foresthill Divide has a historically slow growth rate (less than 2% for the past ten years). Approval of the project proposals has the potential to accelerate the pace of development beyond the capability of the community to adapt. The area in question is undeveloped (with the exception of several logging operations within the recent past). A project (or projects) that would likely result from approval of the GPA and REA would induce substantial growth into an area not previously designated for it.

GEOLOGIC PROBLEMS

Planning Department
The development of a residential/recreational project as envisioned by the applicants' proposals would very likely result in significant grading and landform disturbance. Soils in this area are highly erodable and are unstable on steep slopes. The potential exists for substantial alteration of indigenous landforms (including unique physical features) as a result of the development of the property in accordance with the GPA and REA proposals..

Department of Public Works
The project as proposed would disturb areas which have previously been undisturbed or which may have been logged in the past. There is a reasonable potential for unstable earth conditions to be created without appropriate mitigation being applied. It is unknown at this time if any unique geological or physical features may be impacted by this proposed project. In addition, the project would create structures where none currently exist creating new opportunities for people to be exposed to geologic hazards such as exist in the Sierra foothills, which is located in Seismic Zone III. These are potentially significant impacts.

The applicant estimates that upon buildout grading activities would have disturbed 18-22% of the site. There is a potential to create significant erosion impacts through grading of the project site. There is potential for increases in impervious surfaces on the site to increase the amount of runoff entering the American River. These are potentially significant impacts.

WATER

Planning Department
The development of the land in question pursuant to the proposals of the Forest Ranch proponents could result in changes in the absorption rates, runoff patterns and the amount of surface runoff. As a consequence of these potential changes, discharge into surface water could occur that would alter the ambient water quality. Any adverse effects to ambient the water quality could have a commensurate adverse effect on

downstream bodies of water (North Fork American River, Lake Clementine, Folsom Lake) that serve as both public water supplies and habitat for fish and other wildlife.

Department of Public Works
This project will create impervious surfaces including roads, driveways, buildings, parking and circulation areas. It is reasonable to expect these hard surfaces may lead to increases in the rate and amount of runoff from the site. The location of the site in relation to natural streams, including the North Fork of the American River creates concern that additional runoff could lead to adverse water quality impacts. This could be exacerbated by the disturbance of the site during construction. It is not known what impacts additional impervious surface could have on flood plains both on and off-site. These are all potentially significant impacts.

This project will include grading and roadway construction which could conceivably impact streams on-site. This is a potentially significant impact.

Environmental Health
The use of golf course turf management chemicals have the potential to impact or alter surface water quality.

Use of groundwater for irrigation has the potential to reduce the quantity of available groundwater.

Septic systems and turf management chemicals have the potential to adversely impact groundwater quality.

AIR QUALITY

Air Pollution Control District
The proposed project could result in air pollutant emissions. The air quality concerns includes emissions form the development of this project and the impacts to localized and regional air quality.

TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

Planning Department
Any development resulting from the approval of the applicant's requested GPA and REA applications would result in significant increases in vehicular traffic on local roadways (especially the Foresthill Road). If developed in the widely dispersed design included with the GPA and REA applications, emergency access to the most remote portions of the project would be potentially inadequate.

Department of Public Works
There is a potential for this project to contribute to significant increases in traffic and congestion. All points of access as well as major intersections along these links may be impacted along with Foresthill Road between the Community of Foresthill and Auburn.

Depending on the design of the on-site roadway system, there may be significant circulation impacts. These are potentially significant impacts.

The project proposes roads on-site, but no detail has been provided regarding their design. There is the potential for hazards to be significant if the project does not maintain consistency with the Placer County Land Development Manual. This is a potentially significant impact.

This project would be located in a forested area subject to wildfire risks, potentially requiring secondary accesses. It is not clear from the information submitted that the proposed project would incorporate sufficient emergency access. Access to adjacent uses may also be impacted. This is a potentially significant impact.

The project as proposed may require additional parking on-site or off. There is a potential for significant parking impacts.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Planning Department

Biological studies produced during the FDCP process has demonstrated the potential existence of threatened or rare species or their habitats in the immediate area of the proposed development. The effects of the project could be considerable. This also applies to locally occurring natural communities such as oak woodlands, mixed conifer forests, annual grasslands, wetlands and riparian areas. The likelihood of critical deer winter ranges and migratory routes existing on the project site is very high. Large areas of non-fragmented, high quality wildlife habitat would be destroyed (or substantially reduced in habitat value), and the resident wildlife populations could be displaced as a consequence of the proposed development.

ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES

Planning Department

The GPA and REA proposals would potentially conflict with energy conservation plans by extending the commute distances for residents of the project rather than concentrating the population nearer to services and allowing for viable alternative transportation modes. The building materials (primarily wood products and oil derivatives) could be more effectively utilized in a development project that was more compact and that had more multiple family dwelling units. The property has had mineral extraction operations in the past (gold, aggregates, etc.) It is unclear how the proposed new land uses would affect the future potential for continued recovery of these resources.

HAZARDS

Planning Department
The proposed golf course could utilize pesticides and herbicides in large amounts. Anytime large concentrations of such compounds are stored, handles and use, a potential exists for these substances to come into contact with people, animals and surface bodies of water. The remote nature of the project may result in difficulty for the emergency response agencies to react to any potential releases of these hazardous substances. An increase risk of wildland fires would be created by the development of a project such as the one proposed in the forest/grassland environment on the property in question.

Environmental Health
Chemicals stored or handled at the project site such as fuel and turf management chemicals pose a hazard from an accidental release. Future residents could be potentially exposed to physical and chemical hazards from abandoned mines.

NOISE

Environmental Health
Increases in area traffic from this project have the potential to significantly increase both on-site and off-site traffic noise.

PUBLIC SERVICES

Planning Department
Virtually all public services could be substantially affected by a project of the size, scale and location proposed for Forest Ranch. The relative remoteness of the project exacerbates the normal problems experienced by fire and public protection agencies in responding in a timely manner. Schools would be impacted by both the number of new students produced by a project of the magnitude of Forest Ranch as well as the rate of growth of the student population. The additional traffic added by the project will increase roadway maintenance costs to the County (including snow removal costs), even if the internal roadway system serving the project is privately maintained. Health and human services provided by Placer County would increase in cost due to the remote nature of the project. Wastewater treatment will be a significant point of concern for a project of this scope in an area that has heretofore had no centralized wastewater treatment systems.

Department of Public Works
There is insufficient information to determine the impact in terms of maintenance of new roads or other public facilities. This could be potentially significant. This project may have impacts on existing facilities which would increase the public maintenance burden as well.

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Department of Public Works
This project will result in the need for additional storm drainage infrastructure. It is not clear at this time what impact this may have on the public or adjacent properties. This could be a potentially significant impact.

Environmental Health
This project has the potential to impact the treatment and distribution capabilities of the Foresthill Public Utility District.

The project has the potential to create the need for new creation of or expansion of a public managing entity to oversee the operation and maintenance of project sewage disposal systems.

The project may create cumulative impacts on the solid waste collection and disposal systems.

AESTHETICS

Planning Department
Development of a large residential/recreational project such as the Forest Ranch proposal in a forest environment will cause substantial negative aesthetic effects, both in terms of significant removal of the forest backdrop and in the introduction of excess light and glare in an otherwise "dark sky" situation.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Planning Department
The widespread disturbance of the natural landforms that is normally associated with a project of this size and scale, especially when such a project is located in an area that is well known for the occurrence of paleontological, archaeological and historical resources, is likely to result in a significant effect on these resources. Native American use of this area was substantial both before and after the arrival of Europeans. The likelihood of important cultural and/or religious sites within the boundaries of the Forest Ranch proposal is very high.

RECREATION

Planning Department
The demands for recreational facilities that a development of the size and scale of Forest Ranch would produce would adversely affect existing public recreation facilities on the Foresthill Divide (many of which are already overtaxed). The project may provide some additional recreational opportunities (golf, extended trails systems, etc.);

however, other existing recreational opportunities (bird watching, nature study, fishing, hunting, trail riding/hiking, etc.) may be adversely affected.

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Department of Public Works

The project as proposed has the potential to have significant adverse impacts on traffic and parking. It is reasonable to assume that the project could also contribute cumulatively to existing parking and traffic problems in the area (Foresthill). In addition, the increased runoff generated from the new coverage proposed by this project could contribute to potentially significant impacts to both water quality and water quantity in the American River.

Air Pollution Control District

The proposed project could result in short and long-term regional and local air quality impacts. The project is located in the portion of the Mountain Counties Air Basin of Placer County. The area is classified as non-attainment for the State Particulate Matter (PM10) standards and non-attainment for the federal and state ozone standards.

PLACER COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

11414 B Avenue/Auburn, California 95603/Telephone (530) 889-7470/FAX (530) 889-7499
Web Page: http://www.placer.ca.gov/planning E-Mail: ljlawren@placer.ca.gov

February 5, 2002

Don Ryan, et.al
Forest Ranch Associates
1735 Crockett Lane
Hillsborough, CA 94010

Subject: **Forest Ranch (EIAQ-3656), Notice of Preparation Comments**

Comments regarding the NOP are attached for your review and response in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Any additional comments that may be received will be forwarded to you by fax.

The first administrative draft EIR (10 copies) should be received by this office no later than **90 days from contract approval.** The submittal shall be accompanied by the current EIR review fee. If you require additional time in order to prepare the EIR, please do not hesitate to contact this office and request a suspension of the processing timeframes.

Sincerely,

Lori Lawrence

LORI LAWRENCE
Planning Technician/Environmental Coordinator

Attached comments:
Placer County Department of Public Works, 1/29/02
Placer County Air Pollution Control District, 1/28/02
Placer County Facility Services, Parks Division, 1/7/02
Placer County Sheriff, 1/15/02
United States Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, 1/28/02
United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, 1/25/02
State of California Native American Heritage Commission, 1/9/02
State of California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), 1/28/02
State of California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, 1/17/02
State of California Water Resources Control Board, 1/23/02
Foresthill Fire Department, 1/17/02
Foresthill Public Utility District, 1/18/02
Sierra Club, 1/25/02
Brent A. Backus, 1/21/02
Residents on Blackhawk Road and Black Oak Ridge, 1/26/02
Harry Shuger, 1/25/02
Beverly Anderson, 1/17/02
Foresthill Union School Dist, 2/25/02

cc: ERC members

MEMORANDUM

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

County of Placer

TO: LORI LAWRENCE, PLANNING DEPT. DATE: January 29, 2002

FROM: DAVID W. PRICE, DPW - LAND DEVELOPMENT

SUBJECT: EIAQ-3656, NOP: FOREST RANCH; FORESTHILL DIVIDE; (APN: SEVERAL - BOOK 007 AND 064)

The Department of Public Works (DPW) has reviewed the subject Notice of Preparation (NOP) and would like to offer the following comments. If not expressly stated in the comments below, it is intended that the EIR propose appropriate mitigations for all project impacts identified.

GEOLOGY & SOILS

1. The EIR should include a preliminary grading plan for the project which shows all proposed grading, cut/fill limits, slopes, road grades, retaining walls, etc. This plan should be of sufficient scale and detail to allow evaluation of environmental impacts. Earthwork quantities for various project components should be summarized in the document. Existing and proposed contours and/or spot elevations should be clearly identified. The preliminary grading plan should be prepared to an appropriate engineering scale so that an accurate environmental finding can be made. The plan should include:

a) a vicinity sketch (not at map scale) indicating the location of the site relative to the principal roads, lakes and watercourses in the area.
b) the complete site boundaries and locations of any easements and rights-of-way traversing and adjacent to the property, appropriately labeled and dimensioned.
c) the location of all existing and proposed roads, buildings, wells, pipelines, watercourses, septic systems or areas reserved for on-site sewage disposal, and other structures, facilities, and features of the site, and the location of all improvements on adjacent land within 50 feet of the proposed work.
d) location and nature of known or suspected soil or geologic hazard areas.
e) contour lines of the existing terrain and proposed approximate finished grade at intervals not greater than five feet, or spot elevations 25 feet on center showing all topographic features and drainage patterns throughout the area where proposed grading is to occur. The contour lines/spot elevations shall be extended to a minimum of 50 feet beyond the affected area, and further if needed to define intercepted drainage, and shall be extended a minimum of 100 feet outside of any future road rights of way.

f) approximate location of cut and fill lines and the limits of grading for all the proposed grading work, including borrow and stockpile areas. Include an estimate of the total quantity of earthwork.
g) location, width, direction of flow and approximate location of tops and toes of banks of any watercourses.
h) approximate boundaries of any areas with a history of flooding.
i) proposed provisions for storm drainage control and any existing or proposed flood control facilities or septic tank disposal fields or areas reserved for on-site sewage disposal in the vicinity of the grading.
j) a conceptual plan for erosion and sediment control including both temporary facilities and long term site stabilization features such as planting or seeding for the area affected by the proposed grading.
k) a conceptual plan for management of hazardous materials. The plan will include designation of an area to store and maintain equipment, and to store and dispose of hazardous materials. The Director of Public Works may waive this requirement for sites where equipment and hazardous materials will not be stored.
l) General location and character of vegetation covering the site.
m) parking lot layout/circulation area dimensions
n) existing improvements and improvements that are currently proposed to be constructed by this development. Show any future improvements as an additional phase of the project and clearly indicate this phasing.

2. The EIR should identify quantities, stockpile locations, haul routes, etc. for excavation and/or embankment soils between phases. The EIR should address off-site stockpiling, if proposed, as well as any off-site locations which would be the source of borrow material, or the destination for excess cut material.

3. Construction impacts associated with on- and off-site utilities, roads, etc. should be evaluated. Include analyses of new easements which would be necessary or existing easements which may be impacted by the project.

4. The EIR should discuss potential erosion risks. Discussion should address potential impacts to adjacent streams, wetlands and the American River watershed. The EIR should propose specific methods to minimize the project's impacts on water quality both during and after construction of the project.

5. New development is required to provide frontage improvements to County roadways per the Placer County Street Ordinance. The EIR should show the half-street improvements to Foresthill Road and Yankee Jim's Road on the preliminary grading plan to allow evaluation of the grading impacts resulting from said improvements. For Foresthill Road, the required frontage improvement is ½ of a 40'-wide road. The design speed shall be 55 mph with a TI of 10.0. For Yankee Jim's Road, the required frontage improvement is ½ o32f a 40'-wide road. The design speed shall be 35 mph with a TI of 6.5. The applicant would be required to dedicate or show that there exists ½ of an 84'-wide right-of-way on Foresthill Road and ½ of a 60'-wide right-of-way

on Yankee Jim's Road. All dedications and improvements in this condition are to be measured from centerline of the existing roadway, the plan line, or other alignment as approved by the DPW.

The applicant should be aware that improvement to County Roads passing through the development, where double frontage exists, will require full roadway improvements (i.e. half-street improvement on each frontage).

6. A preliminary geotechnical report should be provided with the EIR. The investigation report should contain all of the following, as they may be applicable to the subject site:

A. An index map showing the regional setting of the site;
B. A site map which shows the topographic features of the site and locations of all soil borings and test excavations;
C. A classification of the soil types (unified soil classification), pertinent laboratory test data and consequent evaluation regarding the nature, distribution, and strength of existing soils;
D. A description of the geology of the site and geology of the adjacent areas;
E. A suitably scaled map and cross sections showing all identified areas of land slippage;
F. A description of any encountered groundwater or excessive moisture conditions;
G. A description of the soil and geological investigative techniques employed;
H. A log for each soil boring and test excavation showing elevation at ground level and the depth of each soil or rock strata;
I. An evaluation of the stability of pertinent natural slopes and recommendations regarding maximum cut and fill slopes of proposed work;
J. An evaluation of settlement associated with the placement of any fill;
K. Recommendations for grading procedures and specifications, including methods for excavation and subsequent placement of fill;
L. Recommendations regarding surface and subsurface drainage and erosion control;
M. Recommendations for mitigation of geologic hazards (Ord. 5056-B (part), 2000);
N. Recommended erosion control measures applicable to the soil types present on site.

WATER

1. As part of the EIR, a drainage study should be prepared (conforming to the Stormwater Management Manual and Section 5 of the Placer County Land Development Manual) in order to analyze the drainage related impacts occurring from the proposed development. The study should address issues such as, but not necessarily limited to the following so that appropriate environmental findings can be made (with preliminary calculations where appropriate):

a) existing conditions;

b) description of the proposed improvements, both on and off-site and the effect of the improvements and mitigations to existing, downstream, drainage structures (Identify the length, size, slope, elevation and maximum capacity of proposed and existing inlets, outlets, pipes, culverts or other structures on-site or that this project drains to pre- versus the post-development project flow);
c) goals and all assumptions of the design, including a description of the hydrologic method used;
d) explanation of all special designs;
e) description of easements required;
f) drainage during construction;
g) description of any existing irrigation ditches/canals on the project site, and upstream or downstream of the site with any applicable "spill rights" that the canal(s) may have which would impact the design;
h) location and typical details of the method of discharge of collected storm water to avoid downstream impacts;
i) a shed map that depicts all watershed areas that drain into/through/from the subject parcel as well as on and off -site drainage locations of the storm water collection system improvements. Include tables indexed to the shed map indicating drainage areas in acres, soil and cover types, existing and/or future land use, pervious infiltration rates, impervious areas, flows for both the pre- and post-development conditions for both the 10 and 100-year storm event;
j) summary table of detention basin design data;
k) The 100-year floodplain limits of significant on-site drainage courses must be clearly identified and shown on a suitable exhibit.
l) The design of stream crossings and effects on the flow and floodplain in the stream(s) should be adequately described and impacts analyzed.

Also included should be hydraulic design of any channels that transport off-site drainage through the subject parcel as well as any surface flow facilities (such as concrete v-gutters or asphalt/PCC swales proposed within roadways or parking areas). Identify any impacts to adjacent property with the construction of said channels. Appropriate mitigations for all impacts should be identified.

2. The EIR should discuss the project's impacts relative to water quality degradation through sedimentation and urban runoff. To the greatest extent possible, the impacts and mitigation effectiveness should be quantified. The use of Best Management Practices (BMPs) for mitigating sedimentation impacts is a preferred approach, and the consultant should consider multi-functional facilities designed for both water quality and stormwater detention/retention. The EIR should also discuss the long- and short-term maintenance requirements of these facilities. Applicability of construction permits pursuant to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program administered by the State Regional Water Quality Control Board should be described.

3. The EIR should provide a wetlands analysis and identify impacts associated with grading activities, increased stormwater discharge, pond construction/outlet conditions, and general project development, as applicable.

4. Overland release points for the 100-year event should be shown on the watershed map or preliminary grading plan and identified as such. All associated grading and limits of required drainage easements shall be shown.

FIRE PROTECTION

1. The EIR should evaluate requirements of the servicing fire district and/or CDF and any impacts meeting these requirements may create. For example, maximum dead end road standards required by the Placer County Land Development Manual and PRC 4290 may require secondary accesses or alternative mitigations approved by the servicing fire district.

TRANSPORTATION / CIRCULATION

1. Provide an exhibit which clearly shows all proposed and required accesses (both primary and secondary). Include design standards for each roadway and associated intersections.

2. The EIR should include a comprehensive traffic impact analysis that includes the following:

- An existing conditions analysis. This analysis will provide the benchmark against which the impacts of the project can be measured vis-à-vis level of service, operating conditions and roadway conditions such as width, curvature, speed, sight distances, etc.

- A trip generation analysis. The analysis should include a comprehensive discussion and calculation of the trip generation potential of the proposed project.

- Evaluation of public transit needs. The demand and need for public transit should be evaluated given the large senior restricted population.

- A trip distribution analysis. The traffic analysis should develop an analysis of the trip distribution of the project trip generation.

- A traffic assignment and impact evaluation. Based on the trip generation, mode split and trip distribution analyses, the impact analysis should assign project generated trips to the available street system, both existing and proposed and provide an evaluation of the impact of the project traffic on level of service, traffic operations, and other roadway conditions.

The sphere of potential impacts of this proposed project is vast. All existing roadways that will experience an increase in traffic from the project must be included in the traffic analysis. This

includes Foresthill Road, Yankee Jims Road, Black Hawk Lane, California Street, Main Street, Gold Street, Race Track Road and potentially others. All on-site roadways and intersections should also be included.

The analysis should include evaluations of existing, existing plus project, cumulative and cumulative plus project conditions. If phasing of the project is proposed, analysis of potential impacts of each phase must also be evaluated. We would yield to the Planning Department regarding the Cumulative, no project base conditions with respect to the appropriate long range planning documents from which to derive this base.

PUBLIC SERVICES/UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

1. The EIR should evaluate roadway and storm drainage infrastructure requirements of the project. An evaluation of the ongoing maintenance requirements any such proposed or necessary improvements would create should be included as well. Appropriate mitigations for impacts identified in the EIR should be proposed.

2. Impacts to service providers (i.e. fire service, police/sheriff service, water service, transportation, sanitary sewer, solid waste) should be identified. Appropriate mitigations should be proposed.

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

1. The EIR should address cumulative impacts related to this project proposal. Given the status of the Foresthill Divide Community Plan update, the DPW will defer to the Planning Department with regard to the impacts which may or may not be considered cumulative. Appropriate mitigations should be proposed. Significant and unmitigable impacts should be identified as well.

cc: Tom Brinkman, DPW Transportation

PLACER COUNTY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT

11464 B Avenue, Auburn, CA 95603 ▫ (530) 889-7130 ▫ Fax (530) 889-7107

MEMORANDUM

TO: Lori Lawrence, Planning Department

FROM: Ann Hobbs, Air Quality Specialist\Planner

DATE: January 28, 2002

SUBJECT: Forest Ranch –(EIAQ-3656)
Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report

The Placer County Air Pollution Control District (District) has completed its review of the above referenced project. Buildout of this project will result in significant regional air quality impacts, including direct and indirect impacts to air quality in Placer County. As a result, a detailed air quality analysis using a reasonable worst case scenario should be provided in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR).

The Air Quality analysis needs to accurately estimate air pollutant emissions from all sources associated with this project and to identify feasible mitigation measures that can be evaluated in the DEIR. In addition to the Setting and Background sections, the DEIR should provide the following information so that the significance of project alone and cumulative impacts can be determined.

1. For infrastructure improvements, estimate the amount of dust emissions that could be generated based on the size and number of area(s) being disturbed. Estimate the types and quantities of emissions (in pounds per day) that could be expected from the diesel powered earth moving equipment working simultaneously on an average construction day. The Urbemis 7G model can be used to estimate construction equipment emissions.

2. Please identify how removed vegetation will be disposed. Opening burning of cleared vegetation should not be permitted. Mitigation measures should be proposed that eliminate the need for open burning.

3. Qualitatively discuss the project=s air quality impacts in relation to the new National Ambient Air Quality Standards for ozone and particulate matter (2.5 micron size particles). What effect would this project have on the District=s ability to meet these standards?

4. If the traffic study prepared for this project identifies any intersection(s) that would fall below a Levels of Service D under project alone or cumulative development scenarios, a detailed Caline 4 Carbon Monoxide analysis should be prepared.

5. Estimate the amount of Particulate, Carbon Monoxide and Nitrogen Oxide emissions that can be expected from residential woodburning devices (inc. fireplaces) and hot water heaters.

6. Identify all sources of air emissions that could result from implementation of the project. Using the Urbemis 7G computer model, estimate project emissions in pounds per day and compare the project=s emissions to the District=s significance thresholds. Emission estimates should be made based on the existing general plan and zoning designations for the property and for the proposed project. A comparison should be made that indicates the increase in regional emissions due to the proposed land use changes.

7. Identify both on-site and off-site mitigation measures that can be implemented to offset the short and long-term air quality impacts from this project. Also, discuss how the mitigation measures will be monitored to ensure that they are implemented.

8. Qualitatively and quantitatively (when possible) evaluate the effectiveness of the mitigation measures that are proposed to reduce air quality impacts.

9. If the DEIR determines that implementation of the project will result in growth inducing impacts, please discuss and quantify these impacts as they relate to air quality issues.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (916) 889-7137.

MEMORANDUM

DEPARTMENT OF FACILITY SERVICES

COUNTY OF PLACER

To: **LORI LAWRENCE/PLANNING** Date: **January 7, 2002**

From: **VANCE KIMBRELL**

Subject: **FOREST RANCH NOP(EIAQ 3656)**

The Parks Division has reviewed this submittal and has the following comments:

1. For a subdivision of this size, the project would need to provide a minimum of 29 acres of active recreation facilities. The only definition presented in this proposal is trails, a golf course, meeting rooms, and a swimming pool. Neither golf courses nor trails count against this acreage requirement, and meeting rooms may not count.
2. Does the applicant propose public or private facilities and where are those locations?
3. Use trail classifications as defined in the draft Placer County Trails Master Plan. Contact Parks Division at (530) 889-7750 for a copy.

The plan, as submitted, is inadequate for our review of recreation requirements.

VK:dh

CC: John Ramirez

T\F\V\FOREST RANCH NOP EIAQ (3656)

PLACER COUNTY
DATE
RECEIVED
JAN 09 2002
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

PLACER COUNTY
SHERIFF
CORONER-MARSHAL

EST. 1851

MAIN OFFICE
P.O. BOX 6990
AUBURN, CA 95604
PH: (530) 889-7800 FAX: (530) 889-7899

TAHOE SUBSTATION
DRAWER 1710
TAHOE CITY, CA 96145
PH: (530) 581-6300 FAX: (530) 581-6377

EDWARD N. BONNER
SHERIFF-CORONER-MARSHAL

STEPHEN L. D'ARCY
UNDERSHERIFF

LAW ENFORCEMENT IMPACT REPORT

Prepared by the Placer County Sheriff's Department
DANIEL D. HALL/FIELD OPERATIONS COMMANDER

I. NAME OF PROJECT: FOREST RANCH (EIAQ-3656)

II. LOCATION: North and East of Foresthill.

III. AGENICIES/FIRM REQUESTING REPORT:
Lori Lawrence
Placer County Planning Department
11414 B Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603

IV. COMMERCIAL:
A.
B.

RESIDENTIAL
A. 2,213 residential units x 2.5 = 5,533 residents
B.

V. BUDGET IMPACT:

A. Personnel (sworn)

1. At one (1) Deputy for every 1,000 residents
   5,533 residents = 16,599 Deputy hours for field operations per year
   (5,533 res. x 3.0)
2. Jail deputies = 6,695 hours per year
   (5,533 res. x 1.21)

Total sworn hours per year: 23, 294 @40.00 per hour = $931,760.00

B. Personnel (non-sworn)

1. Dispatch = 205 hours per year
2. Records = 72 hour per year
3. Clerical = 44 hour per year

Total support personnel hours per year: 321 @27.00 per hour = $8,667.00

C. Equipment
Vehicles, gasoline, maintenance, printing,
Weaponry, training, jail buildings = **$313,476.00**

VI. ANNUAL BUDGET INCREASE

Sworn Personnel	$931,760.00
Support Personnel	$ 8,667.00
Equipment, etc.	$313,476.00
TOTAL PER YEAR	**$1,253,903.00**

VII. SPECIAL PROBLEMS: none noted.

VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS: Many of the potential crime problems dealing with circulation systems and structures may be reduced by utilizing the concepts of "Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design" (CPTED). By working closely with law enforcement during all stages of this development, design features that encourage criminal activity can be identified and solutions found to mitigate problem designs.

IX. WILL/WILL NOT SERVE:
The Placer County Sheriff's Department's ability to handle law enforcement needs generated by this development are dependant on the Board of Supervisors authorizing funding equivalent to the needs mentioned in this report. Without the additional personnel, equipment, etc., appropriate service will be severely impaired.

EDWARD N. BONNER
SHERIFF/CORONER/MARSHAL

prepared by: A. Flaherty/Crime Prevention
Placer County Sheriff/South Placer Substation
652-2415 01-15-02

United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office
2800 Cottage Way, Room W-2605
Sacramento, California 95825-1846

IN REPLY REFER TO:
PPN 2901

PLACER COUNTY
DATE
RECEIVED
JAN 2 9 2002
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

January 28, 2002

Lori Lawrence
County of Placer
Planning Department
11414 B Avenue
Auburn, California 95603

Subject: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report; Forest Ranch, Forest Ranch Associates, Foresthill, Placer County, California

Dear Ms. Lawrence:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the proposed Forest Ranch project. The enclosures provided in this letter are intended to assist you in the early environmental review of this proposal. Future consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) may be required under the provisions of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act or the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (Act) if project activities are anticipated to affect federally listed endangered species or impact jurisdictional wetlands.

Enclosure A provides a list of sensitive species that may occur in or near the project site. The Service recommends that surveys be completed by a qualified biologist on the proposed project site to confirm the presence or absence of special-status species or their habitats. For information on whether this project may affect federally listed anadromous fishes, we recommend contacting the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS).

Direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts on federally listed species and species of concern to the Service should be evaluated. The existing conditions on the project site provide actual or potential habitat for many species of concern. Species of concern are provided no protection under the Act. However, one potential benefit of considering species of concern is that by exploring alternatives early in the planning process, it may be possible to provide long-term conservation benefits for these species and avoid future conflicts that could otherwise develop.

Enclosure B recommends general guidelines for identifying and mitigating project impacts to fish, wildlife, and their habitats. The Council on Environmental Quality developed regulations for implementing the National Environmental Policy Act, and defines mitigation to include: (1) avoiding the impact; (2) minimizing the impact; (3) rectifying the impact; (4) reducing or eliminating the impact over time; and (5) compensating for impacts. The Service supports and adopts this definition of mitigation and considers the specific elements to represent the desirable sequence of steps in the mitigation planning process. Accordingly, we maintain that the best way to mitigate for the adverse biological impacts is avoidance when at all possible.

GENERAL COMMENTS

The DEIR should identify and discuss all direct and indirect impacts to natural resources (i.e., wetlands, wildlife habitat, sensitive species) associated with construction, operation, and maintenance of the proposed Forest Ranch development. Further, a cumulative effects analysis should incorporate any related actions that would not be undertaken but for the proposed project. Such related actions include, but are not limited to:

- all necessary roadway improvements required for project implementation;
- installation of any water distribution system needed to service the facility; and
- adoption or installation of a wastewater treatment system.

The NOP does not discuss any proposed design alternatives. Consideration of alternative design proposals should be included in the DEIR. In a project of this magnitude there are innumerable potential options available to reduce the direct and indirect impacts to natural resources. Inclusion of a comprehensive array of design alternatives which reduce resource impacts would be greatly beneficial.

Cursory examination of the Service's National Wetland Inventory maps has identified wetland habitats on the proposed project site. We recommend a wetland delineation of the proposed project site be conducted by a qualified biologist or firm and submitted to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for verification. The DEIR should include a wetlands map and consider all direct and indirect impacts of the proposed project to wetlands located on or adjacent to the site.

We encourage you to use these comments and guidelines to develop a comprehensive environmental document that addresses these needs. The Service requests that a copy of the DEIR be provided to this office. If you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact Larry Butcher in the Watershed Planning Branch at (916) 414-6580. For questions concerning special status species issues, please contact Ann Bowers, Endangered Species Division at (916) 414-6600.

Sincerely,

Michael B. Hoover
Acting Field Supervisor

Enclosures

cc:
AES, Portland, OR

cc (w/o enclosures):
NMFS, Sacramento, CA
RM, CDFG, Region 2, Rancho Cordova, CA

Important Information
About Your Species List

How We Make Species Lists
We store information about endangered and threatened species lists by counties and by U.S. Geological Survey 7 1/2 minute quads. The United States is divided into these quads, which are about the size of San Francisco. If you requested your list by county or by quad name or number, that is what we used. Otherwise, we used the information you sent us to determine which counties and quads to use.

Animals
The animals on your species list are ones that occur within, or may be affected by projects within, the quads covered by the list. Fish and other aquatic species appear on your list if they are in the same watershed as your quad or if water use in your quad might affect them. Amphibians will be on the list for a quad or county if pesticides applied in that area may be carried to their habitat by air currents. Birds are shown regardless of whether they are resident or migratory. Relevant birds on a county list should be considered regardless of whether they appear on a quad list for that county.

Plants
Any plants on your list are ones that have actually been observed in the quad or quads covered by the list. We may have also given you either a county species list or a list of species in nearby quads. We recommend that you check for the plants on this additional list.

State-Listed Species
If a species has been listed as threatened or endangered by the State of California, but not by us nor by the National Marine Fisheries Service, it will appear on your list as a Species of Concern. However you should contact the California Department of Fish and Game for official information about these species. Call (916) 322-2493 or write Marketing Manager, California Department of Fish and Game, Natural Diversity Data Base, 1416 Ninth Street, Sacramento, California 95814.

Critical Habitat
When a species is listed as endangered or threatened, areas of habitat considered essential to its conservation may be designated as critical habitat. These areas may require special management considerations or protection. They provide needed space for growth and normal behavior; food, water, air, light, other nutritional or physiological requirements; cover or shelter; and sites for breeding, reproduction, rearing of offspring, germination or seed dispersal.

Although critical habitat may be designated on private or State lands, activities on these lands are not restricted unless there is Federal involvement in the activities or direct harm to listed wildlife. If any species has proposed or designated critical habitat within a quad, this will be noted on the species list. Maps and boundary descriptions of the critical habitat may be found in the Federal Register. The information is also reprinted in the Code of Federal Regulations (50 CFR 17.95).

Species of Concern
Your list may contain a section called Species of Concern. This term includes former category 2 candidate species and other plants and animals of concern to the Service and other Federal, State and private conservation agencies and organizations. Some of these species may become candidate species in the future.

Endangered and Threatened Species that May Occur in
or be Affected by Projects in the Selected Quads Listed Below
Reference File No. 1-1-02-SP-0610
Forest Ranch NOP
January 15, 2002

QUAD: 541C COLFAX

Listed Species

Birds

bald eagle, *Haliaeetus leucocephalus* (T)

Amphibians

California red-legged frog, *Rana aurora draytonii* (T)

Fish

delta smelt, *Hypomesus transpacificus* (T)

Central Valley steelhead, *Oncorhynchus mykiss* (T) NMFS

winter-run chinook salmon, *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha* (E) NMFS

Central Valley spring-run chinook salmon, *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha* (T) NMFS

Sacramento splittail, *Pogonichthys macrolepidotus* (T)

Invertebrates

valley elderberry longhorn beetle, *Desmocerus californicus dimorphus* (T)

Candidate Species

Fish

Central Valley fall/late fall-run chinook salmon, *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha* (C) NMFS

Species of Concern

Mammals

spotted bat, *Euderma maculatum* (SC)

greater western mastiff-bat, *Eumops perotis californicus* (SC)

Sierra Nevada snowshoe hare, *Lepus americanus tahoensis* (SC)

small-footed myotis bat, *Myotis ciliolabrum* (SC)

long-eared myotis bat, *Myotis evotis* (SC)

fringed myotis bat, *Myotis thysanodes* (SC)

long-legged myotis bat, *Myotis volans* (SC)

Yuma myotis bat, *Myotis yumanensis* (SC)

Birds

northern goshawk, *Accipiter gentilis* (SC)

tricolored blackbird, *Agelaius tricolor* (SC)

grasshopper sparrow, *Ammodramus savannarum* (SC)

short-eared owl, *Asio flammeus* (SC)

western burrowing owl, *Athene cunicularia hypugaea* (SC)

Lawrence's goldfinch, *Carduelis lawrencei* (SC)
Vaux's swift, *Chaetura vauxi* (SC)
black tern, *Chlidonias niger* (SC)
black swift, *Cypseloides niger* (SC)
hermit warbler, *Dendroica occidentalis* (SC)
little willow flycatcher, *Empidonax traillii brewsteri* (CA)
American peregrine falcon, *Falco peregrinus anatum* (D)
loggerhead shrike, *Lanius ludovicianus* (SC)
Lewis' woodpecker, *Melanerpes lewis* (SC)
long-billed curlew, *Numenius americanus* (SC)
bank swallow, *Riparia riparia* (CA)
rufous hummingbird, *Selasphorus rufus* (SC)
Brewer's sparrow, *Spizella breweri* (SC)
California spotted owl, *Strix occidentalis occidentalis* (SC)

Reptiles
northwestern pond turtle, *Clemmys marmorata marmorata* (SC)
California horned lizard, *Phrynosoma coronatum frontale* (SC)

Amphibians
foothill yellow-legged frog, *Rana boylii* (SC)
western spadefoot toad, *Scaphiopus hammondii* (SC)

Fish
green sturgeon, *Acipenser medirostris* (SC)
longfin smelt, *Spirinchus thaleichthys* (SC)

Invertebrates
Sagehen Creek goracean caddisfly, *Goeracea oregona* (SC)
Shirttail Creek stonefly, *Megaleuctra sierra* (SC)
spiny rhyacophilan caddisfly, *Rhyacophila spinata* (SC)

QUAD: 541D FORESTHILL

Listed Species

Birds
bald eagle, *Haliaeetus leucocephalus* (T)

Amphibians
California red-legged frog, *Rana aurora draytonii* (T)

Fish
delta smelt, *Hypomesus transpacificus* (T)
Central Valley steelhead, *Oncorhynchus mykiss* (T) NMFS
winter-run chinook salmon, *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha* (E) NMFS

Central Valley spring-run chinook salmon, *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha* (T) NMFS
Sacramento splittail, *Pogonichthys macrolepidotus* (T)

Invertebrates

valley elderberry longhorn beetle, *Desmocerus californicus dimorphus* (T)

Candidate Species

Fish

Central Valley fall/late fall-run chinook salmon, *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha* (C) NMFS

Species of Concern

Mammals

spotted bat, *Euderma maculatum* (SC)

greater western mastiff-bat, *Eumops perotis californicus* (SC)

Sierra Nevada snowshoe hare, *Lepus americanus tahoensis* (SC)

Pacific fisher, *Martes pennanti pacifica* (SC)

small-footed myotis bat, *Myotis ciliolabrum* (SC)

long-eared myotis bat, *Myotis evotis* (SC)

fringed myotis bat, *Myotis thysanodes* (SC)

long-legged myotis bat, *Myotis volans* (SC)

Yuma myotis bat, *Myotis yumanensis* (SC)

Birds

northern goshawk, *Accipiter gentilis* (SC)

tricolored blackbird, *Agelaius tricolor* (SC)

black tern, *Chlidonias niger* (SC)

black swift, *Cypseloides niger* (SC)

hermit warbler, *Dendroica occidentalis* (SC)

little willow flycatcher, *Empidonax traillii brewsteri* (CA)

American peregrine falcon, *Falco peregrinus anatum* (D)

loggerhead shrike, *Lanius ludovicianus* (SC)

Lewis' woodpecker, *Melanerpes lewis* (SC)

bank swallow, *Riparia riparia* (CA)

rufous hummingbird, *Selasphorus rufus* (SC)

Brewer's sparrow, *Spizella breweri* (SC)

California spotted owl, *Strix occidentalis occidentalis* (SC)

Reptiles

northwestern pond turtle, *Clemmys marmorata marmorata* (SC)

California horned lizard, *Phrynosoma coronatum frontale* (SC)

Amphibians

foothill yellow-legged frog, *Rana boylii* (SC)

western spadefoot toad, *Scaphiopus hammondii* (SC)

Fish

green sturgeon, *Acipenser medirostris* (SC)

longfin smelt, *Spirinchus thaleichthys* (SC)

Invertebrates

Sagehen Creek goracean caddisfly, *Goeracea oregona* (SC)

Shirttail Creek stonefly, *Megaleuctra sierra* (SC)

KEY:

(E)	*Endangered*	Listed (in the Federal Register) as being in danger of extinction.
(T)	*Threatened*	Listed as likely to become endangered within the foreseeable future.
(P)	*Proposed*	Officially proposed (in the Federal Register) for listing as endangered or threatened.
(PX)	*Proposed Critical Habitat*	Proposed as an area essential to the conservation of the species.
(C)	*Candidate*	Candidate to become a *proposed* species.
(SC)	*Species of Concern*	May be endangered or threatened. Not enough biological information has been gathered to support listing at this time.
(MB)	*Migratory Bird*	Migratory bird
NMFS	NMFS species	Under the jurisdiction of the National Marine Fisheries Service. Contact them directly.
(D)	*Delisted*	Delisted. Status to be monitored for 5 years.
(CA)	*State-Listed*	Listed as threatened or endangered by the State of California.
(*)	*Extirpated*	Possibly extirpated from this quad.
(**)	*Extinct*	Possibly extinct.
	Critical Habitat	Area essential to the conservation of a species.

Endangered and Threatened Species that May Occur in or be Affected by
Projects in the Area of the Following California Counties
Reference File No. 1-1-02-SP-0610
January 15, 2002

PLACER COUNTY

Listed Species

Birds

bald eagle, *Haliaeetus leucocephalus* (T)

Reptiles

giant garter snake, *Thamnophis gigas* (T)

Amphibians

California red-legged frog, *Rana aurora draytonii* (T)

Fish

Central Valley steelhead, *Oncorhynchus mykiss* (T) NMFS
Critical habitat, Central Valley steelhead, *Oncorhynchus mykiss* (T) NMFS
Central Valley spring-run chinook salmon, *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha* (T) NMFS
Critical Habitat, Central Valley spring-run chinook, *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha* (T) NMFS
delta smelt, *Hypomesus transpacificus* (T) *
Lahontan cutthroat trout, *Oncorhynchus (=Salmo) clarki henshawi* (T)
Sacramento splittail, *Pogonichthys macrolepidotus* (T)
winter-run chinook salmon, *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha* (E) NMFS

Invertebrates

valley elderberry longhorn beetle, *Desmocerus californicus dimorphus* (T)
vernal pool fairy shrimp, *Branchinecta lynchi* (T)
vernal pool tadpole shrimp, *Lepidurus packardi* (E)

Plants

Truckee barberry, *Berberis sonnei* (E)

Proposed Species

Birds

mountain plover, *Charadrius montanus* (PT)

Candidate Species

Birds

Western yellow-billed cuckoo, *Coccyzus americanus occidentalis* (C) *

Amphibians

California tiger salamander, *Ambystoma californiense* (C)

Plants

slender Moonwort (= narrowleaf grapefern), *Botrychium lineare* (C) *

Tahoe yellow-cress, *Rorippa subumbellata* (C)

Species of Concern

Mammals

California wolverine, *Gulo gulo luteus* (CA)
fringed myotis bat, *Myotis thysanodes* (SC)
greater western mastiff-bat, *Eumops perotis californicus* (SC)
long-eared myotis bat, *Myotis evotis* (SC)
long-legged myotis bat, *Myotis volans* (SC)
American (=pine) marten, *Martes americana* (SC)
pale Townsend's big-eared bat, *Corynorhinus (=Plecotus) townsendii pallescens* (SC)
Pacific fisher, *Martes pennanti pacifica* (SC)
Pacific western big-eared bat, *Corynorhinus (=Plecotus) townsendii townsendii* (SC)
spotted bat, *Euderma maculatum* (SC)
small-footed myotis bat, *Myotis ciliolabrum* (SC)
San Joaquin pocket mouse, *Perognathus inornatus* (SC)
Sierra Nevada red fox, *Vulpes vulpes necator* (CA)
Sierra Nevada snowshoe hare, *Lepus americanus tahoensis* (SC)
Yuma myotis bat, *Myotis yumanensis* (SC)

Birds

Aleutian Canada goose, *Branta canadensis leucopareia* (D)
American bittern, *Botaurus lentiginosus* (SC)
American peregrine falcon, *Falco peregrinus anatum* (D)
bank swallow, *Riparia riparia* (CA)
black swift, *Cypseloides niger* (SC)
Brewer's sparrow, *Spizella breweri* (SC)
California thrasher, *Toxostoma redivivum* (SC)
common loon, *Gavia immer* (SC)
California spotted owl, *Strix occidentalis occidentalis* (SC)
ferruginous hawk, *Buteo regalis* (SC)
grasshopper sparrow, *Ammodramus savannarum* (SC)
Harlequin duck, *Histrionicus histrionicus* (SC)
hermit warbler, *Dendroica occidentalis* (SC)
Lawrence's goldfinch, *Carduelis lawrencei* (SC)
long-billed curlew, *Numenius americanus* (SC)
Lewis' woodpecker, *Melanerpes lewis* (SC)
little willow flycatcher, *Empidonax traillii brewsteri* (CA)
northern goshawk, *Accipiter gentilis* (SC)
olive-sided flycatcher, *Contopus cooperi* (SC)
rufous hummingbird, *Selasphorus rufus* (SC)

short-eared owl, *Asio flammeus* (SC)
Swainson's hawk, *Buteo Swainsoni* (CA)
tricolored blackbird, *Agelaius tricolor* (SC)
Vaux's swift, *Chaetura vauxi* (SC)
western burrowing owl, *Athene cunicularia hypugaea* (SC)
white-faced ibis, *Plegadis chihi* (SC)

Reptiles

California horned lizard, *Phrynosoma coronatum frontale* (SC)
northwestern pond turtle, *Clemmys marmorata marmorata* (SC)
southwestern pond turtle, *Clemmys marmorata pallida* (SC)

Amphibians

foothill yellow-legged frog, *Rana boylii* (SC)
Mount Lyell salamander, *Hydromantes platycephalus* (SC)
mountain yellow-legged frog, *Rana muscosa* (SC)
western spadefoot toad, *Scaphiopus hammondii* (SC)

Fish

green sturgeon, *Acipenser medirostris* (SC)
Pacific lamprey, *Lampetra tridentata* (SC)
river lamprey, *Lampetra ayresi* (SC)

Invertebrates

California linderiella fairy shrimp, *Linderiella occidentalis* (SC)
Lake Tahoe benthic stonefly, *Capnia lacustra* (SC)
Sagehen Creek goracean caddisfly, *Goeracea oregona* (SC)
Shirttail Creek stonefly, *Megaleuctra sierra* (SC)
South Forks ground beetle, *Nebria darlingtoni* (SC)
spiny rhyacophilan caddisfly, *Rhyacophila spinata* (SC)

Plants

Carson Range rock-cress, *Arabis rigidissima var. demota* (SC)
Red Hills soaproot, *Chlorogalum grandiflorum* (SC)
hispid bird's-beak, *Cordylanthus mollis ssp. hispidus* (SC)
Donner Pass buckwheat, *Eriogonum umbellatum var. torreyanum* (SC)
Boggs Lake hedge-hyssop, *Gratiola heterosepala* (CA)
Plumas ivesia, *Ivesia sericoleuca* (SC)
Ahart's rush, *Juncus leiospermus var. ahartii* (SC)
legenere, *Legenere limosa* (SC)
long-petaled lewisia, *Lewisia longipetala* (SC)
saw-toothed lewisia, *Lewisia serrata* (SC)
Stebbins' phacelia, *Phacelia stebbinsii* (SC)

ENCLOSURE B

The goal of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is to conserve, protect and enhance fish, wildlife, and their habitats by timely and effective provision of fish and wildlife information and recommendations. To assist us in accomplishing this goal, we would like to see the items described below discussed in your environmental documents for the proposed project.

Project Description. The document should very clearly state the purposes of, and document the needs for, the proposed project so that the capabilities of the various alternatives to meet the purposes and needs can be readily determined.

A thorough description of all permanent and temporary facilities to be constructed and work to be done as a part of the project should be included. The document should identify any new access roads, equipment staging areas, and gravel processing facilities which are needed. Figures accurately depicting proposed project features in relation to natural features (such as streams, wetlands, riparian areas, and other habitat types) in the project area should be included.

Affected Environment. The document should show the location of, and describe, all vegetative cover types in the areas potentially affected by all project alternatives and associated activities. Tables with acreages of each cover type with and without the project for each alternative would also be appropriate. We recommend that all wetlands in the project area be delineated and described according to the classification system found in the Service's Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats of the United States (Cowardin 1979). The Service's National Wetland Inventory maps would be one starting point for this effort.

The document should present and analyze a full range of alternatives to the proposed project. At least one alternative should be designed to avoid all impacts to wetlands, including riparian areas. Similarly, within each alternative, measures to minimize or avoid impacts to wetlands should be included.

Lists of fish and wildlife species expected to occur in the project area should be in the document. The lists should also indicate for each species whether or not it is a resident or migrant, and the period(s) of the year it would be expected in the project area.

Environmental Consequences. The sections on impacts to fish and wildlife should discuss impacts from vegetation removal (both permanent and temporary), filling or degradation of wetlands, interruption of wildlife migration corridors, and disturbance from trucks and other machinery during construction and/or operation. These sections should also analyze possible impacts to streams from construction of outfall structures, pipeline crossings, and filling. Impacts on water quality, including nutrient loading, sedimentation, toxics, biological oxygen demand, and temperature in receiving waters should also be discussed in detail along with the resultant effects on fish and aquatic invertebrates. Discussion of indirect impacts to fish, wildlife, and their habitats, including impacts from growth induced by the proposed project, should also be addressed in the document. The impacts of each alternative should be discussed in sufficient detail to allow comparison between the alternatives.

The cumulative impacts of the project, when viewed in conjunction with other past, existing, and foreseeable projects, need to be addressed. Cumulative impacts to fish, wildlife, wetlands and other habitats, and water quality should be included.

Mitigation Planning. Under provisions of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, the Service advises the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers on projects involving dredge and fill activities in "waters of the United States", of which wetlands and some riparian habitats are subcategories. Since portions of this proposal may ultimately require a Corps permit, the Service will subsequently be involved under the Coordination Act. Therefore, if you have not done so already, we suggest that you or your representative consult the Corps regarding onsite wetlands and related habitats that may fall under their jurisdiction, and include this information in the draft document. When reviewing Corps public notices, the Service generally does not object to projects meeting the following criteria:

1. They are ecologically sound;

2. The least environmentally damaging reasonable alternative is selected;

3. Every reasonable effort is made to avoid or minimize damage or loss of fish and wildlife resources and uses;

4. All important recommended means and measures have been adopted, with guaranteed implementation to satisfactorily compensate for unavoidable damage or loss consistent with the appropriate mitigation goal; and

5. For wetlands and shallow water habitats, the proposed activity is clearly water dependent and there is a demonstrated public need.

The Service may recommend the "no project" alternative for those projects which do not meet all of the above criteria, and where there is likely to be a significant fish and wildlife resource loss.

When projects impacting waterways or wetlands are deemed acceptable to the Service, we recommend full mitigation for any impacts to fish and wildlife. The Council on Environmental Quality regulations for implementing the National Environmental Policy Act define mitigation to include: 1) Avoiding the impact; 2) minimizing the impact; 3) rectifying the impact; 4) reducing or eliminating the impact over time; and 5) compensating for impacts. The Service supports and adopts this definition of mitigation and considers the specific elements to represent the desirable sequence of steps in the mitigation planning process. Accordingly, we maintain that the best way to mitigate for adverse biological impacts is to avoid them altogether.

The document should describe all measures proposed to avoid, minimize, or compensate for impacts to fish and wildlife and their habitats. The measures should be presented in as much detail as possible to allow us to evaluate their probable effectiveness.

Because of their very high value to migratory birds, and their ever-increasing scarcity in California, our mitigation goal for wetlands (including riparian and riverine wetlands) is no net loss of in-kind habitat value or acreage (whichever is greater).

For unavoidable impacts, to determine the mitigation credits available for a given mitigation project, we evaluate what conditions would exist on the mitigation site in the future in the absence of the mitigation actions, and compare those conditions to the conditions we would expect to develop on the site with implementation of the mitigation plan.

Mitigation habitat should be equal to or exceed the quality of the habitat to be affected by the project. Baseline information would need to be gathered at the impact site to be able to quantify this goal in terms of plant species diversity, shrub and tree canopy cover, stems/acre, tree height, etc. The ultimate success of the project should be judged according to these same measurements at the mitigation site.

Criteria should be developed for assessing the progress of the project during its developmental stages as well. Assessment criteria should include rates of plant growth, plant health, and evidence of natural reproduction. Success criteria should be geared toward equaling or exceeding the quality of the highest quality habitat to be affected. In other words, the mitigation effort would be deemed a success in relation to this goal if the mitigation site met or exceeded habitat measurements at a "model" site (plant cover, density, species diversity, etc.).

The plan should present the proposed ground elevations at the mitigation site, along with elevations in the adjacent areas. A comparison of the soils of the proposed mitigation and adjacent areas should also be included in the plan, and a determination made as to the suitability of the soils to support habitats consistent with the mitigation goals.

Because wetland ecosystems are driven by suitable hydrological conditions, additional information must be developed on the predicted hydrology of the mitigation site. The plan should describe the depth of the water table, and the frequency, duration, areal extent, and depth of flooding which would occur on the site. The hydrologic information should include an analysis of extreme conditions (drought, flooding) as well as typical conditions.

The plan must include a timeframe for implementing the mitigation in relation to the proposed project. We recommend that mitigation be initiated prior to the onset of construction. If there will be a substantial time lag between project construction and completion of the mitigation, a net loss of habitat values would result, and more mitigation would be required to offset this loss.

Generally, monitoring of the mitigation site should occur annually for at least the first five years, biennially for years 6 through 11, and every five years thereafter until the mitigation has met all success criteria. Remediation efforts and additional monitoring should occur if success criteria are not met during the first five years. Some projects will require monitoring throughout the life of the project. Reports should be prepared after each monitoring session.

The plan should require the preparation of "as-built" plans. Such plans provide valuable information, especially if the mitigation effort fails. Similarly, a "time-zero" report should be mandated. This report would describe exactly what was done during the construction of the mitigation project, what problems were encountered, and what corrections or modifications to the plans were undertaken.

The plan should detail how the site is to be maintained during the mitigation establishment period, and how long the establishment period will be. It will also be important to note what entity will perform the maintenance activities, and what entity will ultimately own and manage the site. In addition, a mechanism to fund the maintenance and management of the site should be established and identified. A permanent easement should be placed on the property used for the mitigation that would preclude incompatible activities on the site in perpetuity.

Finally, in some cases, a performance bond may be required as part of the mitigation plan. The amount of the bond should be sufficient to cover the costs of designing and implementing an adequate mitigation plan (and purchasing land if needed) should the proposed plan not succeed.

Reference

Cowardin, L.M., V. Carter, F.C. Golet, and E.T. LaRoe. 1979. Classification of wetlands and deepwater habitats of the United States. FWS/OBS-79/31. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D.C. 103 pp.

United States Department of Agriculture | Forest Service | Foresthill Ranger District
22830 Foresthill Road
Foresthill, CA 95631
530-367-2224
530-367-2226 TDD
530-367-2992 FAX

File Code: 1920
Date: JAN 2 5 2002

PLACER COUNTY DATE RECEIVED
JAN 2 8 2002
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Dean Prigmore
Placer County Planning Department
11414 "B" Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603

Dear Mr. Prigmore:

I have reviewed the Notice of Preparation and associated documents regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Forest Ranch development (EIAQ-3656) in Foresthill. In a telephone conversation with Acting Public Service Officer Mo Tebbe, you stated this was a programmatic DEIR. It is our understanding that if/when a site specific EIR for Forest Ranch is developed, it will tier to this programmatic EIR.

The Forest Service has the following general concerns:

- With regards to public safety: the Foresthill Ranger District provides year round and diverse recreational opportunities and attracts visitors from far and near. All of the Foresthill Ranger District is accessed by Foresthill Road, as are portions of the Truckee and Georgetown Ranger Districts. The traffic on Foresthill Road flows well until reaching the one lane, and older, segments of the road. The Foresthill community currently experiences periods of congestion, including on the weekends. In addition, we want people to safely reach their destination points. There are several National Forest recreational destinations out the Mosquito Ridge Road, as well as further up Foresthill Divide Road. Also, the Foresthill Road is a 'haul route' for timber harvested from private and public lands, providing large truck traffic.

  The increase of population related to this proposal could lead to additional road use, congestion, and potential of accidents. This issue is highly likely to be one of significance as additional residences commute to work, school, and 'off-hill' amenities, and as people destined for the Forest Ranch RV Park and golf course come into Foresthill.

- Under cooperative protection agreement, the Forest Service provides mutual aid to the Foresthill Fire Protection District and CDF for emergency services (wild land and structure fires, medical aids and accidents). Unlike Foresthill CDF, the Forest Service is staffed year round. With an increase in traffic and population living in a wild land environment, it could be anticipated there would be a correlated increase in responses,

with associated costs. If there were an emergency worthy of evacuation, the Forest Service would be involved; and again the issue of public safety and transportation arises since Foresthill Road is the best, although not the only way, to leave the area.

The analysis should address the addition of people and animals that would need to be evacuated to safe zones in a timely manner should such an emergency take place. Also, the analysis should address the impact to public services such as emergency services.

- It is my understanding that under the programmatic EIR there are no foreseen access needs onto, or across, National Forest lands for roads, utilities, or trails. However, should this change under the site specific plan, the Forest Service would need a sufficient document meeting the National Environment Planning Act, including a Biological Evaluation, to issue Special Use Permits, Easements, or Rights of Way.

- There are two developed National Forest areas immediately adjacent to the planned Forest Ranch. One of these developments is the Administrative Residence area currently housing employees; we would want appropriate activities adjacent to this area for residential security, quiet, and safety.

  The other developed area is industrial in nature and is called the Foresthill Work Center. The Forest Service Emergency Response teams are located at this center, as are Forest Service fleet and barracks. The work center occasionally experiences 24-hour a day activity. Noise and light impacts occur.

- The Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment (called the Framework) currently guides National Forest planning for portions of the Sierra Nevada. The Framework provides for threat and defense protection areas. We request a 1:24,000 scale map of the entire Forest Ranch showing surrounding National Forest lands to determine if threat and defense zones on National Forest land would need to be designated and addressed by this Agency. This map would be valuable at this time, as this planning is in progress.

Please completely display and evaluate the cumulative effects to public safety, transportation, and community services such as emergency responses.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input to this phase of the analysis. We would like to continue to be involved in this project. If you should want to contact the Public Service's Officer, or myself, please call (530) 478-6254.

Sincerely,

RICHARD A. JOHNSON
District Ranger

NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION
915 CAPITOL MALL, ROOM 364
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
(916) 653-4082
Fax (916) 657-5390

January 9, 2002

PLACER COUNTY
DATE
RECEIVED
JAN 16 2002 DP
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Mr. Dean Prigmore
Placer County Planning Department
11414 B Avenue
Auburn, California 95603

RE: SCH# 2001122105 Forest Ranch

Dear Mr. Prigmore:

The Native American Heritage Commission has reviewed the above mentioned NOP. To adequately assess and mitigate project-related impacts on archaeological resources, the Commission recommends the following actions be required:

1. Contact the appropriate Information Center for a record search. The record search will determine:
   - If a part 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.
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 measurers 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 pubic disclosure.
   - The final written report should be submitted within 3 months after work has been completed to the appropriate regional archaeological Information Center.
3. Contact the Native American Heritage Commission for:
   - A Sacred Lands File Check.
   - A list of appropriate Native American Contacts for consultation concerning the project site and to assist in the mitigation measures.
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 archaeological sensitivity, a certified archaeologist 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 §5097.98 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.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (916) 653-4038.

Sincerely,

Debbie Pilas-Treadway
Environmental Specialist III

CC: State Clearinghouse

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DISTRICT 3, SACRAMENTO AREA OFFICE – MS 41
P. O. BOX 942874
SACRAMENTO, CA 94274-0001
PHONE (916) 327-3859
FAX (916) 323-7669
TTY (530) 741-4509

Flex your power!
Be energy efficient!

PLACER COUNTY
DATE
RECEIVED
JAN 30 2002
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

January 28, 2002

01PLA0142
Forest Ranch (EIAQ- 3656)
NOP EIR
03PLA080 PM 19.456

Dean Prigmore
Placer County Planning Department
11414 B Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603

Dear Mr. Prigmore:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Forest Ranch. Our comments are as follows:

- A traffic impact study (TIS) should be prepared to assess the project impacts to Interstate 80 and all associated access roads. The "Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies" is enclosed for reference.

- The TIS should include an analysis of all four intersections at the Auburn Ravine/Foresthill Interchange at Interstate 80. It should by analyzed from 3:00 to 6:00 PM on a weekday when schools are in session. This project could lengthen the peak period congestion, as well as impact the peak hour. An analysis should be provided for the twenty-year "buildout" scenario, with and without the proposed General Plan Amendment. An analysis of a five or ten year scenario may be necessary to determine appropriate mitigation measures for this development.

- The TIS should incorporate the following scenarios:

  -Existing conditions without the project (current year).
  -Existing conditions plus any proposed phasing of the project.
  -Cumulative conditions (without the project).
  -Cumulative conditions (with project build-out).

- The TIS should provide a Level of Service (LOS) analysis for freeways, ramps and ramp terminal intersections. A merge/diverge analysis should be performed for freeway and ramp junctions, all analysis should be based on AM and PM peak hour volumes. The analysis should include the (individual, not averaged) LOS and traffic volumes applicable to all intersection road approaches and turn movements. The procedures contained in the 1997 Update to the

Highway Capacity Manual along with the Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies should be used as a guide for the TIS.

- Mitigation measures should be identified where the project would have a significant impact. Caltrans considers the following to be significant impacts:

  -Off-ramps with vehicle queues that extend into the ramp's deceleration area or onto the freeway.
  -Vehicle queues at intersections that exceed existing lane storage.
  -Project traffic impacts that cause any ramp's merge/diverge Level of Service (LOS) to be worse than the freeway's LOS.
  -Project impacts that cause the freeway or intersection LOS to deteriorate beyond LOS E for freeway and LOS D for highway and intersections. If the LOS is already "E" or "F", then a quantitative measure of increased queue lengths and delay should be used to determine appropriate mitigation measures.

  Possible mitigation measures to consider include:

  -Widening interchange ramps to increase capacity.
  -Modifying ramp terminal intersections.
  -Adding auxiliary lanes between interchanges.
  -Increasing the ramp acceleration or deceleration lane length to improve merge/diverge operations.
  -Adding signalization and ramp intersection geometric improvements at impacted intersections.

- The analysis of future traffic impacts should be based on a 20 year planning horizon.

- Future transportation systems assumed for cumulative conditions should only include those improvements that are included in the most recent approved Placer County Transportation Planning Agency Regional Transportation Plan.

- A Caltrans Encroachment Permit will be required for any work conducted within State right-of-way. Please contact Mr. Bruce Capaul, Caltrans, District 3 Office of Permits, at (530) 741-4408, for an application and assistance.

Please provide Caltrans with a copy of the draft traffic study. If you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact Jennifer Hayes at (916) 324-6634.

Sincerely,

JEFFREY PULVERMAN, Chief
Office Of Regional Planning

GUIDE FOR THE PREPARATION

OF

TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDIES

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

January 2001

PREFACE

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) has developed this "Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies" in response to a survey of cities and counties in California. The purpose of that survey was to improve the Caltrans local development review process (also known as the Intergovernmental Review/California Environmental Quality Act or IGR/CEQA process). The survey indicated that approximately 30 percent of the respondents were not aware of what Caltrans required in a traffic impact study (TIS).

In the early 1990s, the Caltrans District 6 office located in Fresno identified a need to provide better quality and consistency in the analysis of traffic impacts generated by local development and land use change proposals that effect State highway facilities. At that time District 6 brought together both public and private sector expertise to develop a traffic impact study guide. The District 6 guide has proven to be successful at promoting consistency and uniformity in the identification and analysis of traffic impacts generated by local development and land use changes.

The guide developed in Fresno was adapted for statewide use by a team of Headquarters and district staff. The guide will provide consistent guidance for Caltrans staff who review local development and land use change proposals as well as inform local agencies of the information needed for Caltrans to analyze the traffic impacts to State highway facilities. The guide will also benefit local agencies and the development community by providing more expeditious review of local development proposals.

Even though sound planning and engineering practices were used to adapt the Fresno TIS guide, it is anticipated that changes will occur over time as new technologies and more efficient practices become available. To facilitate these changes, Caltrans encourages all those who use this guide to contact their nearest district office (i.e., IGR/CEQA Coordinators) to coordinate any changes with the development team.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The District 6 traffic impact study guide provided the impetus and a starting point for developing the statewide guide. Special thanks is given to Marc Birnbaum for recognizing the need for a TIS guide and for his valued experience and vast knowledge of land use planning to significantly enhance the effort to adapt the District 6 guide for statewide use. Randy Treece from District 6 provided many hours of coordination, research and development of the original guide and should be commended for his diligent efforts. Sharri Bender Ehlert of District 6 provided much of the technical expertise in the adaptation of the District 6 guide and her efforts are greatly appreciated.

A special thanks is also given to all those Cities, Counties, Regional Agencies, Congestion Management Agencies, Consultants, and Caltrans Employees who reviewed the guide and provided input during the development of this Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents		Page Number
PREFACE and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS		ii
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	WHEN A TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY IS NEEDED	1
A.	Trip Generation Thresholds	2
B.	Exceptions	
C.	Updating An Existing Traffic Impact Study	2
III.	SCOPE OF TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY	2
A.	Boundaries of the Traffic Impact Study	2
B.	Traffic Analysis Scenarios	2
IV.	TRAFFIC DATA	4
A.	Trip Generation	4
B.	Traffic Counts	4
C.	Peak Hours	4
D.	Travel Forecasting (Transportation Modeling)	5
V.	TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS METHODOLOGIES	5
A.	Freeway Sections	5
B.	Weaving Areas	5
C.	Ramps and Ramp Junctions	5
D.	Multi-lane Rural and Urban Highways	5
E.	Two-lane Highways	5
F.	Signalized Intersections	5
G.	Unsignalized Intersections	5
H.	Transit Capacity	5
I.	Pedestrians	5
J.	Bicycles	5
K.	Caltrans Criteria/Warrants	5
L.	Channelization	5
VI.	MITIGATION MEASURES	6

Appendix "A" Minimum Contents of Traffic Impact Study
Appendix "B" Methodology for Calculating Equitable Mitigation Measures
Appendix "C" Measures of Effectiveness by Facility Type

I. INTRODUCTION

Caltrans desires to provide a safe and efficient State transportation system for the citizens of California pursuant to various Sections of the California Streets and Highway Code. This is done in partnership with local and regional agencies through procedures established by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and other land use planning processes. The intent of this guide is to provide a starting point and a consistent basis in which Caltrans evaluates traffic impacts to State highway facilities. The applicability of this guide for local streets and roads (non-State highways) is at the discretion of the effected jurisdiction.

Caltrans reviews federal, state, and local agency development projects[1], and land use change proposals for their potential impact to State highway facilities. The primary objectives of this guide is to provide:

- guidance in determining if and when a traffic impact study (TIS) is needed,
- consistency and uniformity in the identification of traffic impacts generated by local land use proposals,
- consistency and equity in the identification of measures to mitigate the traffic impacts generated by land use proposals,
- lead agency[2] officials with the information necessary to make informed decisions regarding the existing and proposed transportation infrastructure (see Appendix A, Minimum Contents of a TIS)
- TIS requirements early in the planning phase of a project (i.e., initial study, notice of preparation, or earlier) to eliminate potential delays later,
- a quality TIS by agreeing to the assumptions, data requirements, study scenarios, and analysis methodologies in advance of beginning the study, and
- early coordination during the planning phases of a project to reduce the time and cost of preparing a TIS.

II. WHEN A TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY IS NEEDED

The level of service[3] (LOS) for operating State highway facilities is based upon measures of effectiveness (MOEs). These MOEs (see Appendix "C-2") describe the measures best suited for analyzing State highway facilities (i.e., freeway sections, signalized intersections, on- or off-ramps, etc.). Caltrans endeavors to maintain a target LOS at the transition between LOS "C" and LOS "D" (see Appendix "C-3") on State highway facilities, however, Caltrans acknowledges that this may not always be feasible and recommends that the lead agency consult with Caltrans to determine the appropriate target LOS. If an existing State highway facility is operating at less than the appropriate target LOS, the existing MOE should be maintained.

---

[1] "Project" refers to activities directly undertaken by government, financed by government, or requiring a permit or other approval from government as defined in Section 21065 of the Public Resources Code and Section 15378 of the California Code of Regulations.

[2] "Lead Agency" refers to the public agency that has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project. Defined in Section 21165 of the Public Resources Code, the "California Environmental Quality Act, and Section 15367 of the California Code of Regulations.

[3] "Level of service" as defined in the latest edition of the Highway Capacity Manual, Special Report 209, Transportation Research Board, National Research Council.

A. Trip Generation Thresholds

The following criterion is a starting point in determining when a TIS is needed. When a project:

1. Generates over 100 peak hour trips assigned to a State highway facility
2. Generates 50 to 100 peak hour trips assigned to a State highway facility – and, affected State highway facilities are experiencing noticeable delay; approaching unstable traffic flow conditions (LOS "C" or "D").
3. Generates 1 to 49 peak hour trips assigned to a State highway facility – the following are examples that may require a full TIS or some lesser analysis[4]:
   a. Affected State highway facilities experiencing significant delay; unstable or forced traffic flow conditions (LOS "E" or "F").
   b. The potential risk for a traffic incident is significantly increased (i.e., congestion related collisions, non-standard sight distance considerations, increase in traffic conflict points, etc.).
   c. Change in local circulation networks that impact a State highway facility (i.e., direct access to State highway facility, a non-standard highway geometric design, etc.).

Note: A traffic study may be as simple as providing a traffic count to as complex as a microscopic simulation. The appropriate level of study is determined by the particulars of a project, the prevailing highway conditions, and the forecasted traffic.

B. Exceptions

Exceptions require consultation between the lead agency, Caltrans, and those preparing the TIS. When a project's traffic impact to a State highway facility can clearly be anticipated without a study and all the parties involved (lead agency, developer, and the Caltrans district office) are able to negotiate appropriate mitigation, a TIS may not be necessary.

C. Updating An Existing Traffic Impact Study

A TIS requires updating when the amount or character of traffic is significantly different from an earlier study. Generally a TIS requires updating every two years. A TIS may require updating sooner in rapidly developing areas and not as often in slower developing areas. In these cases, consultation with Caltrans is strongly recommended.

III. SCOPE OF TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY

Consultation between the lead agency, Caltrans, and those preparing the TIS is recommended before commencing work on the study to establish the appropriate scope. At a minimum, the TIS should include the following:

A. Boundaries of the Traffic Impact Study

All State highway facilities impacted in accordance with the criteria in Section II should be studied. Traffic impacts to local streets and roads can impact intersections with State highway facilities. In these cases, the TIS should include an analysis of adjacent local facilities, upstream and downstream, of the intersection (i.e., driveways, intersections, and interchanges) with the State highway.

[4] A "lesser analysis" may include obtaining traffic counts, preparing signal warrants, or a focused TIS, etc.

B. Traffic Analysis Scenarios

Caltrans is interested in the effects of general plan updates and amendments as well as the effects of specific project entitlements (i.e., site plans, conditional use permits, sub-divisions, rezoning, etc.) that have the potential to impact a State highway facility. The complexity or magnitude of the impacts of a project will normally dictate the scenarios necessary to analyze the project. Consultation between the lead agency, Caltrans, and those preparing the TIS is recommended to determine the appropriate scenarios for the analysis. The following scenarios should be addressed in the TIS when appropriate:

1. When only a general plan amendment or update is being sought, the following scenarios are required:
   a) Existing Conditions - Current year traffic volumes and peak hour LOS analysis of effected State highway facilities.
   b) Proposed Project Only with Select Link[5] Analysis - Trip generation and assignment for build-out of general plan.
   c) General Plan Build-out Only - Trip assignment and peak hour LOS analysis. Include current land uses and other pending general plan amendments.
   d) General Plan Build-out Plus Proposed Project - Trip assignment and peak hour LOS analysis. Include proposed project and other pending general plan amendments.

2. When a general plan amendment is not proposed and a proposed project is seeking specific entitlements (i.e., site plans, conditional use permits, sub-division, rezoning, etc.), the following scenarios must be analyzed in the TIS:
   a) Existing Conditions - Current year traffic volumes and peak hour LOS analysis of effected State highway facilities.
   b) Proposed Project Only - Trip generation, distribution, and assignment in the year the project is anticipated to complete construction.
   c) Cumulative Conditions (Existing Conditions Plus Other Approved and Pending Projects Without Proposed Project) - Trip assignment and peak hour LOS analysis in the year the project is anticipated to complete construction.
   d) Cumulative Conditions Plus Proposed Project (Existing Conditions Plus Other Approved and Pending Projects Plus Proposed Project) - Trip assignment and peak hour LOS analysis in the year the project is anticipated to complete construction.
   e) Cumulative Conditions Plus Proposed Phases (Interim Years) - Trip assignment and peak hour LOS analysis in the years the project phases are anticipated to complete construction.
3. In cases where the circulation element of the general plan is not consistent with the land use element or the general plan is outdated and not representative of current or future forecasted conditions, all scenarios from Sections III. B. 1. and 2. should be utilized with the exception of duplicating of item 2.a.

[5] "Select link" analysis represents a project only traffic model run, where the project's trips are distributed and assigned along the highway network. This procedure isolates the specific impact on the State highway network.

IV. TRAFFIC DATA

Prior to any fieldwork, consultation between the lead agency, Caltrans, and those preparing the TIS is recommended to reach consensus on the data and assumptions necessary for the study. The following elements are a starting point in that consideration.

A. Trip Generation

The latest edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineers' (ITE) TRIP GENERATION report should be used for trip generation forecasts. Local trip generation rates are also acceptable if appropriate validation is provided to support them.

1. Trip Generation Rates – When the land use has a limited number of studies to support the trip generation rates or when the Coefficient of Determination (R^2) is below 0.75, consultation between the lead agency, Caltrans and those preparing the TIS is recommended.
2. Pass-by Trips[6] – Pass-by trips are only considered for retail oriented development. Reductions greater than 15% requires consultation and acceptance by Caltrans. The justification for exceeding a 15% reduction should be discussed in the TIS.
3. Captured Trips[7] – Captured trip reductions greater than 5% requires consultation and acceptance by Caltrans. The justification for exceeding a 5% reduction should be discussed in the TIS.
4. Transportation Demand Management (TDM) – Consultation between the lead agency and Caltrans is essential before applying trip reduction for TDM strategies.

NOTE: Reasonable reductions to trip generation rates are considered when adjacent State highway volumes are sufficient (at least 5000 ADT) to support reductions for the land use.

B. Traffic Counts

Prior to field traffic counts, consultation between the lead agency, Caltrans and those preparing the TIS is recommended to determine the level of detail (e.g., location, signal timing, travel speeds, turning movements, etc.) required at each traffic count site. All State highway facilities within the boundaries of the TIS should be considered. Common rules for counting vehicular traffic include but are not limited to:

1. Vehicle counts should be conducted on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, or Thursdays during weeks not containing a holiday and conducted in favorable weather conditions.
2. Vehicle counts should be conducted during the appropriate peak hours (see peak hour discussion below).
3. Seasonal and weekend variations in traffic should also be considered where appropriate (i.e., recreational routes, tourist attractions, harvest season, etc.).

C. Peak Hours

To eliminate unnecessary analysis, consultation between the lead agency, Caltrans and those preparing the TIS is recommended during the early planning stages of a project. In general, the TIS should include a morning (a.m.) and an evening (p.m.) peak hour analyses. Other peak hours (e.g., 11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m., weekend, holidays, etc.) may also be required to determine the significance of the traffic impacts generated by a project.

---

[6] "Pass-by" trips are made as intermediate stops between an origin and a primary trip destination (i.e., home to work, home to shopping, etc.).

[7] "Captured Trips" are trips that do not enter or leave the driveways of a project's boundary within a mixed-use development.

D. Travel Forecasting (Transportation Modeling)

The local or regional traffic model should reflect the most current land use and planned improvements (i.e., where programming or funding is secured). When a general plan build-out model is not available, the closest forecast model year to build-out should be used. If a traffic model is not available, historical growth rates and current trends can be used to project future traffic volumes. The TIS should clearly describe any changes made in the model to accommodate the analysis of a proposed project.

V. TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS METHODOLOGIES

Typically, the traffic analysis methodologies for the facility types indicated below are used by Caltrans and will be accepted without prior consultation. When a State highway has saturated flows, the use of a micro-simulation model is encouraged for the analysis. Other analysis methods may be accepted, however, consultation between the lead agency, Caltrans and those preparing the TIS is recommended to agree on the information necessary for the analysis.

A. Freeway Sections – Highway Capacity Manual (HCM)* Chapter 3, operational analysis
B. Weaving Areas – Caltrans Highway Design Manual (HDM) Chapter 500
C. Ramps and Ramp Junctions – HCM* Chapter 5, operational analysis or Caltrans HDM Chapters 400 and 500, Caltrans Ramp Metering Guidelines (most recent edition)
D. Multi-Lane Rural and Urban Highways – HCM* Chapter 7, operational analysis
E. Two-lane Highways – HCM* Chapter 8, operational analysis
F. Signalized Intersections[8] – HCM* Chapter 9, Highway Capacity Software**, operational analysis, TRAFFIX™**, Synchro**, see footnote 8
G. Unsignalized Intersections – HCM* Chapter 10, operational analysis, Caltrans Traffic Manual for signal warrants if a signal is being considered
H. Transit Capacity – HCM* Chapter 12, operational analysis
I. Pedestrians - HCM* Chapter 13
J. Bicycles – HCM* Chapters 14, use operational analysis when applying Chapter 9 and 10 HCM methods to bicycle analysis
K. Caltrans Criteria/Warrants – Caltrans Traffic Manual (stop signs, traffic signals, freeway lighting, conventional highway lighting, school crossings)
L. Channelization – Caltrans guidelines for Reconstruction of Intersections, August 1985, Ichiro Fukutome

*The most current edition of the Highway Capacity Manual, Special Report 209, Transportation Research Board, National Research Council, should be used.

**NOTE: Caltrans does not officially advocate the use of any special software. However, consistency with the HCM is advocated in most but not all cases. The Caltrans local development review units utilize the software mentioned above. If different software or analytical techniques are used for the TIS then consultation between the lead agency, Caltrans and those preparing the TIS is recommended. Results that are significantly different than those produced with the analytical techniques above should be challenged.

[8] The procedures in the Highway Capacity Manual "do not explicitly address operations of closely spaced signalized intersections. Under such conditions, several unique characteristics must be considered, including spill-back potential from the downstream intersection to the upstream intersection, effects of downstream queues on upstream saturation flow rate, and unusual platoon dispersion or compression between intersections. An example of such closely spaced operations is signalized ramp terminals at urban interchanges. Queue interactions between closely spaced intersections may seriously distort the procedures in" the HCM. Scope of Manual, page 1-2, Highway Capacity Manual, Special Report 209, updated December 1997.

VI. MITIGATION MEASURES

The TIS should provide the nexus [Nollan v. California Coastal Commission, 1987, 483 U.S. 825 (108 S.Ct. 314)] between a project and the traffic impacts to State highway facilities. The TIS should also establish the rough proportionality [Dolan v. City of Tigard, 1994, 512 U.S. 374 (114 S. Ct. 2309)] between the mitigation measures and the traffic impacts. One method for establishing the rough proportionality or a project proponent's equitable responsibility for a project's impacts is provided in Appendix "B." Consultation between the lead agency, Caltrans and those preparing the TIS is recommended to reach consensus on the mitigation measures and who will be responsible.

Mitigation measures must be included in the traffic impact analysis. This determines if a project's impacts can be eliminated or reduced to a level of insignificance. Eliminating or reducing impacts to a level of insignificance is the standard pursuant to CEQA and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The lead agency is responsible for administering the CEQA review process and has the principal authority for approving a local development proposal or land use change. Caltrans, as a responsible agency, is responsible for reviewing the TIS for errors and omissions that pertain to State highway facilities. The authority vested in the lead agency to administer the CEQA process does not take precedence over other authorities in law.

If the mitigation measures require work in the State highway right-of-way an encroachment permit from Caltrans will be required. This work will also be subject to Caltrans standards and specifications. Consultation between the lead agency, Caltrans and those preparing the TIS early in the planning process is strongly recommended to expedite the review of local development proposals and to reduce conflicts and misunderstandings in both the local agency CEQA review process as well as the Caltrans encroachment permit process.

APPENDIX "A"

MINIMUM CONTENTS

OF A

TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY

MINIMUM CONTENTS OF TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY REPORT

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

II. TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. List of Figures (Maps)
B. List of Tables

III. INTRODUCTION

A. Description of the proposed project
B. Location of project
C. Site plan including all access to State highways (site plan, map)
D. Circulation network including all access to State highways (vicinity map)
E. Land use and zoning
F. Phasing plan including proposed dates of project (phase) completion
G. Project sponsor and contact person(s)
H. References to other traffic impact studies

IV. TRAFFIC ANALYSIS

A. Clearly stated assumptions
B. Existing and projected traffic volumes (including turning movements), facility geometry (including storage lengths), and traffic controls (including signal phasing and multi-signal progression where appropriate) (figure)
C. Project trip generation including references (table)
D. Project generated trip distribution and assignment (figure)
E. LOS and warrant analyses - existing conditions, cumulative conditions, and full build of general plan conditions with and without project

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. LOS and appropriate MOE quantities of impacted facilities with and without mitigation measures
B. Mitigation phasing plan including dates of proposed mitigation measures
C. Define responsibilities for implementing mitigation measures
D. Cost estimates for mitigation measures and financing plan

VI. APPENDICES

A. Description of how traffic data was collected
B. Description of methodologies and assumptions used in analyses
C. Worksheets used in analyses (i.e., signal warrant, LOS, traffic count information, etc.)

APPENDIX "B"

METHODOLOGY FOR

CALCULATING EQUITABLE

MITIGATION MEASURES

METHOD FOR CALCULATING EQUITABLE MITIGATION MEASURES

The methodology below is neither intended as, nor does it establish, a legal standard for determining equitable responsibility and cost of a project's traffic impact, the intent is to provide:

1. A starting point for early discussions to address traffic mitigation equitably.
2. A means for calculating the equitable share for mitigating traffic impacts.
3. A means for establishing rough proportionality [Dolan v. City of Tigard, 1994, 512 U.S. 374 (114 S. Ct. 2309)].

The formulas should be used when:

- A project has impacts that do not immediately warrant mitigation, but their cumulative effects are significant and will require mitigating in the future.
- A project has an immediate impact and the lead agency has assumed responsibility for addressing operational improvements

NOTE: This formula is not intended for circumstances where a project proponent will be receiving a substantial benefit from the identified mitigation measures. In these cases, (e.g., mid-block access and signalization to a shopping center) the project should take full responsibility to toward providing the necessary infrastructure.

EQUITABLE SHARE RESPONSIBILITY: **Equation C-1**

NOTE: $T_E < T_B$, see explanation for T_B below.

$$P = \frac{T}{T_B - T_E}$$

Where:

P = The equitable share for the proposed project's traffic impact.

T = The vehicle trips generated by the project during the peak hour of adjacent State highway facility in vehicles per hour, vph.

T_B = The forecasted traffic volume on an impacted State highway facility at the time of general plan build-out (e.g., 20 year model or the furthest future model date feasible), vph.

T_E = The traffic volume existing on the impacted State highway facility plus other approved projects that will generate traffic that has yet to be constructed/opened, vph.

EQUITABLE COST: **Equation C-2**

$$C = P\ (C_T)$$

Where:

C = The equitable cost of traffic mitigation for the proposed project, ($). (Rounded to nearest one thousand dollars)

P = The equitable share for the project being considered.

C_T = The total cost estimate for improvements necessary to mitigate the forecasted traffic demand on the impacted State highway facility in question at general plan build-out, ($).

NOTES

1. Once the equitable share responsibility and equitable cost has been established on a per trip basis, these values can be utilized for all projects on that State highway facility until the forecasted general plan build-out model is revised.
2. Truck traffic should be converted to passenger car equivalents before utilizing these equations (see the Highway Capacity Manual for converting to passenger car equivalents).

APPENDIX "C"

MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS

BY

FACILITY TYPE

MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS BY FACILITY TYPE

TYPE OF FACILITY	MEASURE OF EFFECTIVENESS
Freeways	
Basic Freeway Segments	Density (pc/mi/ln)
Weaving Areas	Density (pc/mi/ln)
Ramp Junctions	Flow Rates (pcph)
Multi-Lane Highways	Density (pc/mi/ln) Free-Flow Speed (mph)
Two-Lane Highways	Time Delay (percent)
Signalized Intersections	Average Control Delay (sec/veh)
Unsignalized Intersections	Average Control Delay (sec/veh)
Arterials	Average Travel Speed (mph)
Transit	Load Factor (pers/seat, veh/hr, people/hr)
Pedestrians	Space (sq. ft./ped)

Measures of effectiveness for level of service definitions located in table 1-2, Chapter 1, of the 1997 Highway Capacity Manual, Special Report 209, Transportation Research Board, National Research Council.

Transition between LOS "C" and LOS "D" Criteria
(Reference 1997 Highway Capacity Manual)

Basic Freeway Sections

LOS	Maximum Density (pc/mi/ln)	Minimum Speed (mph)	Maximum Service Flow Rate (pcphpl)	Maximum Volume/Capacity Ratio
	Free-Flow Speed = 70 mph			
A	10.0	70.0	700	0.29
B	16.0	70.0	1120	0.47
C	24.0	68.0	1632	0.68
D	32.0	64.0	2048	0.85
E	45.0	53.0	2400	1.00
F	var	var	var	var

Weaving Areas

LOS	MAXIMUM DENSITY (pc/mi/ln)	
	Freeway Weaving Area	Multi-lane and C - D Weaving Areas
A	10	12
B	20	24
C	28	32
D	35	36
E	<= 43	<= 40
F	> 43	>40

Ramp-Freeway Junction Areas of Influence

LOS	Maximum Density (Primary Measure) (pc/mi/ln)	Minimum Speed (Secondary Measure) (MPH)
A	10	58
B	20	56
C	28	52
D	35	46
E	> 35	42
F	[a]	[a]

[a] Demand flows exceed limits of table 5-1.

Signalized Intersections

LOS	Control Delay Per Vehicle (sec)
A	10
B	20
C	35
D	55
E	80
F	> 80

Dotted line represents the transition between LOS "C" and LOS "D"

Gray Davis
Governor

Maria Contreras-Sweet
Secretary, Business, Transportation and Housing Agency

Jeff Morales
Director, California Department of Transportation

Kim Nystrom
Program Manager, Traffic Operations

For additional copies of these guidelines, please contact Tom Persons at, Tom_Persons@dot.ca.gov.

DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION
NEVADA-YUBA-PLACER UNIT
13760 Lincoln Way
Auburn, CA 95603
(530) 889-0111 X 107

PLACER COUNTY
DATE
RECEIVED
JAN 22 2002
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

January 17, 2001

Dean Prigmore
Placer County Planning Dept.
11414 B Ave.
Auburn CA 95603

I am writing in regard to the Forest Ranch (SCH # 2001122105) Notice of Preparation for draft environmental impact report.

The specific impacts CDF requests to be evaluated in this EIR are:

1. The historic and prehistoric sites identified in the survey area for THP 2-97-070 PLA.

2. The decrease in timber base and impact on future timber supply in the county as a result of the project.

3. A discussion of the cover type, including commercial species, density, age, and size composition affected by project.

4. The soils, slopes and aspects affected by project.

5. Potential effects on wildfire prevention and control and vegetation management.

6. The trend this amendment will have toward more zoning changes and conversion on other parcels in the Foresthill area.

7. Restriction on timber harvesting and management on neighboring parcels.

8. Any significant problems that may affect this amendment.

CDF requests that an alternative site in oak-woodland habitat be evaluated for the proposed development. This alternative avoids impacts to commercial timberland and farm land.

I am also providing additional information and comments on materials in the package from the State Clearinghouse. The following comments refer to the Environmental Impact Assessment Questionnaire.

p.2 item 14, natural economic resources. The response states there is immature timber not viable for re-harvesting for 20-30 years.

There is an active timber harvesting plan on the property (THP 2-97-070 PLA). Most of the property has been logged and most of the merchantable timber removed. However,

there are portions of the property where proposed helicopter yarding has not been done. The timberland is highly productive and portions could be harvested in less than 20 years.

p.6 item 56, historical, archaeological, or cultural features. The response states none are known.

An archaeological survey was conducted as part of the planning process for THP 2-97-070 PLA. At least 40 historic and prehistoric sites were identified in the survey area.

p.7 item 75. Displace currently productive use. The response states the proposal will not displace any currently productive use.

Most of the property is highly productive timberland. Besides timber production, the forest provides fish and wildlife habitat, aesthetics, water, and other benefits.

CDF is concerned about rezoning and conversion of timberland to other uses because it conflicts with CDF's mission and with the Forest Practice Act, especially Public Resources Code sections 4512 and 4513.

4512. Findings and declarations.
(a) The Legislature hereby finds and declares that the forest resources and timberlands of the state are among the most valuable of the natural resources of the state and that there is great concern throughout the state relating to their utilization, restoration, and protection.
(b) The Legislature further finds and declares that the forest resources and timberlands of the state furnish high-quality timber, recreational opportunities, and aesthetic enjoyment while providing watershed protection and maintaining fisheries and wildlife.
(c) The Legislature thus declares that it is the policy of this state to encourage prudent and responsible forest resource management calculated to serve the public's need for timber and other forest products, while giving consideration to the public's need for watershed protection, fisheries and wildlife, and recreational opportunities alike in this and future generations.
(d) It is not the intent of the Legislature by the enactment of this chapter to take private property for public use without payment of just compensation in violation of the California and United States Constitutions.

4513. Intent of Legislature. It is the intent of the Legislature to create and maintain an effective and comprehensive system of regulation and use of all timberlands so as to assure that:
(a) Where feasible, the productivity of timberlands is restored, enhanced, and maintained.
(b) The goal of maximum sustained production of high-quality timber products is achieved while giving consideration to values relating to recreation, watershed, wildlife, range and forage, fisheries, regional economic vitality, employment, and aesthetic enjoyment.

The Land Use and Planning section of the Forest Ranch (EIAQ-3656) Probable Environmental Effects document discusses some of the environmental issues for the proposed general plan amendment. As mentioned earlier, the property in question is highly productive. Two separate non-industrial timber management plans were prepared for this property in 1993 and 1994 (NTMP 2-93-3 and NTNP 2-94-3). The forester who prepared the plans segregated the different timber stand types and estimated their current and projected growth rates. The forester estimated that over 2000 acres of the property is capable of producing 600-800 board feet of timber per acre per year with proper timber management. With the recent timber harvesting in the last decade the amount of timber on site dwindled. But in the long term, this property could, with proper management, grow 1.2 to 1.6 million board feet of timber per year. I estimate that is enough to build about 150 homes per year. Also for comparison, the Sierra Pacific Industries lumber mill in Lincoln

processes about 150 million board feet of logs per year. If aggressive management was provided, this property could annually supply nearly 1% of the raw material for the Lincoln sawmill. Converting this timberland to other uses will lower productivity and reduce the timber supply in the region.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Very truly yours,

Gary Brittner
Division Chief

CC: Allen Robertson

FORESTHILL FIRE DEPT.

Foresthill Fire Protection District
P.O. Box 1099 • Foresthill, CA 95631
(530) 367-3498

PLACER COUNTY
DATE
RECEIVED
JAN 22 2002
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

January 17, 2002

Placer County Planning Department
11414 "B" Avenue
Auburn, CA. 95603

Attn.: Dean Prigmore

Subject: Forest Ranch

Mr. Prigmore

After reviewing both the Initial Project Application and the Placer County Initial Study we found several significant oversights in the documents relating to fire protection issues as listed below.

Initial Project Application

Item 8, This should be "Yes" as the Foresthill Fire Protection District is a governmental agency and their approval of such projects is required.

Item 9, Under "Fire Protection" the Foresthill Fire Protection District would be the lead agency providing protection which includes fire, medical and rescue services. The project is all within its District boundaries. Please disregard the words "Foresthill Volunteer F.D."

It should be further noted that CDF only provides seasonal fire protection services to the area.

Environmental Impact Assessment Questionnaire

Item DPW 37, The CDF station does not operate year around, this should be Foresthill Fire Protection District Station #1 at a distance of approximately 1/4 mile.

Item DPW 39, The project would create significant impact to the Foresthill Fire Protection District. The District could require as much as a 70% increase

in infrastructure, such as a larger/additional fire station(s), additional fire engines, and personnel.

As for the off-site access limitations, This should be "Yes" as the general area geographics reflect steep slopes and grades. The Foresthill Fire Protection District should also be listed here as a governing agency.

Placer County Planning Department Initial Study

Item V, The "Foresthill Fire Protection District" must be added to the list, as the project is all within its sphere of influence.

In conclusion, the Foresthill Fire Protection District has not been recognized and listed appropriately as required, please make the necessary changes as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Robert McChesney
Fire Chief

Ken E. Hodkin
Vice Chairman
Board of Directors

SIERRA CLUB
FOUNDED 1892

PLACER GROUP
P.O. BOX 7167, AUBURN, CA 95604

January 25, 2002

Lori Lawrence
Environmental Review Clerk
Placer County Planning Department
11414 "B" Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603

RECEIVED
JAN 28 2002
PLANNING DEPT.

Re: **Forest Ranch NOP** (EIAQ-3656)

Dear Ms. Lawrence:

Please include the following comments on the Forest Ranch Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report, made on behalf of the Sierra Club, in the public record.

General Plan Amendment & Rezone
The document prepared by the county, "Forest Ranch's Probable Environmental Effects," does an excellent job of listing the extensive range of impacts that would likely result from the development of this proposed project. The fact that this project proposes to amend the General Plan and rezone land from timber production to residential and commercial uses, in conflict with the current Foresthill General Plan and all of the Plan alternatives recommended by the Foresthill Community Plan Team, suggests that the proponents hope to gain approval for the maximum dwelling units allowed by current zoning (500+ dwelling units) by later "scaling back" the inappropriate project described in this N.O.P.

Most of the environmental effects described for this huge project would also apply to a smaller project utilizing existing zoning. This site is totally inappropriate for a golf course and 2,213 residential units. A large RV Park or equestrian center are also problematic for this remote area. Instead of trying to rush this project through before the new Community Plan takes effect, proponents should put the project "on hold" until after the new Foresthill Community Plan has been completed and approved.

Impacts from Sprawl
This proposed development is fatally flawed in all respects and represents sprawl at its worst. Forest Ranch is the opposite of sound planning principles advocated by "smart growth." This project would put thousands of families and senior citizens in a remote location with non-existent or inadequate infrastructure to serve them. New and existing residents of the area will suffer impacts to their water quality and supply, air quality, traffic, public services (health care, sheriff, fire protection, schools, roads, energy supply, and wastewater treatment facilities), timber production, recreation, wildlife, cultural resources and aesthetics. The Draft EIR should address fully all of these issues, including specific impacts from the golf course, equestrian facilities, and RV Park, including the likely cumulative impacts of this proposed project.

Biological Impacts
Thorough surveys should be conducted by wildlife biologists, botanists, arborists, and other experts to inform the public which plant and animal species may be put at risk, and how many trees of what size and species will be lost or impacted by the development. Wildlife corridors and critical fawning areas should be identified and protected from disturbance by people and domestic animals. Trails should be placed to minimize potentially hazardous conflicts with wildlife. These conflicts will be a major problem in maintaining a golf course located so inappropriately in a forest habitat setting. The EIR should evaluate how golf course greens could be maintained without the killing of native wildlife that would likely disturb the turf, and how residential landscaping could be planned not to attract wildlife.

Boarding horses in this remote location would also pose problems for wildlife and the environment. The number of horses that will be allowed on site must be disclosed in the EIR. Since horses are very hard on soils, plants and trees, how and where they will be kept/housed should be discussed and impacts mitigated. What animal husbandry techniques would be utilized to minimize conflicts with predators such as cougars and bears? Native wildlife species should not have to be displaced or killed because domestic animals are made easy prey in their territory. The EIR should also evaluate the impact of greatly increased equestrian use of public and private trails and any potential conflicts this use may have on hikers, bikers, and other equestrians, as well as on wildlife.

Water Quality/Supply
Water quality, both surface and ground, is likely to be impaired from golf course runoff and the equestrian facility. The EIR should disclose how on-site and downhill streams and the North Fork American River would be protected from project run-off. Groundwater should not be used for irrigation in such a large golf course/residential project. The Foresthill P.U.D. must ensure that it can provide sufficient water to the project without impairing its supply to existing residents and the build-out of existing zoning in the area.

Sewage
Sewage disposal for such a large project is a major concern. On the Initial Project Application under "sewer" it states, "Current method of sewage disposal would be by on-site septic systems. With ultimate development, project will provide community treatment system." The EIR should address the immediate need for a community treatment system, even for a 500+ home project without the golf course, RV Park or equestrian facility. On-site septic systems for any stage of this project would be inappropriate. Recycling of the project's wastewater for golf course irrigation and other uses should be analyzed in the EIR

Transportation
Statements made by the project proponent on the Initial Project Application with regard to transportation and circulation have dubious validity. Claims that an active retirement community would have only a 10% likelihood of traveling outside of the local community on any given trip may be true for Arizona, but this would not be the case in Foresthill. Unless the developer is planning to provide additional growth–inducing new businesses and services to the existing town, most residents will continue to travel to Auburn and surrounding cities for entertainment, work, shopping, and health services. While senior citizens may not travel much during peak hours, only 11 of the 524 existing zoned units are age restricted, so that the vast majority of the new residents would be traveling during peak hours to work, school, etc. Although the project proposes to have 1,700 of the 2,213 (rezoned) residential units age restricted (55+ years), most 55 year old adults are active and not necessarily retired. This project's golf course and 5 acres of office and professional zoning will not provide enough jobs to local residents to lessen traffic on Auburn Foresthill Road at peak hours or any other time.

The proponent does not address the traffic congestion that would result from the 100-vehicle RV Park or the equestrian center. The golf course and club house/restaurant would also generate trips from both the Foresthill Divide and other parts of the county. The EIR should fully disclose the traffic impacts of this project and evaluate the health and safety risks to current and future residents and visitors, bearing in mind the two-lane bridge that provides the main access to the Foresthill Divide.

Air Quality
This project will contribute to the poor air quality of the area, both in ozone and particulate matter. The EIR should address ways to avoid or mitigate these impacts. For example, wood-burning stoves and fireplaces could be prohibited, and outdoor burning could be restricted or prohibited. Energy-saving, ozone-reducing transit options should be explored, as well.

Alternatives
Proposed project alternatives that comply with the Foresthill Community Plan (currently being updated) should be developed and analyzed. These should include no-golf course, no RV park, and no equestrian center alternatives. Clustered housing with natural open space and public trail amenities on the portion zoned for residential use would be one environmentally superior alternative. Maintaining the majority of the property in sustainable timber production, providing wildlife habitat and natural open space, would meet the goals of the Community Plan and preserve the quality of life for the residents of Placer County. The County is not obligated to provide developers an easy way to maximize profits from their speculative investments.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this N.O.P. Please keep the Sierra Club informed on the status of this proposed project.

Sincerely yours,

Sharon P. Cavallo

Sharon P. Cavallo
Conservation Committee
Placer Group Sierra Club

January 21, 2002

6134 Green Ridge Drive
Foresthill, CA 95631

PLACER COUNTY
DATE
RECEIVED

JAN 22 2002
LL
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Lori Lawrence
Placer County Planning Department
11414 "B" Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603

Re: Forest Ranch (EIAQ-3656)

Please add my name to the distribution list concerning the above project. I also would like to receive a copy of the DIER when it becomes available.

Below are additional issues to be addressed in the DEIR:

Wildlife corridors: The proposed project would increase traffic on Foresthill road thereby increasing the incidents of collision with big game animals.

Public services: The project would impact the existing water supply, especially during drought years.

Public services: The project would impact fire-fighting capabilities, emergency, sheriff, and health services on the divide.

Energy and Mineral Resources: The project would contribute to an ongoing energy supply-demand problem in the State of California.

Recreation: The project would impact the use of local trails and increase conflicts amongst trail users (equestrian, hikers, runners, and Mt. bikes). The project would create a burden on staffing needs of the Auburn State Recreation Area, and the Forest Service.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Brent A. Backus

PLACER COUNTY
DATE
RECEIVED
JAN 2 8 2002
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

January 26, 2002
Mr. Dean Prigmore, Asst. Director of Planning
Placer County Planning Department
11414 "B" Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603

Attn: Ms. Lori Lawrence, Environmental Review Clerk

Re: Forest Ranch (EIAQ-3656)

Dear Ms. Lawrence:

As members of the Blackhawk and Black Oak Ridge Homeowners' Associations living in CSA # 28 we strenuously object to the above captioned project based upon the following essential environmental and safety concerns.

1. **The quality of our drinking water will be compromised.** Each of the undersigned obtains drinking water from wells, fed by aquifers that permeate the entire region. This same region contains several miles of mineshafts, commencing from abandoned mines located on the Project Site (particularly the Mayflower Mine). Maps verify that these shafts exist under many of our parcels. Empirical evidence proves that these shafts are full of water, indicative of seepage from these aquifers. Mining experts indicate the strong likelihood of the existence of mercury and cyanide in these mining areas. [We demand that before any work begins on the Project Site, the Applicant be required to, not just clean up each mine, all shafts and the surrounding environs of all toxic wastes, but also to purchase a bond of a sufficient size to cover all foreseeable costs associated with the cleanup of our water supply.]

The existence of 2,213 septic systems or, in the alternative, one very large wastewater treatment plant will also prove detrimental to the (water) ecology as will the implementation of water run off and drainage systems.

2. **The quality of Brushy Creek and all down stream bodies of water including Shirttail Creek and the north fork of the American River will be jeopardized.** A number of homeowners live adjacent to Brushy Creek, which flows on the north side and below the north boundary of the Project. There are at least four mine shafts, flooded with water, that either empty into or cross this creek. It is feared that the toxic wastes that exist on the Project Site will spill and flow down Brushy to Shirttail to the American River. Pesticides, fertilizers, and herbicides that will be applied to the golf course, landscapes, and Site homes will result in runoff that will leach back into the ground, adversely affecting our water supplies as well as Brushy Creek and all down stream bodies of water.

10. **The herds of deer (and all other wild life) will be displaced.** There already exists a problem of excess wildlife in Todd Valley.

These are the issues with which Blackhawk and Black Oak Ridge homeowners associations are most concerned. We must advise that we will vigorously oppose any zoning change that will allow such heavy concentrations of population, a complete disregard of the dangers that exist in and about the abandoned mines, of the adverse effect on our streams, water quality and water tables, and the creation of noise, dust and light pollution that Forest Ranch represents.

Respectfully submitted,

Ivan & Judy Strayer	7060 Blackhawk Rd
Ed & Pat Fleming	7057 Blackhawk Rd
Dennis & Gail McCafferty	7037 Blackhawk Rd
Janet Leatherman	7017 Blackhawk Rd
Dick & Margie Kloth	7007 Blackhawk Rd
Rod & Linda Ondricek	26200 Black Oak Ridge
Gary & Kathleen Duncan	27000 Black Oak Ridge
Larry & Sue Hicks	27200 Black Oak Ridge
Ron Flodine	28355 Black Oak Ridge
Bob & Terrie Malella	26400 Black Oak Ridge

P.S.: Contact Person

is

Larry & Sue Hicks

P.O. Box 76

Forest Hill, CA 95631

1/25/02

Placer County Planning Comm.

Re: Foresthill development

Dear Sirs,

My name is Harry Shuger. I have been a resident of Foresthill for fourteen years and have had two businesses there since 1989. During that time I served five years on the Foresthill Chamber of Commerce both as Vice president and later a director. For five years I also served as President of Foresthill Rod & Gun club.

During these fourteen years I have observed many changes take place, mostly positive, in our small community. Even when perceived "negative" changes and community hardships occurred, the community pulled together, rallied back and became stronger. This is the natural ***evolutionary*** process at work in any dynamic entity, and Foresthill **IS** a dynamic entity. I have watched her grow for the last fourteen years. Now a developer wants to change that ***evolutionary*** process with a ***STEROID*** overdose. Foresthill is growing just fine without a Steroid injection.

When I moved to Foresthill in 1988, the population on the Foresthill Divide was believed to be around four thousand. It is now around the six thousand mark, an increase of two thousand (50 %) in fourteen years. That is why it was hard for me to believe a statement I read in the Auburn Journal. The statement was attributed to the Placer County planning commission. You had reached the conclusion that doubling the population in Foresthill with this ONE proposed development "*would have no negative impact on Foresthill*". Do you believe that, or does the county just see the $$ in developer fees and property taxes. These $$ will come at the expense of the quality of life, the environment, and the natural evolutionary development that the residents of this community currently enjoy.

I urge you to think seriously about this before tendering your vote. Thank You

Sincerely:

Harry Shuger
P.O. Box 1067
Foresthill Ca. 95631

Cc: all Comms.

28320 Secret Town Ct.
Colfax, CA 95713
January 17, 2001

PLACER COUNTY
DATE
RECEIVED
JAN 25 2002
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Fred Yeager, Placer County Planning Director
11414 B Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603

Dear Mr. Yeager:

I saw the article in the Auburn Journal concerning the development in Foresthill. It is rather huge but phased in over a period of time so the community is not doubled overnight might make it a valuable piece. With the new high school being built, additional development is not only expected, it would be advantageous.

It, however, must be integrated housing so that the various levels of housing need are addressed. Low income, first time home buyers, upward mobile or downsizing families, and those who want their dream house in the woods and can pay a good deal for it. People who demand services and those who provide them should be able to live in the same general community.

One area of concern I'd have is health care. Kaiser Permanente is a major player in the health care field in Placer County but they only can serve part of the County due to the Balance Budget Act of 1997 mandating people be within 30 miles of the medical group they use. After I moved to the Colfax area, I had to change medical coverage. Presently the line is at Weimar. Foresthill is over 30 miles from Roseville so is not covered by Kaiser. Their zip code is not on the list. I know people there who have received a letter I did informing them they have to change because of the law.

I petitioned Kaiser to put a clinic in Auburn which would open up much more of the county to coverage. There is even that empty medical building at the corner of Bell and Heritage Oaks that I alerted them to. I also alerted the realtor to the possibility. It seems to me that if there are further large developments in the Foresthill or Colfax area, Placer County should make a concerted effort to get Kaiser to put a clinic in Auburn. That would open up the area as far as Alta and possibly some beyond that. So many from this area go to Roseville, it might well take some of the pressure off that facility.

Thank you for your good work. I was there to rejoice when the Planning Commission so decisively approved the Silver Bend Project. I'm trusting the Board of Supervisors will do the same.

Sincerely,

Beverly Anderson

Beverly Anderson

FORESTHILL UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT

Jim Roberts, Superintendent
24750 Main Street
Foresthill, CA 95631
(530) 367-2966 • (530) 367-2470 fax • jroberts@fusd.org

PLACER COUNTY
DATE
RECEIVED
FEB 06 2002 L L
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

January 25, 2002

Lori Lawrence
Placer County Planning Department
11414 "B" Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603

Dear Ms. Lawrence:

As requested, I am responding to your "Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report" for the Forest Ranch (EIAQ-3656). On behalf of the Foresthill Union School District, I am providing our views on the probable environmental effects of the proposed project.

The project as proposed has the potential to have significant adverse impacts on traffic in and around Foresthill Elementary School and Foresthill Divide Middle School. The additional traffic added by the project could increase the length of bus routes. Bus routes will necessarily be longer requiring additional driver time at a cost to the District. Additional traffic in and around the schools increases safety concerns. Students who live within a mile of the schools walk to attend class. Without careful planning these walkers could be put in harms way because there are an increased number of motorists on the roads.

It is difficult to from the Proposed Zoning Plan where the entrances, exits and roads will be within the proposed development but additional concerns about "red light bus stops" is another issue for the District. "Red light stops" are required whenever a student(s) exits the bus and has to cross the street to get home. Without knowing the plan for roads, entrances and exits to the proposed project, it is difficult to ascertain the number of "red light stops." This type of stop is of concern to the District both for financial and safety considerations.

Jim Roberts, Principal
Foresthill Elementary School
24750 Main Street
(530) 367-2211
(530) 367-2470 fax
jroberts@fusd.org

Board of Trustees
Anne Davis
Richard Beress
Nancy Lambuth
Francine Nunes
Mark Sussman

Matt Miller, Principal
Foresthill Divide Middle School
22888 Foresthill Road
(530) 367-3782
(530) 367-4526 fax
mmiller@fusd.org

The project as proposed has the potential to impact the District by both the number of new students produced by a project this size and by the growth of the student population. Currently the District's facilities are impacted and near capacity. With additional growth there is the potential need for a new elementary school. To finance a new school would require the passage of a bond. It is doubtful that the tax base of the Foresthill community could provide adequate funding to build a new school.

Date: 2/6/02

Signature: Jim Roberts

Title: Superintendent

Dear Ms. Daniels,

I am writing in concern about Dr. Ryan's proposal of building a retirement community in Forestdill. I will be directly affected by this. I do not object to new homes being built by me but I do object to a poorly planned proposal. We are a forest community with houses well spaced apart to maintain the integrity of the forest. What Dr. Ryan proposes is too impacted for our community. I am primarily concerned with the noise level and the polluting of wells. Golf courses are major pollutants. Will there be money from the county to put in city plumbing if my well is polluted? I certainly don't have the money to do so. My concern is one of a myriad of concerns

Andrew D. Funk
Consulting Forester

Dave Funk
PMB 6442. 10556 Combie Road. Auburn, CA 95602
Phone:530. 274-7809 Fax: 530. 274-7809 Mobile: 530. 908-7809
funkforestry@jps.net

PLACER COUNTY
DATE
RECEIVED

MAR 1 1 2002

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

March 8, 2002

Ms. Lori Lawrence
Placer County Planning Department
11414 B Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603

Reference: Forest Ranch NOP (EIQA)-3656.

Dear Ms. Lawrence;

Mr. Donald Ryan requested that I respond to statements made by CDF in their letter dated January 17, 2002. He asked me to respond on his behalf because of my familiarity with past and current activities on this property. I prepared the documents that withdrew the former NTMP's as well as the currently active Timber Harvest Plan 97-070. During these processes, I had the opportunity meet or speak with numerous individuals from various professions about the property. These included many foresters, neighbors, state and federal biologists, hydrologists, engineers and an archaeologist. I inspected and reviewed the archaeological sites and records for this property. I constructed the Archaeological Addendum to Timber Harvesting Plan 97-070. This addendum is the current document referenced by CDF. The addendum includes the previously recorded cultural information and newly recorded cultural information from my survey of the property in 1997.

Response to the following items contained in the CDF Letter:

CDF Impact Number 1: The subject property contains a variety of cultural resources. I reviewed the Conceptual Development Plan Map. The sites that could be impacted are miner's ditches that were used to convey water and diggings areas. Both of these features are not unique as they are well represented throughout the Foresthill Divide and the Central Sierra Regions. Review by a professional archaeologist will easily mitigate impacts associated with miner's ditches and diggings areas.

CDF Impact Number 2: The Foresthill Divide contains tens of thousands of acres of forested land. This timberland is currently managed for forest resources that include timber production, wildlife, fisheries, recreation and aesthetics. The largest owner is the USDA Forest Service. Other large owners include Sierra Pacific Industries and Fruit Growers. It was suggested that the Ryan, et. al. property could produce 1% of Sierra Pacific's annual Lincoln wood fiber production. Sierra Pacific Industries owns more than one million acres of California timberland. The entire subject property represents just thousandths of one a percent when compared to the holdings of just this one company. Sierra Pacific Industries saw mill in Lincoln is a destination mill. The facility does not derive its material entirely from Placer County but rather from the entire Central Sierra Region. The facilities close proximity to the Stockton and Sacramento ports makes the location of the Lincoln mill desirable to import sawlogs from foreign sources.

The timber industry has declined even though the subject property has been producing sawlogs for many years. Notwithstanding the obvious risk to catastrophic loss due to wildland fire, thirty years ago a timber producer could go to the market with his produce and find many buyers. Today, the timber producer goes to the market and finds the price set by only one buyer. Will that one buyer still be there in another thirty years, the earliest under the best conditions in which another substantial harvest could be contemplated? We all hope so but if the present trend is any indication of the future, then there will likely not be a market in thirty years. Already some timber producers are moving operations out of California and the United States due to uncertainty about the future direction of local, state and federal regulations.

CDF Impact Number 3: The subject property north of the Foresthill Divide Road contains the typical vegetation found in the Sierra Mixed Conifer Forest Type. The subject property does not contain pasture lands, blue oak woodlands or wetlands. The property does contain riparian areas that are typical of the forest type. While pure conifer and hardwood stands exist, the vast majority of the area contains a mixture of both conifer and hardwood. The most recent harvest substantially removed the overstory that was suppressing the release of the young developing conifers. The thinning was directed at achieving a more balanced composition. The NTMP began the process of reducing the excessive amount of incense cedar in the intermediate canopy layers that was retained from previous harvest entries. The THP continued the thinning to balance the species composition.

CDF Impact Number 4: The topography contained on the subject property north of Foresthill Divide road is mostly gentle with some moderately sloped terrain. It is generally accepted that this area contains good forest soils. The majority of the soils are very deep and nutrient rich. These soils are capable of producing high quality sawlog and wood fiber forest products. The only exceptions to this are those areas where placer mining removed the surface soil. Slope stability problems are associated with the scarps at the diggings areas. These areas are becoming more stable with the advance of vegetation.

CDF Impact Number 5: CDF and US Forest Service stations are within just minutes of the subject property. CDF staffs an air tanker base in Grass Valley, California that is only a few minutes air time from the property. The owners have cooperated with CDF to reduce fuels along the major roads. The proposed project will result in interrupting the continuity of vegetation and thus increase the likelihood of successful fire suppression.

THP 97-070: The Timber Harvesting Plan will expire on July 2, 2002. The helicopter portion of the THP has not been harvested due to poor market conditions. No further harvesting is planned.

Estimates of current and potential wood growth: The timberland owners contracted in 1993 to have two documents written that would satisfy the requirements of a Non-industrial Timber Management Plan (NTMP). The documents, NTMP 2-93-03 and 2-94-03 were executed until withdrawn by the timberland owners in 1997. Following the acceptance of withdrawal by CDF in 1997, a new Timber Harvesting Plan, 97-070, was prepared. Timber Harvesting Plan 97-070 will expire on July 2, 2002.

The NTMP's made two growth projections that were based on two different methods of estimating future growth. CATOS [California Conifer Output Simulator] and a growth prediction from the yield tables contained in the document titled, "Preliminary Yield Tables for Second Growth Stands in the California Pine Region", Technical Bulletin Number 354. This document was published in June of 1933. CACTOS was developed by the Northern California Forest Yield Cooperative, Meerchaert and Wensel, et al, in the mid to late 1980's.

CDF has concluded from reading the NTMP's that 600 to 800 board feet per year per acre is the sawlog productivity for over 2,000 acres of the subject property. The following considerations should be made in evaluating this claim:

..... How many acres will be contained in the open space areas?

..... The CACTOS projection included an estimate of current growth with one five-year growth projection. It is not clear as to whether hardwood board foot volume was included in the growth projection.

..... Bulletin Number 354 was referenced as providing an estimate that the subject property was capable of producing between 600 and 800 board per acre per year. While the CACTOS projections were supported by a substantial amount of supporting documentation, the Bulletin 354 projection was not.

..... The Yield tables in Bulletin 354 are derived from a sample of selected plots in cut-over land with varied forest structure and composition in the 1920's and 1930's. From this sample, forest structure and composition estimates of future volume are made given a rating of the quality of the growing site. This is typically called a site index. Or, range of site indexes called site I, II, III etc.

..... The yield tables are heavily weighted on the assumption of the density and composition of average conifer stands which consists of ponderosa and sugar pine, Douglas-fir and white fir. Incense cedar is treated in the yield table construction as a minor species with compositions of 10 percent and less. The area of the NTMP identified for 600 to 800 board feet of growth per acre per year contains hardwoods and incense cedar both reported in excess of 30 percent. The influence that hardwoods have on the growth rates of conifers was not discussed in Bulletin 394; hence, the growth projections used may not apply.

..... To measure the productivity of a given property after conversion from a mixed forest of conifer and hardwood to entirely conifer is not a measure of a practical constrained management policy where a variety of related values are given importance. While making this type of assumption produces some great productivity numbers, the reality of constrained optimization is a reduction in conifer timber production in-lieu of enhancing other values such as wildlife habitat and recreation.

In closing, it is generally accepted that the entire Foresthill Divide contains good forest soils. These soils are capable of producing a series of periodic harvests. The current forest structure and composition is not the same forest structure and composition that existed at the time of the preparation of the NTMP's or THP 97-070. Drawing future volume conclusions from Bulletin 394 yield tables is interesting; however, it is not recommended because of the unknown competitive influence on future growth from hardwoods that are a significant part of the past and present stands. Changing the forest mix is speculative at best and improbable given the constraints imposed by other considerations such as wildlife habitat and recreation. Even if such a conversion were to occur, it is questionable if there would be any local mills which could accept sawlogs in 30 years time.

Should you have any question, please feel contact me at any time.

Respectfully,

Andrew D. Funk

Andrew D. Funk
Professional Forester
Calif. Reg. Number 2260
Exp. 7/1/02

.cc: Barbara Ryan
Donald Ryan
Douglas Ryan
Michael Ryan
CDF, Gary Brittner
file