7. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (PLN)				X
8. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (PLN)				X

Discussion- Item IV-1, 2, 5:
The project area contains species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status plant or wildlife species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, or birds protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

The Sheridan townsite is developed with residential, commercial, industrial, park, public and semi-public areas. Relatively undisturbed and natural areas exist outside of the townsite including two conservation/mitigation banks. The proposed project involves regulatory and policy changes and does not include any physical development. However, buildout as facilitated by the Plan permits additional industrial and commercial uses west of Sheridan Lincoln Boulevard on vacant or underdeveloped parcels.

The Plan area also contains a variety of natural habitats, which could include several candidates, sensitive or special status species that are known to, or would likely, occur in the Sheridan vicinity. Special-status species that have the potential to occur in the Sheridan area include the Conservancy fairy shrimp, vernal pool fairy shrimp, vernal pool tadpole shrimp, and western spadefoot. Grasslands and agricultural fields provide foraging opportunities for raptors, such as northern harrier, white-tailed kite and Swainson's hawk. Loss of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat would be considered significant if the proposed project may result in 1) nest abandonment, 2) loss of young and 3) reduced health and vigor of eggs and/or nestlings and, therefore, result in the incidental death of nestling or fledgling Swainson's hawk.

Several special-status aquatic species occur or are likely to occur in the Plan area. Community Plan policies require discretionary projects to avoid and minimize impacts to jurisdictional wetlands including vernal pools. Any development would be subject to individual County determination of project consistency with the Zoning Ordinance, Community Plan, environmental review, and other State and Federal regulations.

When impacts do occur on jurisdictional wetlands, Plan policies ensure that projects will result in no net loss of waters of the U.S. Requirements include impact avoidance such as adjustments to the project footprint and design features necessary to completely or better avoid special status plants and animals, impact minimization, and/or compensatory mitigation for the impact, as determined in the CWA Section 404/401 permits and a Streambed Alteration Agreement.

The County's Use Permit process, the County's protocol for assessing and addressing critical habitat and species presence on sites proposed for development, and adherence to, and coordination with, existing state and federal species protection regulations, is expected to result in less than significant impacts to the critical vernal pool and Swainson's hawk habitat at the time of future development.

The Land Use Diagram of the Community Plan proposes rezoning 25.4 acres of grassland from Farm to Business Park, and 33.6 acres of grassland from Farm to Industrial Park along Wind Flower Place. The Plan contains goals and policies that protect the sensitive species and habitats. Specifically, Natural Resource Policy #1: "The natural resources and features of a site proposed for development shall be one of the planning factors determining the scope and magnitude of development," Policy #3: Identify and preserve any rare, significant, or endangered environmental features and conditions," and Policy #4: "Site-specific surveys shall be required prior to development to delineate wetlands and vernal pools in the Sheridan Community Plan area." The implementation of these measures will ensure there is no impact to sensitive species and habitats.

Discussion- Item IV-3:
There are significant oak woodlands in the eastern portion of the Plan area. The Sheridan Community Plan update does not propose any changes to existing land use or zoning designations nor does it propose changes to the existing goals or policies which could increase the number of housing units, the potential population, or increase the intensity of nonresidential uses in this area. Future projects will need to comply with the County's Tree Preservation Ordinance and PRC 21083.4 and mitigate for oak woodland impacts as required. Where land use changes are proposed, no oak woodlands or individual oak trees are present.

Discussion- Item IV-4, 6:
The proposed Community Plan is a land use policy document and does not grant entitlements for any projects. Furthermore, the Plan contains goals and policies that protect the environment and wildlife habitats and corridors. Specifically, Natural Resource Policy #6: "All stream influence areas, including floodplains and riparian vegetation areas, shall be retained in their natural condition, while allowing for limited stream crossings for public roads, trails, and utilities."

Discussion- Item IV-7:
Future development projects will be scrutinized for potential impacts during the project review proceedings which are neither defined nor altered in the draft Community Plan. At that time, reviewing agencies will determine on a case-by-case basis whatever and which conditions are necessary to mitigate potential environmental impacts, should any be identified through that review. Future projects will need to comply with the County's Tree Preservation Ordinance and other policies such as stream setback requirements that protect biological resources.

Portions of the Plan area, most notably the area along Karchner Road, contain oak woodlands. The Community Plan contains goals and policies specific to protecting sensitive natural habitat areas. Specifically, Natural Resources Policy #13 calls for protection of "sensitive habitats such as wetlands, riparian areas, and oak woodlands against any significant disruption or degradation of habitat values".

Discussion- Item IV-8:
The Sheridan Community Plan Update provides discussions in the Natural Resources and the Open Space chapters on the following topics: fish and wildlife, vegetation, wetlands, conservation planning, oak woodlands, and Conservation Space Implementation. The Community Plan update also describes the County's attempt to develop its own habitat conservation plan and natural communities conservation plan known as the Placer County Conservation Plan (PCCP), which is intended to provide a broad scale, multi-species conservation plan in association with watershed and wetlands protection. The PCCP, now in draft form, is designed to manage growth by balancing habitat preservation with economic development and population growth. The PCCP is expected to be implemented in 2015.

State, federal and local standards and guidelines related to the preservation and protection of biological resources will reduce future development impacts. No mitigation measures are required.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

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

Discussion- Item V, 1:
The Cultural Resources chapter includes an extensive history discussion, a summary of the California Laws protecting cultural resources, and a summary of the Sheridan historical resources that were identified in a Historical, Architectural, and Archeological survey of unincorporated Placer County that was completed in 1992.

There are no structures or sites in the Plan area currently listed on the National Register of Historic Places or the California State Register. While archaeological resources may exist, they are not readily known. Archeological resources are identified on a project-specific basis. Doing so is part of the development application process and part of future applicant's responsibilities.

A significant impact on historical resources would occur if the proposed project would cause demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the character-defining features of a significant historical resource. In practice, actions that would cause the loss of integrity, causing a historical resource to lose its significance, would be considered adverse.

Discussion- Item V-2:
Without specific data on the location and type of new development, it is not possible to determine potential impacts to cultural archeological resources. The proposed updated Community Plan does not involve revisions to the development standards that would impact cultural or historical resources and adds protection to existing cultural resources. Cultural Resources Policy #2 emphasizes "protection and stabilization of existing cultural resource sites and features over removal or replacement." Policy #3 encourages "retention, integration, and adaptive reuse of significant historical resources." The Community Design chapter Policy #11 encourages the "preservation of historic and/or unique, culturally and architecturally significant buildings" and has a lengthy discussion on the need to preserve the Sheridan Cash Store at 5740 13th Street as an anchor to the commercial street's revitalization.

Discussion- Item V-3:
While paleontological resources may exist in the Plan area, they are not readily known. Paleontological resources are identified and considered on a project-specific basis. Doing so is part of the development application process and part of future applicants' responsibilities.

Discussion- Item V-4:
The adoption of the Community Plan will not have the potential to cause a physical change which will affect unique ethnic cultural values.

Discussion- Item V-5:
The proposed project will also not restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the Plan area.

Review of new development(s) will permit an analysis of how such development may potentially conflict with cultural resources. Adherence to applicable County, State, and Federal standards and guidelines related to the protection/preservation of cultural resources, as well as the requirements mandated during the environmental review of individual projects will eliminate potential impacts related to cultural resources. No mitigation measures are required.

VI. GEOLOGY & SOILS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Expose people or structures to unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures? (ESD)				X
2. Result in significant disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcrowding of the soil? (ESD)				X
3. Result in substantial change in topography or ground surface relief features? (ESD)				X
4. Result in the destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features? (ESD)				X
5. Result in any significant increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site? (ESD)				X
6. Result in changes in deposition or erosion or changes in siltation which may modify the channel of a river, stream, or lake? (ESD)				X

7. Result in exposure of people or property to geologic and geomorphological (i.e. Avalanches) hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards? (ESD)				X
8. Be located on a geological unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse? (ESD)				X
9. Be located on expansive soils, as defined in Section 1802.3.2 of the California Building Code (2007), creating substantial risks to life or property? (ESD)				X

Discussion- All Items:
The Geology and Soils sections of the Natural Resources chapter includes an in-depth discussion on soil hazards, soil types, geologic formations, and seismicity. The Health and Safety chapter includes an expanded discussion on seismic safety.

The Community Plan is a land use policy document and does not entail any grading in the community and sets goals and policies that would guide future land disturbance in the community to minimize impacts on the natural topography. Buildout of the project area is expected to primarily involve grading for roads, and building pads for residential and non-residential structures. Given the existing topographic character of the area that will see higher-density development (i.e., the townsite), such grading would typically involve minor topographic changes.

The project does not authorize specific development projects for specific sites. Potential geologic impacts associated with new construction would vary on a project-by-project basis. The Plan area generally consists of flat to gently rolling terrain lacking unique geologic features. As future development would primarily be limited to individual structures on large lots, it would not be expected to involve any substantial topographic changes.

Placer County requires that water quality treatment facilities/Best Management Practices (BMPs) be designed according to the guidance of the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks for Construction, for New Development/Redevelopment, and for industrial and commercial (or other similar sources as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Division such as the Stormwater Quality Design Manual for the Sacramento and South Placer Regions).

Each future development project would be subject to separate environmental review at the time a specific development proposal is made, and project-specific geologic constraints (e.g., potential for fault rupture, ground shaking, ground failure, subsidence, expansive soils) would be evaluated at that time. Individual projects will be evaluated and conditions imposed to ensure compliance with the County's grading ordinance and BMP requirements.

There is no impact to geology and soils and mitigation measures are not required.

VII. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine handling, transport, use, or disposal of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials? (EHS)				X
2. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (EHS)				X
3. Emit hazardous emissions, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (APCD)				X

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

Discussion- Items VII-1, 2, 3, 4:
The future development pursuant to the proposed land use designations would include residential, retail, highway service, and commercial uses that may use some cleaning and other janitorial materials similar to those used by current uses in the Plan area. These uses will not include or result in substantial sources of toxics that may impact schools. The project area is not known to be on a list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. No substantial impacts related to hazardous materials or substances are anticipated.

The project area is served by existing public streets, and the individual future new development will not block access to any of those streets. No adverse effect on emergency evacuation or emergency evacuation plans is anticipated. All future development within the project area will comply with all pertinent Building, Fire, and Safety Codes, and individual project plans will be reviewed by County departments as well as by CAL FIRE. Compliance with existing requirements will ensure no impact.

Discussion- Items VII-5, 6:
The Sheridan Community Plan area does not have a public airport or public use airport nor is it located within two miles of a public or public use airport. Therefore, there will be no impact.

Discussion- Items VII-7, 8, 9:
CAL FIRE has adopted Fire Hazard Severity Zone maps for areas of California where the state has responsibility for fire suppression efforts. The Plan area east of Sheridan Lincoln Boulevard is located in the High Fire Hazard Severity Zone.

Buildout of the plan area would introduce new residential units and commercial space into the existing high fire hazard area on vacant parcels and on existing parcels large enough to be split into one or more new lot(s) and subsequently developed with a new unit under existing zone.

The County and CAL FIRE have standards for roads and driveways, fire hydrant spacing and flow rates, stored water fire protection systems, automatic fire sprinkler systems, automatic alarm systems, and vegetation management, etc. In addition, County Building Code sets standards for building construction in high fire hazard areas including roof covering, protection of eaves, exterior walls, wood columns, etc.

Adoption of the Community Plan will not create new health hazards or expose people to existing health hazards. There is no impact from Hazards and Hazardous Material and no mitigation measures are required.

VIII. HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Violate any potable water quality standards? (EHS)				X
2. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lessening of local groundwater supplies (i.e. the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? (EHS)				X
3. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area? (ESD)				X
4. Increase the rate or amount of surface runoff? (ESD)				X
5. Create or contribute runoff water which would include substantial additional sources of polluted water? (ESD)				X
6. Otherwise substantially degrade surface water quality?(ESD)				X
7. Otherwise substantially degrade ground water quality? (EHS)				X
8. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? (ESD)				X
9. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area improvements which would impede or redirect flood flows? (ESD)				X
10. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? (ESD)				X
11. Alter the direction or rate of flow of groundwater? (EHS)				X
12. Impact the watershed of important surface water resources, including but not limited to Lake Tahoe, Folsom Lake, Hell Hole Reservoir, Rock Creek Reservoir, Sugar Pine Reservoir, French Meadows Reservoir, Combie Lake, and Rollins Lake? (EHS, ESD)				X

Discussion- Item VIII-1:
Adoption of the Plan will not violate any potable water quality standards as there is not a new potable water supply proposed with this project.

Discussion- Item VIII-2:
The project will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies as it does not propose construction of new groundwater sources. All future development will be subject to site-specific environmental studies as determined appropriate by the County and will comply with all applicable County policies related to hydrology and water quality. The Plan encourages the use of Best Management Practices to achieve a "best fit" of design and technology to promote environmentally sustainable development.

Discussion- Items VIII-3, 4, 5, 6, 7:
Development must be found consistent with County policies to be approved including the Grading Ordinance which outlines Best Management Practices for new grading, excavations, fills, cuts, borrow pits, stockpiling, compaction of fill

and land reclamation projects. Each future development project would be subject to separate environmental review at the time a specific development proposal is made, and project-specific hydrologic impacts (e.g. changes in drainage patterns, increased surface runoff, flood hazards, water quality degradation) would be evaluated at that time.

Discussion- Items VIII-8, 9:
The Plan area is located within the Bear River watershed. Yankee Slough runs east to west south of the townsite. 100-year floodplains are located along the Bear River north of Camp Far West Road and along Yankee Slough, south of Dalbey Road, west of N. Dowd Road. The Community Plan does not grant entitlements for any projects. Future development projects in these areas will require compliance with County Code requirements for setbacks and other measures to avoid flood hazard impacts, as well as County policies that discourage development in flood prone areas. Specifically Natural Resource Policy #9 states: "New construction shall not be permitted within 100 feet of the centerline of permanent streams and 50 feet of intermittent streams, or within the 100 year floodplain, whichever is greater."

Discussion- Item VIII-10:
The adoption of the Community Plan does not approve any projects in areas prone to flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion- Item VIII-11:
Future projects outside of the townsite are likely to utilize groundwater as the source for its water supply needs. Due to the low-density, low-intensity uses anticipated for these areas, there will be no impact to the direction or rate of flow of groundwater.

Discussion- Item VIII-12:
Best Management Practices (BMPs) are required by the Placer County Engineering and Surveying Division during construction of future projects in the Plan area. There will be no impact to surface water resources and no mitigation is required.

IX. LAND USE & PLANNING – Would the project:

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

Discussion- item IX-1:
The adoption of the Community Plan will not physically divide an established community. The proposed Plan area expansion will merge two areas of the County that were covered by either the Sheridan General Plan or Placer County General Plan.

Discussion- items IX-2, 3, 4:
The draft Community Plan is primarily a regulatory document that seeks to manage growth and its adoption does not grant entitlements for any projects. The Plan does not change residential land use designations outlined in the Land Use section. Detached residences and Live-Work Unis would be permitted in the Town Center Commercial combining district along with the multi-family residential that is currently allowed in this area.

The Plan and Land Use Map are consistent with the proposed Placer County Conservation Plan. In order to achieve consistency between land use and zoning as required by California law, the Plan contains a zoning consistency section and the project includes a Zoning Consistency Ordinance.

Discussion- items IX-5, 7:
The Sheridan Community Plan includes an area of 14,958.5 acres. 1,453 acres (9.7 percent of Plan area) are proposed for rezoning through the Zoning Consistency Ordinance. Of the rezoned acres, 1,347 (92.7 percent of rezoned acreage) will be rezoned to Open Space. 33 acres would be downzoned from Industrial Park to Farm. 66 acres would be rezoned from Farm to Industrial/Business Park or Highway Service. 5.3 acres would receive a Town Center Commercial combining district designation.

Fifty-five acres of Farmland of Local Importance along Wind Flower Place are proposed for rezoning and could be converted to industrial uses. These two properties are not currently farmed or grazed and are located immediately adjacent to the townsite. This is considered to have no significant impact.

Discussion- items IX-6, 8:
The proposed project will not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community. Adoption of the Community Plan will not cause economic or social changes that would result in significant adverse physical changes to the environment such as urban decay or deterioration. Goals and policies in the Plan encourage infill development and revitalization of the existing Sheridan townsite.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project result in:

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

Discussion- All Items:
Adopting the Community Plan will not by itself substantially result in the loss of the availability of mineral resources, particularly petroleum resources. All future development proposals in the Plan area will be analyzed for specific project impacts to mineral resources.

The Sheridan Community Plan update added a discussion on Mineral Resources. There is one active quarry site along the Bear River and one proposed immediately south of the Plan area. The project does not permit any deep excavation or grading activities that could potentially affect mineral resources in the Plan area. Therefore, adoption of the Community Plan will not by itself substantially result in the loss of the availability of mineral resources, including petroleum resources. There would be no impact to Mineral Resources and no mitigation measures are required.

XI. NOISE – Would the project result in:

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

Discussion- Items XI-1, 2, 3:
The Highway 65 bypass runs through the western portion of the Plan area as does a single-track Union Pacific rail line. Both are considered sources of noise for the project area. Future projects proposed near high noise sources must comply with existing County codes and policies, including the County Noise Ordinance (Article 9.36 of the County Code).

There are noise sensitive uses located in Sheridan including the Sheridan Elementary School. The Community Plan does not grant entitlements for the development of sensitive uses and will not result in the direct increase in ambient noise levels affecting sensitive land uses. Future projects will be required to meet current noise standards and comply with the County Noise Ordinance.

The Plan contains goals and policies to address noise. Specifically, Noise policy #3: "Avoid the interface of noise-producing and noise-sensitive land uses" and #5: "The County shall employ procedures to ensure that noise mitigation measures required pursuant to an acoustical analysis are implemented in the project review process and, as may be determined necessary, through the building permit process."

Discussion- Items XI-4, 5:
The Sheridan Community Plan area does not have a public airport or public use airport nor is it located within two miles of a public or public use airport. Therefore, there will be no impact and no mitigation measures are required.

XII. POPULATION & HOUSING – Would the project:

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

elsewhere? (PLN)				

Discussion- Item XII-1:
Adoption of the Community Plan does not grant entitlements for any projects and does not change existing residential land use designations. The plan aims to direct anticipated natural growth in the population into areas that are already developed and contain existing infrastructure as depicted in the proposed Land Use Map and corresponding policies. Potential development is restricted in relatively undeveloped areas due to large lot size requirements where there is less existing infrastructure.

Discussion- Item XII-2:
The project sets forth programs and policies to facilitate housing conservation and maintenance and therefore has the potential to improve the quality of the existing housing stock within the community. The Plan also contains programs and policies to address the community's future housing needs by encouraging housing that provides diversity in type and price. No aspect of the project involves the displacement of any number of people.

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

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

Discussion- All Items:
Future development in the Plan area will result in additional demand for public services through the following providers: CAL FIRE provides fire protection services to the project area; the Placer County Sheriff's Department provides police protection services; the Department of Public Works is responsible for maintaining county roads; County Sewer Maintenance District 6 for sewage disposal and water service within the townsite, and Western Placer Unified School District. Future development will contribute to the maintenance of public facilities including roads and recreational through mechanisms adopted by the Sheridan Community Plan.

All future development will be subject to site-specific environmental studies as determined appropriate by the County, and will comply with all applicable County policies and regulation related to public services.

XIV. RECREATION – Would the project result in:

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

Discussion- Item XIV-1:
The Sheridan Community Plan update does not propose any changes to existing residential land use or zoning designations nor does it propose any changes to the existing goals or policies which could increase the number of housing units or the potential population within the Plan area. There would be a negligible increase in the use of existing recreational areas as a result of build-out of the Plan area.

Discussion- Item XIV-2:
The Parks and Recreation chapter includes a history of recreational planning, an inventory of existing facilities, pathways and trails maps, and a discussion on the Sheridan Parks and Recreation District. There are no additional recreational facilities anticipated besides expanded trails and bikeways. No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Discussion- Items XVI-1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7:
The Sheridan Community Plan update does not propose an increase in Plan area population beyond what is allowed under current zoning. No new roads are proposed. Future development project-specific traffic impacts (e.g., level of service operation, access or circulation issues, provision of appropriate pedestrian and bicycle facilities, reduction or removal of hazards or safety concerns) would be evaluated when such proposed project plans are submitted to the County. Measures have been integrated into the Community Plan in the form of goals and policies to ensure that there is no impact to local traffic and parking.

The Circulation chapter includes a discussion on a new state requirement entitled "The California Complete Streets Act". Complete streets are designed and operated to enable safe access for all users including pedestrians, bicyclist, motorists, and transit riders. State law requires that any substantial revision to the Community Plan to incorporate the Complete Street concept. The Community Plan includes goals and policies supporting alternative transportation methods.

Discussion- Item XVI-8:
The Sheridan Community Plan area does contain or propose a public airport or public use airport. Since the Sheridan Community Plan update does not propose changes which could increase the number of housing units or the potential population within the plan area, there will not be an increase in demand for air transportation. Therefore, there will not be an impact to existing air traffic patterns.

XVI. UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

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

Discussion All Items:
The Community Plan is a policy document that does not grant entitlements for any project. Plan density ranges are contingent on adequate service capacities. The County requires that proponents of new development demonstrate that adequate wastewater disposal and water supplies are available to service the proposed development during subsequent project level environmental review.

The proposed Community Plan contains goals and policies to ensure that infrastructure and utilities are adequate to support future development projects. Recent upgrades within the Sheridan Community Service Area allows for 82 additional equivalent dwelling unit connections to the water and waste water system. Public Services policy #1 allows

"annexations into the sewer service areas to developments where public connection to sanitary sewer systems can be provided."

Much of the new development in the Plan area is anticipated to occur in areas within the Sheridan Community Service Area. Elsewhere, implementation of land uses under the Land Use Diagram would increase groundwater usage in the Plan area and require new wells and septic systems.

It is impossible to accurately determine utility and service system requirements of future development west of Sheridan Lincoln Boulevard on industrial or highway service properties. New development in the –UP combining districts west of Sheridan Lincoln Boulevard will be required to demonstrate adequate wastewater and water facilities as part of the Use Permit process. Future utility and service system needs in these areas will be evaluated on an ongoing basis as each new development is proposed. Intensive new development at these sites may be required to connect to the Community Service Area at developer expense.

All onsite septic systems would need to comply with County regulations, which require applicants to demonstrate sufficient space and soil absorptive capacity is available to properly dispose of all sewage effluent.

Projects proposed in areas using individual water wells must comply with County codes and policies including the County's Environmental Health Division's standards for private wells. Future development outside of the townsite will require private sewage disposal systems or expansion of the Community Service Area.

The incremental buildout of the Plan area would not create a substantial impact to landfill capacity. There is sufficient capacity at the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill to accommodate the Plan area's solid waste disposal needs.

XVII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:

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

Discussion- Item XVII-1:
The Sheridan Community Plan, the Zoning Consistency Ordinance, and the Zoning Text Amendments do not authorize specific development projects for specific sites. Construction-level, project-specific information is not known, including construction phases, start dates, end dates, project size, and no specific projects are proposed as part of the Community Plan update. Therefore, construction-related greenhouse gas emissions cannot be quantified at this time. Construction-related greenhouse gas emissions would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis for future projects that are subject to CEQA review.

Air quality mitigation policies in the Community Plan require that future projects within the Plan area that are subject to CEQA review incorporate mitigations to lessen any potential environmental impacts to less than significant. Air Quality policy #1 requires that "project air quality impacts are quantified using analysis methods and significance thresholds as recommended by the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD)." Air Quality policy #2 requires that "projects which may have potential air quality impacts mitigate any of its anticipated emissions which exceed allowable emissions as established by the PCAPCD."

With these policies, the Community Plan is consistent with applicable greenhouse gas reduction plans, policies and regulations.

Discussion- Item XVII-2:
The Natural Resources chapter was expanded to contain a separate section on Air Quality and expanded the goals and policies as recommended by the Placer County Air Pollution Control District for new development. The Natural Resources chapter was also expanded to include a discussion on climate change.

The proposed Plan also contains goals and policies that have the potential co-benefit of offsetting GHG emissions of future development. For example, Circulation policies #12 and #14 incorporate "Complete Street" infrastructure and design and cycling facilities into rehabilitation and reconstruction of existing roadways to create a safe and inviting environment for all users and encouraging alternative modes of transportation to vehicles. Community Design policy #12 will "allow for a mix of uses (office, commercial, residential, and live/units) along 13th Street" to assist in the provision of services and retail to town residents, thereby reducing vehicle trips to neighboring communities and in turn reducing GHG emissions.

Currently, there is no comprehensive greenhouse gas reduction plan in place for the community or Placer County. In absence of an adopted plan, future projects will be evaluated against State and regional plans. Air Quality section policies #2 and #5 require that future projects mitigate any of its anticipated emissions which exceed allowable emissions established by the PCAPCD and work with the County and PCAPCD to reduce particulate emissions from project construction, grading, excavation, demolition, and other sources. Policy #4 encourages innovative mitigation measures and approaches to reduce air quality impacts by coordinating with the PCAPCD, project applicants, and other interested parties.

With implementation of standard County and PCAPCD requirements, there will be no conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. No mitigation measures are required.

E. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

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

Discussion- Item E-1:
The Community Plan is a policy document intended as a guide to decision-makers in meeting the County's and community's objectives over the next twenty five years. Accordingly, the Sheridan Community Plan, the Zoning Consistency Ordinance, and the Zoning Text Amendments do not authorize specific development projects for specific sites. Future projects undertaken in the course of implementing the goals, policies, and vision found in the Plan will be subject to project-specific environmental review in accordance with Section 10562 et seq. of the CEQA Guidelines. Furthermore, the Community Plan contains goals, policies, standards and programs that protect the environment and wildlife habitats and corridors.

Discussion- Item E-2:
The proposed Community Plan entails minimal changes to land use and zoning to certain areas of the community within or adjacent to the townsite while maintaining currently allowable development in other parts of the community. Overall, there is minimal change proposed in the types of uses allowed in the community and no increase in allowable residential units. The application of the Plan's goals, policies, standards and programs, as enumerated above, will insure that the minor changes in land use mitigate any potential impact to a less than significant level. The changes are anticipated to be implemented very slowly over 25 years. Further, the Plan contains goals and policies to limit

environmental impacts including the promotion of conservation and the zoning of 1,347 acres of land Open Space due to its value as permanently protected natural habitat.

Discussion- Item E-3:
Adoption of the Plan would not result in a change in potential adverse effects on human beings in comparison to the impact of not updating the Community Plan. Furthermore, the Community Plan includes goals, policies, and a land use map that restrict development in areas that could cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.

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

☐ California Department of Fish and Wildlife	☐ Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)
☐ California Department of Forestry	☐ National Marine Fisheries Service
☐ California Department of Health Services	☐ Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
☐ California Department of Toxic Substances	☐ U.S. Army Corp of Engineers
☒ California Department of Transportation	☐ U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
☐ California Integrated Waste Management Board	☐ _____
☐ California Regional Water Quality Control Board	☐ _____

G. DETERMINATION – The Environmental Review Committee finds that:

There **WILL NOT** be a significant effect on the environment. A **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

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

Planning Services Division, Christopher Schmidt, Chairperson
Planning Services Division, Air Quality, Lisa Carnahan
Engineering and Surveying Department, Rebecca Taber
Department of Public Works, Transportation, Andrew Gaber
Environmental Health Services, Laura Rath
Flood Control Districts, Andrew Darrow
Facility Services, Parks, Andy Fisher
Placer County Fire/CDF, Mike DiMaggio

Signature _____ Date December 30, 2013
E.J. Ivaldi, Environmental Coordinator

I. SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:

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

County Documents		☒ Community Plan(s)
		☒ Environmental Review Ordinance
		☒ General Plan
		☒ Grading Ordinance
		☒ Land Development Manual
		☐ Land Division Ordinance
		☐ Stormwater Management Manual
		☒ Tree Ordinance
		☒ 2033 Housing Element
Trustee Agency Documents		☐ Department of Toxic Substances Control
		☐ _____
		☐ _____
Site-Specific Studies	Planning Department	☐ Acoustical Analysis
		☐ Biological Study
		☐ Cultural Resources Pedestrian Survey
		☐ Cultural Resources Records Search
		☐ Lighting and Photometric Plan
		☐ Paleontological Survey
		☐ Tree Survey and Arborist Report
		☐ Visual Impact Analysis
		☐ Wetland Delineation
		☐ _____
		☐ _____
	Engineering & Surveying Department, Flood Control District	☐ Phasing Plan
		☐ Preliminary Grading Plan
		☐ Preliminary Geotechnical Report
		☐ Preliminary Drainage Report
		☐ Stormwater and Surface Water Quality BMP Plan
		☐ Traffic Study
		☐ Sewer Pipeline Capacity Analysis
		☐ Placer County Commercial/Industrial Waste Survey (where public sewer is available)
		☐ Sewer Master Plan
		☐ Utility Plan
		☐ _____
		☐ _____
	Environmental Health Services	☐ Groundwater Contamination Report
		☐ Hydro-Geological Study
		☐ Phase I Environmental Site Assessment

		☐ Soils Screening
		☐ Preliminary Endangerment Assessment
		☐ _____
		☐ _____
	Air Pollution Control District	☐ CALINE4 Carbon Monoxide Analysis
		☐ Construction Emission and Dust Control Plan
		☐ Geotechnical Report (for naturally occurring asbestos)
		☐ Health Risk Assessment
		☐ URBEMIS Model Output
		☐ _____
		☐ _____
	Fire Department	☐ Emergency Response and/or Evacuation Plan
		☐ Traffic and Circulation Plan
		☐ _____
	Mosquito Abatement District	☐ Guidelines and Standards for Vector Prevention in Proposed Developments
		☐ _____

STATE OF CALIFORNIA EDMUND G. BROWN JR., *Governor*

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
320 WEST 4TH STREET, SUITE 500
LOS ANGELES, CA 90013
(213) 576-7083

January 17, 2014

Mr. Maywan Krach
County of Placer
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190
Auburn, California 95603

Dear Maywan:

SUBJECT: SCH 2013122066 Placer County, Sheridan Community Plan Update - DND

The California Public Utilities Commission (Commission) has jurisdiction over the safety of highway-rail crossings (crossings) in California. The California Public Utilities Code requires Commission approval for the construction or alteration of crossings and grants the Commission exclusive power on the design, alteration, and closure of crossings in California. The Commission Rail Crossings Engineering Section (RCES) is in receipt of the draft *Negative Declaration (DND)* for the proposed County of Placer (County) Sheridan Community Plan Update Project.

The project area includes active railroad tracks. RCES recommends that the County add language to the Sheridan Community Plan Update so that any future development adjacent to or near the railroad right-of-way (ROW) is planned with the safety of the rail corridor in mind. New developments may increase traffic volumes not only on streets and at intersections, but also at at-grade crossings. This includes considering pedestrian circulation patterns or destinations with respect to railroad ROW and compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Mitigation measures to consider include, but are not limited to, the planning for grade separations for major thoroughfares, improvements to existing at-grade crossings due to increase in traffic volumes, and continuous vandal resistant fencing or other appropriate barriers to limit the access of trespassers onto the railroad ROW.

If you have any questions in this matter, please contact me at (213) 576-7076, ykc@cpuc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Ken Chiang, P.E.
Utilities Engineer
Rail Crossings Engineering Section
Safety and Enforcement Division

C: State Clearinghouse

CALIFORNIA
Water Boards

EDMUND G. BROWN JR.
GOVERNOR

MATTHEW RODRIQUEZ
SECRETARY FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board

24 January 2014

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

CERTIFIED MAIL
7013 1710 0002 3644 0472

COMMENTS TO NOTICE OF INTENT FOR THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION, SHERIDAN COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE (PGPA 20130025) PROJECT, SCH NO. 2013122066, PLACER COUNTY

Pursuant to the State Clearinghouse's 31 December 2013 request, the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Central Valley Water Board) has reviewed the *Notice of Intent for the Negative Declaration* for the Sheridan Community Plan Update (PGPA 20130025) Project, located in Placer County.

Our agency is delegated with the responsibility of protecting the quality of surface and groundwaters of the state; therefore our comments will address concerns surrounding those issues.

Construction Storm Water General Permit

Dischargers whose project disturb one or more acres of soil or where projects disturb less than one acre but are part of a larger common plan of development that in total disturbs one or more acres, are required to obtain coverage under the General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activities (Construction General Permit), Construction General Permit Order No. 2009-009-DWQ. Construction activity subject to this permit includes clearing, grading, grubbing, disturbances to the ground, such as stockpiling, or excavation, but does not include regular maintenance activities performed to restore the original line, grade, or capacity of the facility. The Construction General Permit requires the development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP).

For more information on the Construction General Permit, visit the State Water Resources Control Board website at:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/constpermits.shtml.

Phase I and II Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permits[1]

The Phase I and II MS4 permits require the Permittees reduce pollutants and runoff flows from new development and redevelopment using Best Management Practices (BMPs) to the maximum extent practicable (MEP). MS4 Permittees have their own development standards, also known as Low Impact Development (LID)/post-construction standards that include a hydromodification component. The MS4 permits also require specific design concepts for LID/post-construction BMPs in the early stages of a project during the entitlement and CEQA process and the development plan review process.

For more information on which Phase I MS4 Permit this project applies to, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/storm_water/municipal_permits/.

For more information on the Phase II MS4 permit and who it applies to, visit the State Water Resources Control Board at:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/phase_ii_municipal.shtml

Industrial Storm Water General Permit

Storm water discharges associated with industrial sites must comply with the regulations contained in the Industrial Storm Water General Permit Order No. 97-03-DWQ.

For more information on the Industrial Storm Water General Permit, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/storm_water/industrial_general_permits/index.shtml.

Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit

If the project will involve the discharge of dredged or fill material in navigable waters or wetlands, a permit pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act may be needed from the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE). If a Section 404 permit is required by the USACOE, the Central Valley Water Board will review the permit application to ensure that discharge will not violate water quality standards. If the project requires surface water drainage realignment, the applicant is advised to contact the Department of Fish and Game for information on Streambed Alteration Permit requirements.

If you have any questions regarding the Clean Water Act Section 404 permits, please contact the Regulatory Division of the Sacramento District of USACOE at (916) 557-5250.

---

[1] Municipal Permits = The Phase I Municipal Separate Storm Water System (MS4) Permit covers medium sized Municipalities (serving between 100,000 and 250,000 people) and large sized municipalities (serving over 250,000 people). The Phase II MS4 provides coverage for small municipalities, including non-traditional Small MS4s, which include military bases, public campuses, prisons and hospitals.