COUNTY OF PLACER
Community Development Resource Agency

Michael J. Johnson, AICP
Agency Director

ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATION SERVICES

Gina Langford, Coordinator

NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY

NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR PUBLIC REVIEW

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

PROJECT: **Emergency Shelters, Transitional Housing, Supportive Housing – Housing Element Implementation** (PZTA T20080448)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project proposes to revise the Placer County Code (Zoning Ordinance) to bring the Code into compliance with State housing law for emergency shelters, transitional housing, and supportive housing.

PROJECT LOCATION: Placer County

PROPONENT: Community Development Resource Agency, Planning Department, 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, 530-745-3000

The comment period for this document closes on **August 14, 2009**. A copy of the Negative Declaration is available for public review at the County's web site http://www.placer.ca.gov/Departments/CommunityDevelopment/EnvCoordSvcs/NegDec.aspx Community Development Resource Agency public counter; and at the Applegate, Auburn, Colfax, Foresthill, Granite Bay, Kings Beach, Lincoln, Rocklin, Roseville, Tahoe City, and Truckee Library. Additional information may be obtained by contacting the Environmental Coordination Services, at (530)745-3075 between the hours of 8:00 am and 5:00 pm at Community Development Resource Agency, 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603.

Newspaper: Auburn Journal, Monday, July 20, 2009
Roseville Press Tribune, Saturday, July 18, 2009
Sierra Sun, Wednesday, July 22, 2009

COUNTY OF PLACER
Community Development Resource Agency

Michael J. Johnson, AICP
Agency Director

ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATION SERVICES

Gina Langford, Coordinator

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

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

☒ The proposed project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment; therefore, it does not require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report and this **Negative Declaration** has been prepared.

☐ Although the proposed project could have a significant adverse effect on the environment, there will not be a significant adverse effect in this case because the project has incorporated specific provisions to reduce impacts to a less than significant level and/or the mitigation measures described herein have been added to the project. A **Mitigated Negative Declaration** has thus been prepared.

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

PROJECT INFORMATION

Title: Emergency Shelters, Transitional Housing, Supportive Housing – Housing Element Implementation	**Plus#** PZTA T20080448
Description: The project proposes to revise the Placer County Code (Zoning Ordinance) to bring the Code into compliance with State housing law for emergency shelters, transitional housing, and supportive housing.	
Location: Unincorporated Placer County	
Project Applicant: Planning Department, Community Development Resource Agency	
County Contact Person: Christopher Schmidt	530-745-3076

PUBLIC NOTICE

The comment period for this document closes on **August 14, 2009**. A copy of the Negative Declaration is available for public review at the County's web site:

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

at the Community Development Resource Agency public counter and at the Applegate, Auburn, Colfax, Foresthill, Granite Bay, Kings Beach, Lincoln, Rocklin, Roseville, Tahoe City, and Truckee Library. Additional information may be obtained by contacting the Environmental Coordination Services, at (530)745-3132 between the hours of 8:00 am and 4:00 pm at 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603. For Tahoe projects, please visit our Tahoe Office, 565 West Lake Blvd., Tahoe City, CA 96145.

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

COUNTY OF PLACER
Community Development Resource Agency

ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATION SERVICES

Michael J. Johnson, AICP
Agency Director

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

INITIAL STUDY & CHECKLIST (Revised)

The Initial Study & Checklist was posted for a 30-day public review from July 16, 2009 to August 17, 2009. Subsequent to the public posting period, comments were received resulting revisions and/or clarifications to the analysis/discussions in "Project Description", namely, the proposed allowable Emergency Shelters' capacity is now increased from 20 to 60 persons.

The above cited revision, made on September 8, 2010 does not constitute a "substantial revision" as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15073.5(b) and it has been determined that recirculation is not required (Section 15073.5(c)).

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

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

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

A. BACKGROUND:

Project Title: **Emergency Shelters, Transitional Housing, Supportive Housing – Housing Element Implementation**	Plus# PZTA T20080448
Entitlements: Zoning Text Amendment	
Site Area: n/a	APN: n/a
Location: Unincorporated Placer County	

Project Description:
The project proposes to revise the Placer County Code (Zoning Ordinance) to bring the Code into compliance with State housing law for emergency shelters, transitional housing, and supportive housing. The proposed Zoning Ordinance amendments will implement Housing Element Program G-2, and Program G-3. The amendments are summarized below and Attachment A provides specific language for the amendments.

The proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance would add a definition for Emergency Shelters, also known as homeless shelters and ancillary services. In addition, an amendment to the House of Worship definition is proposed to allow emergency shelters that provide humanitarian assistance as an accessory use (e.g., the Gathering Inn non-profit program).

The proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance would allow Emergency Shelters in five zoning districts consistent with Program G-3 of the Housing Element. The amendments propose that Emergency Shelters with a capacity of 60 persons or fewer would be allowed in the Residential Multi-family (RM) zoning district with Zoning Clearance, in the Neighborhood Commercial (C-1), Highway Service (HS) and Resort (RES) zoning districts with a Minor Use Permit and in the General Commercial (C-2), and Commercial Planned Development (CPD) zoning districts with a Conditional Use Permit. Shelters proposed to accommodate more than 60 persons would be allowed in the Residential Multi-family (RM), Neighborhood Commercial (C-1), General Commercial (C-2), Commercial Planned Development (CPD) and Highway Service (HS) zoning districts with a Conditional Use Permit.

The proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance would also add a new section for development standards designed to ensure the orderly development and/or conversion of facilities to Emergency Shelters. The standards include provisions for site development consistent with multi-family residential, on-site management, lighting, parking, hours of operation, and proximity to other Emergency Shelters. A summary of these standards is provided below.

- Emergency shelter programs must be three hundred (300) feet apart from another emergency shelter, or other similar program. A Minor Use Permit is required for any emergency shelter that is proposed within five hundred (500) feet from a school, or any zone where emergency shelters are not permitted.
- The emergency shelter must meet all building and housing codes and fire standards and comply with the business practices such as: one staff member must be present when the facility is open; buildings should have adequate security lighting; a 24-hour security phone number shall be posted at the entrance and be maintained: and set hours for client intake/discharge.
- Off-street parking must be provided based upon a demonstrated need; however, the parking standard shall not require more parking than for other residential or commercial uses within the same zone district. As a minimum standard, an emergency shelter shall provide one space for every ten adult beds, with one space designated for each employee. All parking is required to be off-street and on-site. Also, temporary residential shelters are encouraged to be located no more than one-half mile from an existing bus route, or to provide transportation between the facility and a transit corridor or bus line.

The proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance would also add a definition for Transitional Housing and Supportive Housing. In addition, the amendments will re-define residential care homes to provide further clarification on the use. This re-defining would change the definition to clarify residential care homes verses transitional and supportive housing.

No specific housing projects are approved as part of these zoning text amendments. In fact, these amendments, in themselves, would not directly result in changes to the physical environment (environmental effects). After the zoning text amendments are adopted, the County will evaluate specific housing development proposals based on their compliance with the General Plan, relevant Community Plans, Zoning Ordinance, and other ordinances. Additional environmental review of potential environmental effects in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act may be required prior to development of any specific special needs housing project.

Project Site: County-wide

B. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

Placer County is a geographically diverse county. While the western portion of the County contains suburbs of the Sacramento Region, the eastern portion lies within the Lake Tahoe Region. Placer County is one of the fastest growing counties in the state. Between 2000 and 2007, the County's population grew from 248,399 to 324,495. The 2009 Housing Element discuses and provides Programs G-2 and G-3 to address special needs housing for the County.

C. PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT:

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

Section 15168 relating to Program EIRs indicates that where subsequent activities involve site-specific operations, the agency should use a written checklist or similar device to document the evaluation of the site and

the activity, to determine whether the environmental effects of the operation were covered in the earlier Program EIR. A Program EIR is intended to provide the basis in an Initial Study for determining whether the later activity may have any significant effects. It will also be incorporated by reference to address regional influences, secondary effects, cumulative impacts, broad alternatives, and other factors that apply to the program as a whole.

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

- ➔ Placer County General Plan EIR

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

The above stated documents are available for review Monday through Friday, 8am to 5pm, at the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603. For Tahoe projects, the document will also be available in our Tahoe Division Office, 565 West Lake Blvd., Tahoe City, CA 96145.

D. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

a) A brief explanation is required for all answers including "No Impact" answers.

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

c) "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The County, as lead agency, must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level (mitigation measures from earlier analyses may be cross-referenced).

d) "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

e) All answers must take account of the entire action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts [CEQA Guidelines, Section 15063(a)(1)].

f) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, Program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration [CEQA Guidelines, Section 15063(c)(3)(D)]. A brief discussion should be attached addressing the following:

   - ➔ **Earlier analyses used** – Identify earlier analyses and state where they are available for review.
   - ➔ **Impacts adequately addressed** – Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of, and adequately analyzed in, an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards. Also, state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
   - ➔ **Mitigation measures** – For effects that are checked as "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

g) References to information sources for potential impacts (i.e. General Plans/Community Plans, zoning ordinances) should be incorporated into the checklist. Reference to a previously-prepared or outside document should include a reference to the pages or chapters where the statement is substantiated. A source list should be attached and other sources used, or individuals contacted, should be cited in the discussion.

I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:

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

Discussion- All Items:
The proposed amendments to the zoning ordinance would add a definition for emergency shelters, transitional housing and supportive housing but does not identify the location and type of new development. Therefore, it is not possible to anticipate how development of new special needs housing will potentially impact the existing visual character of unincorporated areas of the County. To ensure that significant impacts to aesthetic resources do not occur, future development of special needs housing uses will be in accordance with applicable County standards and guidelines, as well as the requirements mandated during the environmental review of individual projects.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCE – Would the project:

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

Discussion- All Items:
Adopting the zoning text amendment will not by itself convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract. A land inventory analysis undertaken in Section II of the Housing Element showed the County has sufficient properly zoned land capacity to accommodate any new special need housing.

2/

III. AIR QUALITY – Would the project:

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

Discussion- All Items:
The proposed zoning text amendments does not revise, replace or attempt to supersede existing standards and procedures to ensure compliance with State and County codes and policies that pertain to Air Quality. Individual future special needs housing projects will be subject to supplemental environmental review as required by State law and County policy.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

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

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

Discussion- All Items:
The proposed amendments to the zoning ordinance would add a definition for emergency shelters, transitional housing and supportive housing but does not identify the location and type of new development and therefore will not affect biological resources. Potential biological impacts associated with construction of special needs housing would vary on a project-by-project basis. Each development project would be subject to separate environment review at the time a specific development proposal is made, and project-specific biological constraints (e.g., presence of rare/endangered species, locally designated species or habitats) would be further assessed at that time in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

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- All Items:
The proposed amendments to the zoning ordinance would add a definition for emergency shelters, transitional housing and supportive housing but does not identify the location and type of new development and therefore it is not possible to determine potential impacts to cultural (historic and archeological) resources.

Review of new special needs housing 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 be implemented when a future project is proposed.

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 proposed amendments to the zoning ordinance would add a definition for emergency shelters, transitional housing and supportive housing but does not identify the location and type of new development and therefore will not affect geologic and soil conditions. Potential geologic impacts associated with the construction of new special needs housing would vary on a project-by-project basis. Each 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, etc.) would be evaluated at that time.

VII. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

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

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

Discussion- All Items:
The proposed amendments to the zoning ordinance will not create concerns regarding hazards or hazardous materials. Future special needs housing development in the county will be subject to hazardous materials regulations and would be required to meet fire safe guidelines. Project-specific health hazards will be evaluated at the time a specific development proposal is made.

VIII. HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY – Would the project:

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

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

Discussion- All Items:
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. Any new special needs housing 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, etc.) would be evaluated as part of this review.

IX. LAND USE & PLANNING – Would the project:

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

Discussion- All Items:
The proposed amendments to the zoning ordinance would add a definition for emergency shelters, transitional housing and supportive housing but does not identify the location and type of new development. Amending the

Zoning Ordinance does not grant entitlements for any projects. The proposed zoning ordinance amendments are required to implement the County General Plan Housing Element Programs G-2 and G-3.

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 proposed amendments to the zoning ordinance will not by itself substantially result in the loss of the availability of mineral resources, particularly mineral (minerals include several different types of aggregate that are used for purposes other than petroleum) resources. All future special need housing development proposals will be analyzed for specific project impacts to mineral resources.

XI. NOISE – Would the project result in:

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

Discussion- All Items:
The proposed amendments to the zoning ordinance would add a definition for emergency shelters, transitional housing and supportive housing but does not identify the location and type of new development and therefore will not affect noise conditions. Potential noise impacts associated with construction and occupation of special needs housing would vary on a project-by-project basis. The County's existing Noise Ordinance (Article 9.36 of the County Code) would apply to proposed special need housing developments and each development project would be subject to separate environmental review at the time a specific development proposal is made; project-specific noise impacts or constraints would be evaluated at that time.

XII. POPULATION & HOUSING – Would the project:

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

Discussion- All Items:
Adopting amendments to the zoning ordinance will not by itself induce substantial population growth in unincorporated Placer County. Implementation of the Housing Element Programs is designed to address the special needs housing forecasted for unincorporated Placer County for the 2006-2013 planning period. Without specific details regarding future developments, it is impossible to evaluate inducement of population growth. Through the County's environmental review process, future development projects would be evaluated for potential growth inducing impacts. No aspect of the project involves the displacement of existing housing.

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

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

Discussion- All Items:
The proposed amendments to the zoning ordinance will not change residential land use designations within the Land Use Element of the Placer County General Plan and / or Community Plan and, therefore, would not cause an increase in demand for public services. All future special need housing 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- All Items:
The proposed amendments to the zoning ordinance do not grant entitlements for any projects. It will not change residential land use designations in the Land Use Element of the Placer County General Plan and, therefore, would not cause an increase in demand for recreational facilities. 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 recreational services.

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

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

Discussion- All Items:
The proposed amendments to the zoning ordinance will not directly affect transportation facilities or traffic conditions. The nature and extent of local traffic impacts would vary on a project-by-project basis. Project-specific traffic impacts

(e.g., level of service operation, access, traffic or pedestrian safety hazards, etc.) would be evaluated when such proposed project plans are submitted to the County. We don't know what future projects will create at this time.

XVI. UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

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

Discussion- All Items:
The proposed amendments to the zoning ordinance would add a definition for emergency shelters, transitional housing and supportive housing but does not identify the location and type of new development and therefore would not increase the demands on existing utilities and services systems. It is impossible to accurately determine utility and service system requirements of future development without identified site locations and specific project details. Future utility and service system needs will be evaluated on an ongoing basis as each new development is proposed.

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- All Items:
The proposed amendments to the zoning ordinance would add a definition for emergency shelters, transitional housing and supportive housing but does not identify the location and type of new development. Accordingly, these changes do not authorize specific special needs housing development projects for specific sites. Housing projects undertaken in the course of implementing the revised ordinance will be subject to project-specific environmental review in accordance with Section 10562 et seq. of the CEQA Guidelines. Any indirect impacts associated with future special needs housing construction have already been addressed in the Placer County General Plan EIR and various community plan EIRs.

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

☐ California Department of Fish and Game	☐ 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:

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 herein have been added to the project. A **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

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

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

Signature Loren E. Clark Date September 8, 2010
Loren Clark, Acting 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, 8am to 5pm, 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, 565 West Lake Blvd., 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	
	☒ 2009 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
		☐ _____