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September 26, 1966

City Council of Colfax
City Hall
Colfax, California

Gentlemen:

Pursuant to our contract with the State of California, we are pleased to submit the Outline General Plan as a guide to future development for the City of Colfax and the surrounding unincorporated area.

The Outline General Plan is the first planning step. It indicates the scale of probable population increase and physical growth and recommends a general organization of land uses for future development. After public hearings, the Plan should be adopted by the City and by Placer County which has jurisdiction over the unincorporated area.

The Plan is not an end in itself, but should be the beginning of a continuous planning program. The adoption of the proposed zoning ordinance for the City, which was prepared as part of this initial program, is an essential next step. As development becomes more intense, the Outline General Plan will need to be refined and made more specific. It should be reviewed annually to keep it up-to-date and responsive to changing conditions and to determine areas where special study is indicated.

Many people have assisted us in our work during the program. We wish to particularly thank the members of the Citizens' Committee who worked long and conscientiously to formulate the goals and objectives on which the Plan is based. The assistance given by Mr. Justin F. Barber, Jr., Placer County Planning Director, and by Mr. Thomas McMahan of his staff was invaluable throughout the whole course of the work. Their review at each stage was careful and useful. The high level of interest and the concern in the community contributed greatly to the Plan and made the entire program a stimulating experience as well.

Sincerely,

SYDNEY H. WILLIAMS, A.I.P.

ROBERT W. COOK, A.I.P.

CORWIN R. MOCINE, A.I.P.
MAJOR PROPOSALS OF THE OUTLINE GENERAL PLAN

Residential. The Plan shows two rural densities and three urban densities of residential development. At the density shown, the existing City of Colfax would approximately double its population by 1990. Close to the City, small areas of high density are shown where apartments and possibly limited transient accommodations would be appropriate. Hilly terrain is generally shown in the rural, low density categories.

Commercial. A major proposal of the Plan is to retain the existing downtown as the community shopping center. Modernization and expansion, including off-street parking, is recommended. Other centers shown on the Plan are neighborhood convenience centers or specialized centers for highway-oriented use. For the highway commercial areas, controls regulating signs, parking, landscaping and general appearance will be particularly important. A visitor commercial center is shown north of Colfax on the proposed freeway.

Industrial. The Plan shows over 100 acres of industrial land to be reserved for future needs. A variety of uses including warehousing, distributing facilities and light manufacturing should be acceptable in this area.

Circulation. The Plan shows an integrated system of major and secondary roads to serve the entire Planning Area. The County origin and destination survey now in progress and other detailed studies will indicate the number of lanes needed and standards to which each of these roads should be developed in the future.

The Plan recommends a new freeway, more or less paralleling existing State Route 174, from Interstate 80 to Grass Valley where a connection would be made with the adopted freeway, Route 20. This proposal would complete the regional system in the Colfax Area and, besides being of local convenience, would make the City easily accessible from most of Northern California. The new freeway would be an important route for vacation travel.

Public Facilities. The existing Colfax elementary school site is shown as a future civic center. New school sites are shown, consistent with modern standards and the projected population. Neighborhood parks are shown adjacent to the school sites. Additional community park area is shown on the Bear River and the North Fork of the American River. Rollins Dam and the new Wildlife Conservation Area on the Bear River will serve local people as well as visitors and vacationers from other areas. The Bunch Creek Reservoir, to be built about 1985, should also be developed for local and regional recreation.
**POPULATION**

**TRENDS AND PROJECTIONS**

**SOURCES**

U.S. CENSUS OF POPULATION
PLACER CO. PLANNING DEPT.
LOOMIS BASIN STUDY
WILLIAMS, COOK & MOCINE
POPULATION

HISTORICAL GROWTH AND FORECASTS FOR THE FUTURE

Placer County population since 1930 is plotted on the graph opposite and projections made by the County Planning Department are shown to the year 2000. Seasonal or part-time population is not included in the projection.

Western Placer County (Auburn, Loomis Basin-Folsom Lake, Roseville and the West Valley Census County Divisions) contained approximately 80 per cent of the County's population in 1960. Projections shown for this area were made by the County for the Loomis Basin Plan. Eastern Placer County (Colfax-Summit, Tahoe, and Foresthill-Back Country Census County Divisions) contained approximately 20 per cent or 10,369 people in 1960. Colfax-Summit Division runs from Clipper Gap up Highway 40 to Donner Summit. A proportion of the eastern County's anticipated growth was first allocated to the Colfax-Summit Division. Slightly less than one-half the Division's growth was then allocated to the Colfax Planning Area itself. The projection assumes that, if the high projection for the County were to be reached, growth of permanent population in the Tahoe area would be accelerated. While the high projection would increase population in the Colfax area modestly, the rate of growth in Colfax would not jump in proportion to overall County growth. In other words, Colfax's growth rate is expected to be more or less steady and will remain within narrow limits whether County growth reaches the high or low projection.

Future growth in the Colfax area will come primarily from three sources: retirement population, new working families who will find employment in the growing industrial complexes near Roseville and Auburn or in recreation areas, and people attracted by new employment opportunities in Colfax. Seasonal homes, while not adding directly to the permanent population, will contribute to overall economic growth by creating local employment opportunities.

Retirement Population

Colfax already has a significantly large retirement population (see section on age composition). Although proportionally the projected State increase in people over 65 (8.9 per cent in 1960 to 10.3 per cent in 1990) does not seem large, the total number of retired people in the State and the Nation will increase dramatically as a result of increased longevity and earlier retirement. Between 1965 and 1990, the increase in actual number of people over 65 in California is projected to be almost 1-1/2 million. These retirees will not settle evenly throughout all parts of the State but will tend to concentrate in various areas which are particularly amenable to their needs and desires. The small foothill communities are one type of area that has proved attractive to retired people.

Retirement housing developments have taken new forms in recent years. Sometimes whole new communities are built catering only to the older age group. In California, these have ranged from luxury homes and condominium apartments with extensive recreational facilities to more modest subdivisions and individual homes. Whether living in new retirement communities or in
individually constructed homes, this population adds relatively little to the tax burden of the community. Economically independent retired people do not create a need for additional schools--always the largest expense of a community--but do add significantly to property tax and sales tax revenue. Their needs also create new opportunities for business and service employment. The number of retired people who will settle in Colfax cannot be computed or estimated with any degree of certitude. A large scale retirement development which would add several thousand retired people in a short period of time may well be attracted to the Colfax area or retirement housing could continue to develop as now, in a pattern of scattered individual construction. Certainly the area can expect to attract an increasing number of retirees over the next two decades.

**Commuting Population**

Colfax is located between a fast expanding major mountain recreation area to the northeast (Donner Summit) and a growing industrial area to the southwest (Metropolitan Sacramento). Auburn Reservoir and Folsom Lake will increase recreation employment to the south and east as well. The Colfax area will have a great attraction for new residents looking for a place to live above the Valley fog, below the heavy snow line and within 30 miles of these major developments.

**Population Attracted by Employment Locally**

Trade and services will expand with a growing population. In Colfax, services of all sorts should undergo a constant increase in the next two decades, especially to meet the demands of vacationing and seasonal and retirement population. Modest expansion will occur locally in heavy commercial and industrial jobs, particularly in construction.

**Seasonal Population**

Summer and part-time residents are not included in the population figures or in the projections. However, as a result of social and economic trends, Colfax is likely to have an increase in part-time residents in the future. The 1960 Census shows the following percentage of seasonal homes in Colfax, the Census County Division and Placer County. Other recreation or retirement-oriented counties are shown for comparison.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per Cent Seasonal Homes--1960</th>
<th>(\text{Colfax}^1)</th>
<th>(\text{Colfax-Summit}^2)</th>
<th>(\text{Placer County})</th>
<th>(\text{Nevada County})</th>
<th>(\text{Amador County})</th>
<th>(\text{El Dorado County})</th>
<th>(\text{Santa Cruz County})</th>
<th>(\text{Lake County})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colfax Census Co. Div.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census, 1960

1/ Seasonal homes and homes held for occasional use.

2/ In Colfax and Colfax-Summit Census County Division, seasonal homes are not totaled separately--figure given is for "other vacant"--not available for rent or sale.
In the Census County Division, almost one-quarter of the homes are seasonal--occupied only part of the year. At the present time, concentrations of seasonal homes are generally at higher elevations than Colfax. The following figures, cited in the "Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Committee's Report to Congress" indicate some factors which will intensify the demand for second homes throughout the nation in future years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Paid Vacation</td>
<td>2.0 weeks</td>
<td>2.8 weeks</td>
<td>3.7 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Per Capita Disposable Income</td>
<td>$1,970</td>
<td>$2,900</td>
<td>$4,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Work Week</td>
<td>39.0 hours</td>
<td>36.0 hours</td>
<td>32.0 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While income and leisure are on the increase, land availability is decreasing close to the prime mountain recreation areas. Areas such as Colfax, where good climate and pleasant rural setting are available, will attract more and more seasonal residents. For the families desiring to acquire seasonal homes with a potential for future retirement, Colfax would be very attractive indeed.

AGE COMPOSITION IN 1960 AND IN THE FUTURE

Age Composition--1960

Table 1 in the Appendix compares 1960 age composition of Colfax, Placer County, California and the Nation. A study of age composition in 1960 shows that Colfax had a smaller proportion of its population in the pre-school age than the County, the State or the Nation. Most significant, however, is the high percentage of people over 65 living in Colfax (close to double the percentage in the State). This emphasizes Colfax's attractiveness to people in retirement.

Future Age Composition

It appears that Colfax will receive an influx of varied families. Some will be workers with families; some will be retired couples whose average age will be over 60. Age composition will probably be modified only slightly in the future. In line with statewide projections and those recently made for neighboring Nevada County, the percentage of the population of school age may fall slightly to about 22 per cent.
ECONOMIC BASE

EMPLOYMENT OF PLACER COUNTY RESIDENTS--1960

Employment by category was not tabulated for Colfax in the 1960 census. However, it was tabulated for rural Placer County which includes Colfax and for Colfax-Summit Census County Division.* Of the 34,422 rural County residents, 12,101 or 35 per cent were in the civilian labor force compared with 39 per cent for the State. This reflects the high number of older people in rural Placer County. Unemployment in the civilian labor force was 8.7 per cent, while in the State as a whole, it was 6.1 per cent.

Per Cent Employment by Industry--1960

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Colfax-Summit</th>
<th>Rural Placer Co.</th>
<th>Placer</th>
<th>Rural California</th>
<th>California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other &amp; Not Reported</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>70.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census - 1960

The figures indicate that while rural Placer County is more dependent on agriculture, Colfax and Colfax-Summit Census County Division are more oriented toward trade and service employment.

Agriculture is still a vital element in the economy of rural Placer County. In the County as a whole, agriculture has declined from 30 per cent of total employment in 1930 to 8 per cent in 1960. Manufacturing in the County has grown in the past 20 years from 6.2 per cent of total employment in 1940 to 12.7 per cent in 1960 and now surpasses agricultural employment. A further breakdown of employment by industry for the Colfax-Summit Census County Division follows.

Employment by Industry--1960--Colfax-Summit--Census County Division Labor Force

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Workers</th>
<th>Per Cent Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Employment</td>
<td>1,805</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroads</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Professional &amp; Related Services</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Colfax-Summit Census County Division includes the City of Colfax and additional rural area from Clipper Gap to Donner Summit.
FUTURE EMPLOYMENT OF PLACER COUNTY LABOR FORCE

Industrial growth in western Placer County will continue to expand and provide the needed industrial jobs to support expected Placer County growth. The Loomis Valley Plan, prepared by the County Planning Department in 1962, estimates that between 90,000 and 125,000 new jobs will be needed in eastern Placer County to support the population forecast for the year 2000.

Another future employment field for rural Placer County residents will be in recreation and services connected to recreational visitors. At a conference on Regional Recreation in 1963, the State Division of Recreation stated:

"California's recreation problem is caused by a spiraling imbalance of demand over supply. Better living is creating a recreation demand, which conservatively, is increasing 400% while the population is increasing but 100%. The available land for recreation is decreasing as communities spread over the landscape and as land is being put to other uses. We can expect the curve of demand for recreation to continue to increase sharply in the next 20 years. This is caused by available leisure time, which will be up 15%; discretionary income up 30% and mobility up 50%.

Placer County contains some of the prime recreational areas in the State. While Colfax itself is not in one of the prime recreation areas, there will be many opportunities for employment in recreation and visitor oriented businesses in the future. While jobs will expand in the Colfax area, a large number of people living in Colfax will commute elsewhere in the County to work, to industrial jobs near Roseville and to recreation areas in the higher elevations.

RECREATION POTENTIAL IN THE COLFAX PLANNING AREA

A State grant, under the Davis Grunsky Act, has just been received by the Nevada Irrigation District for the development of recreation facilities. A total of $4,693,000 will be spent to develop facilities at the four reservoir sites in Nevada County. Rollins Reservoir, just three miles north of Colfax, is the most accessible of the four sites and, having the lowest elevation, will have the longest season of use. Each camp site here is expected to be used 120 days per year as compared with 100 days at Scotts Flat, 75 at Jackson Meadow and 60 days at Faucherie. The day-use season will be somewhat longer at all four reservoirs.

If Colfax takes advantage of its established position as a local trade center, it could become a gateway for visitors to the Rollins Reservoir recreation area and gain in both trade and employment. However, unless Colfax makes definite efforts to attract this business, new service centers will be built elsewhere. For instance, a proposed freeway running north of Colfax from Highway 80, past the Reservoir to Grass Valley, is now being discussed by Nevada County. In preliminary discussion with the State Highway Department, it appears to be a needed regional con-
nection. If it is built, there would undoubtedly be pressure for commercial development to serve Rollins Reservoir close to the interchange with Highway 80. Colfax residents might find employment here but the City would not profit from increased business and tax revenue.

Four basic types of recreation facilities are proposed at Rollins—camp sites, picnic units, boating facilities and swimming beaches. The first stage will include 86 camp sites, 76 picnic units, 4 boat ramps and a beach.

A feasibility report prepared for the Nevada Irrigation District compared potential visitors (based on population projected for the area within 100 miles of the site) and facilities planned at Rollins Reservoir.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Visitor-Day Potential</th>
<th>Planned Facilities Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Overnight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>147,533</td>
<td>48,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 1970</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>173,187</td>
<td>57,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>240,468</td>
<td>77,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>323,592</td>
<td>101,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>427,000</td>
<td>126,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>552,853</td>
<td>152,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>708,857</td>
<td>181,324</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures above indicate two significant facts: there will be a large influx of recreation visitors to be served and the capacity of facilities planned by the Irrigation District will accommodate only about one-half of the potential visitors.

These visitors to Rollins Dam and others who could be attracted by private recreation development could increase jobs and income in Colfax in the retail and service sector. A conservative estimate is that Colfax could attract one-third of the trade coming from the Rollins Reservoir recreation area visitors. As an example, Rollins will be used to project the possible impact of visitors from a given facility on the region and on Colfax.

The first factor to consider is expenditures of tourists—both campers and day visitors. Surveys elsewhere at State parks and other facilities indicate that the average camper spends about $2.50 per day in local stores. A day visitor spends about $1.00. Rollins Reservoir visitors would therefore generate $250,000 of retail trade in the near future and $475,000 when all facilities are completed. By the time these imported dollars circulate and are respent in the community, they will represent about 1.2 to 1.5 times their base amount in trade, i.e. $300,000 to $370,000 and $570,000 to $712,500. What this represents in trade and
individual income and employment is shown below.

### Regional Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imported Income</th>
<th>Local Wages &amp; Salary</th>
<th>Employment in Man Years</th>
<th>Additional Employees Per Season</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 1970</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$300,000-$200,000-$375,000</td>
<td>50 to 63; 150 to 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion (2000+)</td>
<td>$475,000</td>
<td>$570,000-$380,190-$712,500</td>
<td>95 to 119; 285 to 357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impact on Colfax (Assumed 1/3 Total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imported Income</th>
<th>Local Wages &amp; Salary</th>
<th>Employment in Man Years</th>
<th>Additional Employees Per Season</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 1970</td>
<td>$83,333</td>
<td>$208,333-$60,417</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the 1970 local income increase would be significant—representing an increase of about 14 per cent of 1965 taxable retail sales—it would not in itself be enough to cause a sizable expansion in the economic base of Colfax.

There will be recreation needs to be filled in addition to those provided by the public agencies; for example, additional camp sites. Other facilities such as resort hotels and lodges are normally provided by private enterprise. Colfax could expand its economic base and development by concentrating on providing private recreation facilities.

This can best be done by private initiative encouraged and supported by public policies and assistance. If the community organizes its resources and talents to investigate all methods of encouraging the type of recreation development it desires and to create an atmosphere which will attract visitors and generate investment, it will have a good basis for succeeding. First and most important, those qualities which make Colfax attractive for vacationing must be recognized as an extremely valuable and irreplaceable asset. All development should enhance rather than destroy this environment. The investment, income and the employment offered by various types of facilities should be compared. There is a need for more camp sites which require a relatively low investment. Motels and lodges require a vastly different scale of investment but bring equivalently more revenue to the area. As the snow country continues to grow in popularity and land at snow elevations becomes scarcer, there will be an increasing shortage of housing for skiers. If a skier from San Francisco could drive to Colfax and find a good lodge and entertainment facilities and be provided with transportation to and from the summit during the day, this might provide a significant source of revenue to Colfax. The difficulties of financing a
business or running it for only the short summer season are obvious. Ski lodge facilities are one way which might be investigated to effectively double the season.

It should be realized, however, that Colfax's main source of retail trade and the tax revenue to be derived from it, will be from the "permanent resident" segment of the population. The permanent population is projected to increase to about 14,000 during the planning period. If Colfax receives one-third of the Rollins Reservoir visitor revenue and perhaps adds twice that amount by private recreation development, it would be revenue equivalent to that deriving from 633 permanent residents. Five thousand seasonal residents would be equivalent to another 700 permanent residents. In other words, more than 9/10 of the retail trade would still come from permanent population. Retail development based on the other 1/10 of the trade would, at best, be marginal. It therefore would seem prudent to concentrate retail activity in a solid commercial core in downtown Colfax and not to allow scatteration of stores and services in outlying locations aimed at attracting only limited type visitor trade.

JOBS AVAILABLE IN COLFAX--1965

A survey made of employment and space devoted to business was made by the County in August of 1965.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Employment in Colfax 1/</th>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
<th>Seasonal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Personal Services</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Offices, Util., etc.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Processing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Pacific Railroad</td>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Employment in Colfax 1/</th>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
<th>Seasonal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In CBD</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside CBD</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Pacific Railroad</td>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ Government employment not included.
2/ Colfax office employs personnel working outside the City as well as those normally employed in Colfax.

8
For a small rural town, Colfax has a relatively large amount of local employment. It is a small market and service center for the surrounding countryside. In the future, as the hinterland population grows and tourism and recreation increase, Colfax should be able to increase employment opportunities in business, personal services and trade.

RETAIL TRADE IN COLFAX, 1960-1965 AND FORECAST FOR THE FUTURE

Trade, 1960-1965

The Planning Area population was estimated to be approximately 1,800 in 1965. Excluding automobiles, taxable retail sales per capita then were approximately $833. In the County as a whole, per capita sales for the same categories were about $726 in 1964 and were probably about $750 in 1965. This indicates that Colfax, though a small and limited retail center, has a relatively high level of commercial activity.

The graph following shows retail trade by quarter and by year since 1960. Since the dip in the first half of 1961, the over-all trend has been definitely upward. However, the first quarter which is the prime winter sports season has shown the most sizable gain since 1961. The first quarter's per cent of the yearly retail sales was slightly above the average in the State in 1964.

Retail Sales--Percentage Yearly Total by Quarter--1964

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Colfax</th>
<th>California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It appears that these extra sales in the first quarter can be attributed to skiers and travelers to the snow country who pass through Colfax.

Estimated Floor Area and Taxable Sales--Colfax, 1965

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Approximate Square Feet of Sales or Office Space 1/</th>
<th>Estimated Taxable Sales 2/</th>
<th>Estimated Taxable Sales Per Square Foot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail, excluding</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$42.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automotive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automotive Retail,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including parts</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>2/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Outlets</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>2/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>2/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Stores or offices</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ Survey of Space by City of Colfax - 1965.
2/ Estimated on basis of first three quarters for 1964 which have been reported and on local information.
3/ Information unavailable.
TAXABLE TRANSACTIONS BY YEAR AND QUARTER

Source: State Board of Equalization
The sales figures for retail outlets do not include all transactions. For instance, food for home consumption is non-taxable and is therefore not included. Normally, in a vigorous business center, these taxable sales will fall in a range of between $50 and $60 per square foot. Colfax's slightly low figure of about $43 indicates that the area has a potential capacity which has not been attained.

The gross area in the present downtown area (west of the railroad) is approximately 5-1/4 acres.

**Forecast of Future Retail Trade**

Colfax's present level of sales per capita is relatively high for so small a town. While tourism may play a small role in sales, the major portion of the business in Colfax comes from the City itself and the surrounding rural countryside. In order to maintain this high level of sales, the downtown area must be modernized to meet competition from other areas and to discourage businesses from attempting to form new shopping centers in outlying locations. Only by doing this will Colfax maintain its position as a rural market center for the surrounding countryside and continue to serve the residents of the Planning Area.

If the City maintains its present per capita sales, total retail sales (excluding automotive) would be around eleven million dollars by 1990. At sales of $60 per square foot, about 183,000 square feet of retail floor area would be needed. To provide the off-street parking necessary for a healthy modern business district, the following areas would be needed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Parking Ratio</th>
<th>Sq. Ft. Floor Area</th>
<th>Sq. Ft. Parking Area Including Landscaping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2:1</td>
<td>143,000</td>
<td>292,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Center</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>134,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>183,000</td>
<td>426,840</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the areas above, Colfax should reserve certain areas for motels and transient facilities. Limited retail uses should be located within these areas and closely related to the facilities.

Automotive and highway-oriented uses will need a small area--four to six acres--close to the freeway. Once again, these uses should not be allowed to scatter randomly along major streets or the freeway. They should be limited to one area. Heavier commercial or semi-industrial uses such as wholesaling and warehousing should be located within the industrial area.

All California residents have seen the deleterious effects of uncontrolled commercial development strung out along our highways. Unsightly sprawl and inconvenient shopping are often two results. Sometimes vitality is
drained from the older downtown areas as well. Very often the inability or unwillingness of the older commercial area to renew and remodernize itself contributes to the pressure for commercial development elsewhere. In the Colfax area, there may be great pressure to allow commercial development along various highways. Drive-in restaurants, hot dog stands and other uses catering to recreation visitors may want to locate in numerous locations. However, unless the hot dog stand is so located that it will serve the permanent residents all year long, as well as tourists in the short summer season, it is very likely to become a marginal operation very quickly.

These are basic reasons why Colfax should insist that its commercial development be concentrated, that the central area be supported and encouraged to modernize and that other commercial development be limited to that necessary to serve the population.
THE OUTLINE GENERAL PLAN

Colfax has been a small rural town since its inception. Over the past decades, the slow and even pace of growth did not disturb the quiet and peaceful life of the community. The rail yards, the orchards and fruit processing, and the retail stores serving the surrounding countryside were—and still are—the economic life of the town. Now, Colfax is aware that growth will accelerate and more rapid change will occur in the near future. The City has recognized its need for a plan to coordinate all the aspects of future urban growth, in order to preserve the beauty of its mountain environment while making Colfax a city of new opportunity and an even better place to live.

The General Plan is the first step in the planning process. It consists of a map and accompanying text which together express a set of policies for land use, population density, public facilities and traffic circulation. When adopted, the Plan will be an advisory, not mandatory, guide for citizens and developers as well as the basis for ordinances and official acts.

OBJECTIVES OF THE OUTLINE GENERAL PLAN

City planning begins with general policy decisions which can be translated into plans and developed into programs. To be valid and useful, these policies must represent the desires of the citizens of the community while taking into account the economic and social facts found by the planners' research. The City Council of Colfax appointed a Citizens' Committee to study their environment and make meaningful choices among the many alternative directions that future development might take. The Committee's work and the research of the Consultants served as the basis for the Plan. The major objectives of the Citizens' Committee have been summarized in a separate report and are included in the appendix as well.

In general, the goals and policies of the Citizens' Committee looked forward to progress and growth while emphasizing that Colfax must preserve and enhance the natural beauty of its setting. A desire for high standards of development while providing for diversity and individuality runs through all the reports.

DESCRIPTION OF THE OUTLINE GENERAL PLAN

Future Population

The graph which precedes page 1 shows the Planning Area's permanent population projected to the year 2000 when between 14,000 and 18,000 people are expected to reside in the Colfax Area. The projection is based on regional growth and Colfax's expected share of that growth.

The General Plan looks to the year 1990 and describes the amount of land which would be developed to accommodate the projected population. At the densities of residential development shown on the General Plan, approximately 5,500 permanently occupied dwelling units and about 15,000 residents could be accommodated. In addition, there could be between 3,000 and 4,000 part-time or seasonal residents. Full development at the densities shown would not be approached until sometime after 1990.
By 1990, however, the major portion of the permanent population increase is expected to have occurred. If the high projection is reached, approximately 14,000 permanent residents will be living in about 5,000 dwelling units. For planning purposes, the high projection is assumed — to determine the number of public facilities needed and to reserve adequate land for them.

Residential Development

Five residential densities* are shown on the Plan. Gross acres, which include street area and small local facilities (e.g., corner grocery), should not be confused with lot sizes as specified in "zoning" districts. Within the area shown in each density, there may eventually be several zoning districts which would allow different types of residential uses but which together would maintain the over-all density shown on the Plan. The approximate number of acres in each density are given below.

Gross Acres in Residential Use in the Planning Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Rural Densities</th>
<th>Urban Densities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ranchette</td>
<td>Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,480</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>2,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rural Density is shown on steep land (generally over 20 per cent slope) and in farm land. In these areas, there would be an average of one dwelling for each 10 acres with a minimum parcel size of about 5 acres. Pear orchards, Christmas tree farming and other agriculture will continue to operate in these areas.

Estate Density covers outlying lands of more moderate slope and in these areas gross density would range from 4.5 to 1.1 acres per dwelling.

Urban Low Density is shown on close-in land which will be easy to develop and for which urban services can be more readily provided. Here one gross acre could accommodate as many as 3.4 dwellings.

Urban Medium Density is shown in the existing residential areas of Colfax. A maximum of six dwellings per gross acre is specified.

Urban High Density would allow up to 20 dwellings per gross acre. Some of these areas might contain mobile home parks and limited tourist housing without accessory commercial uses. All high density areas are shown in locations close to major traffic arteries.

Of the 14,000 residents in 1990, approximately 11,500 will be living in the three urban density categories, with 2,500 in the rural areas.

Public Facilities

Schools. At the present time, Colfax is served by the Colfax Union Elementary

* For the low density rural categories, where more parcels will remain in acreage, a range of gross acres/dwelling unit is given. For urban densities, ranges are given in dwelling units/gross acre.
School District which maintains one school (K-8) in Colfax. Enrollment is about 350 at the present time. The school site is about 3.5 acres. In addition, a site of roughly 11 acres has been acquired for an intermediate school (7-8). These sites are barely adequate for present needs. They are both small in comparison with the standards maintained by most school districts in California. When enrollment is increased, larger sites should be considered in order to maintain a good standard of classrooms and facilities.

The Colfax High School, which is part of the Placer Joint Union High School District, serves an enrollment close to 400 from an attendance area extending from Clipper Gap to Emigrant Gap. The high school site is about 13 acres. Expansion of this existing site will be needed as well.

Since a major portion of any community's public expenditures is for education, predicting the needs for additional school facilities is an important part of any General Plan. Under-estimating for these needs can be costly, both in money and in the quality of education. The table below indicates the needs for the Colfax Planning Area in 1990 based on the high projection of 14,000 permanent residents (1960 California figures are given as a comparison).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Colfax - 1990</th>
<th>California - 1960</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>30,05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total School Age</td>
<td>3,080</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten-6th Grade</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools Needed</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th &amp; 8th Grades</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools Needed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th-12th Grades</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools Needed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elementary school sites generally range from 8 to 10 acres in California cities. Increased enrollment in Colfax will necessitate acquisition of at least 3 sites of this size in the future. The Plan does not show the existing 3.5 acres as a school site but recommends its eventual abandonment as a school site.

Intermediate schools which meet the State standards for facilities and courses offered generally require an enrollment of about 800 students to be economically feasible. A site of between 15 and 20 acres is needed. An intermediate school of this capacity would serve the Planning Area until after 1990 and have capacity for about 300 students from outside the area. The existing 11-acre site will be sub-standard in size before the useful life of the proposed new school is over. It is not well located in relation to existing or proposed land uses or to the circulation system. While the existing site is shown on the Plan, it is the recommendation of the consultants that a larger and better located site be sought as an alternative. The criteria for the site should include:

1. relatively level land
2. adequate size to serve the Planning Area for the foreseeable future
3. good and safe access from major street system
4. good drainage and soil conditions to permit the most economical construction and operation
5. access to sanitary sewer.

High school enrollment varies considerably in various parts of the State. In intensely developed areas, a single school may have an enrollment as high as 3,000. In less intensely developed areas, enrollment is much lower. However, in order to provide a full range of instruction in keeping with the modern standards, a school of about 1,000 students is considered necessary. A site of 30 to 40 acres should be provided.

The high school population of the Colfax Planning Area will not reach 1,000 students by 1990. The future high school population of the attendance area can, in all probability, be accommodated at one school if sufficient expansion area is provided. The Plan shows the existing high school site expanded to 25 acres which is considered the minimum acceptable size.

Recreation. At present, Colfax has a youth center and a small park with a baseball field and a swimming pool. As a semi-rural community with unlimited natural open space and play area, little more is needed for public recreation. However, at the densities shown on the Plan, 11,500 of Colfax's future residents will be living at urban densities. Open space will not be easily accessible to most of them. Neighborhood play facilities will be needed and should be planned for now. Standards for recreation area vary considerably from city to city in California. A special State study completed a few years ago recommended one neighborhood park for each 2,500 residents. This standard is somewhat higher than most communities can economically meet. In communities similar to Colfax, one park for each 4,000 residents has been found an adequate and feasible standard.

For the area of urban density in Colfax, three neighborhood parks are shown on the Plan. Located adjacent to the elementary schools where joint use of some facilities is possible (particularly large play fields and courts), five acres each is the recommended size. In independent locations, 10 acres would be appropriate. In addition, one community recreation park, including swimming pool, baseball diamonds, recreation building, picnic areas and play facilities will be needed. The existing City park, which has a small pool, baseball field and bleachers, cannot be expanded for this purpose. However, the steep bank behind the park should be acquired and suitably landscaped. The Youth Center site is shown expanded to the south. Although the area here is hilly, careful use of the site could make a useful and very attractive park area. The portion adjoining the proposed elementary school site should be devoted to play facilities. Together, these two sites should contain about 10 acres to accommodate the needed facilities.

Recreation of another sort will be provided by the facilities planned for Rollins Reservoir and the Auburn Dam lands. Both these areas will be developed for regional recreation use and will attract large numbers of visitors from outside the County. However, they will be used by local residents as well, and the water oriented facilities will add greatly to the recreation opportunities of Colfax. The proposed Bunch Creek reservoir which is part of the Giant Gap project of the Placer County Water Agency will not be built until about 1985. The recreation possibilities of this area should be planned for and exploited when development occurs.
In the future, most of the presently undeveloped hillsides and canyons will be committed to private development. The State Wildlife Conservation Board has recently acquired some 260 acres of recreation land on both sides of the Bear River in Nevada and Placer Counties. This project, approximately a mile and a half south of Colfax, is an exceptionally fortunate public acquisition and will preserve some four miles of the Bear River frontage for public use. The proposed park on the North Fork of the American River (primarily on Bureau of Land Management property) and the additional park on the Bear River should be acquired to preserve other portions of this scenic rugged area for community recreation purposes. Rather than providing active recreation, these areas should be devoted to family and group picnic areas, hiking trails and passive recreation. In addition, a system of hiking trails is shown throughout the Planning Area. These trails would connect recreation facilities and make scenic areas accessible to walkers.

Civic Center. The Colfax Citizens' Committee recommended that the City plan for a civic center site to accommodate a City Hall, Library, Post Office and County Justice Court building. In the future, such a civic group would be very appropriate for Colfax. Besides providing convenient and efficient space for needed public functions, a civic center would help to give Colfax a symbolic identity. Grouped on one site, the suggested uses and possibly others in the future would have a greater visual and psychological impact than they would on small, separate sites.

The existing elementary school site is shown on the Plan as a future civic center. It is centrally located and its 3.5 acres are sufficient to meet Colfax's foreseeable needs for civic buildings. An attractive grouping of buildings with landscaping and off-street parking for employees and visitors could be provided. Immediately adjacent to the downtown area but outside the expected retail expansion area, it would be readily accessible to business and professional offices as well as to the general citizenry. When the elementary school is ready to abandon the site for more adequate space, the existing school building might be utilized for other public purposes until it is possible to invest in new buildings.

Commercial Development

Policy Decision. The analysis of Colfax's commercial area and of the present level of retail trade, which is included in the research section of this report, indicates that additional retail area will be required to serve the population expected in the Colfax Planning Area and the surrounding countryside. While research indicates that the most desirable pattern would be expansion of the downtown, expansion could occur in at least three different patterns. Each pattern would have a different impact on the structure of Colfax, and therefore, decisions concerning commercial expansion should be made with full consideration as to the effect on the City and the needs of the citizens. Three patterns are discussed briefly in the following paragraphs.

The first possible pattern of expansion would be a logical extension of the existing retail area. The heart of present day Colfax is the existing downtown area - the traditional market center for the town and the surrounding countryside. It is an exceptionally vigorous and prosperous center for a community of Colfax's size. It has a sense of "place" and gives an identity to Colfax.
However, the existing retail area will not retain its position unless a program of logical expansion and modernization is undertaken. Modernization should not include wholesale removal of all old structures and replacement with new buildings unrelated to an over-all plan. It should mean that good elements of the existing area be preserved and enhanced and the entire area be made a convenient and efficient center which can compete with other modern shopping areas. To do this, a detailed design study of the area should be made which would include a study of off-street parking, pedestrian ways, landscaping, automobile access and preservation of old buildings where feasible. It should include recommendations for implementation of the program by private and public means.

While, as the research section of this report points out, improvement of the downtown area would be to the long-range good of the entire community and should have the support of the citizens, no program will be effective unless it has the active support and cooperation of the merchants and owners who are most intimately concerned with it. Very often such cooperation is only possible after the threat of competition is felt. Sometimes it is never possible. If this proves to be true in Colfax, it would be improper to discourage retail development in outlying areas.

The second possible pattern of development would be to, in effect, create a new community retail center in an outlying location and to assign a secondary role to the existing downtown area. While it is true that new shopping centers with 200,000 square feet of store area and 600,000 to 800,000 square feet of parking area are sometimes created almost overnight, efficient and economic new centers of that scale need a ready market of some 20,000 people. In relatively slow growing regions, such as Colfax and its surrounding market area, it will be unreasonable to expect that development will occur at the scale necessary to create an entirely new and independent community shopping center. It will be some years before the Colfax area has enough population to warrant investment of this sort even if it were to be considered desirable.

A third possible pattern would result from permitting smaller and more limited retail development in one or more outlying locations. While it would be the hope that eventually these smaller scale developments would structure themselves into a true community center, it is more likely that such a policy would result in a “scatteration” of retail uses and a weakening of the existing center. Thus, no community shopping center would be created.

It is the consultant’s recommendation that the first alternative – preserving and expanding the existing downtown area – be adopted. The General Plan therefore shows expansion of the existing downtown area and recommends that no other commercial area be established which would serve to weaken the present center.

However, it is recognized that unless action is initiated within the very near future, it will be improper to attempt to discourage retail development in some outlying location. It is the consultant’s further recommendation that the potential of the existing downtown to serve the needs of the community be re-evaluated in about two years and again in five years. Within two years a coordinated program of development should be formulated and agreed upon. This recommendation should not be interpreted to mean that unless the existing downtown is completely redone and all its problems solved in two years, that...
it should be abandoned to its fate. Progress will be gradual and change will occur over many years. However, in five years time the downtown area should give evidence of moving in the direction of a modern downtown area. Its coordinated plan of expansion and improvement must show evidence of feasibility and support. If this does not appear so after five years, consideration should be given to amending the General Plan.

Description of the Downtown Portion of the Plan. The Plan shows the downtown area expanded to the west as far as Culver and Kneeland Streets and into a portion of the railroad yards. The total area west of the railroad, excluding streets, is approximately 10 acres. An additional two acres are shown east of the tracks for offices. This will allow the downtown area to develop into an efficient and economic community center which can serve the residents of Colfax and the surrounding rural area for the foreseeable future. Camping supply stores, sporting goods stores and restaurants should locate downtown and would receive a significant portion of their business from visitors.

In order to function as a modern community center, off-street parking has to be provided. Although the General Plan program does not include detailed studies of exactly where and how parking should be provided, a policy regarding the provision of off-street parking is included in the Plan recommendations. One possible schematic arrangement was presented earlier to the City along with recommendations for improved circulation around the downtown area. The ratio* of parking to first floor store area is 2:1 as shown on the schematic plan. While this is normally considered adequate for existing downtown areas, which have controlled on-street parking as well, it is considered a minimum and very modest goal for Colfax. In the proposed office area of approximately two acres, at least one half the site should be devoted to parking. As the Plan indicates, the downtown area will continue to serve the daily need for convenience goods, as well as serving a wider area with additional services and goods. One new neighborhood center is shown east of the freeway to serve the future population in that section of the Planning Area. This should be limited to a maximum of eight acres and should not be anticipated to compete with the downtown area. Its use should be limited to the "daily convenience goods" level - food stores, cleaners and laundromats, small drug and sundries stores and the like. The retail uses now scattered around the freeway interchange should be encouraged to group into a compact, modern and convenient shopping center on the east of the freeway interchange. This will satisfy commercial needs for 14,000 permanent residents and the seasonal population as well.

Certain commercial uses such as auto sales and drive-in restaurants cannot be properly located either downtown or in the neighborhood center but need special locations. Two highway commercial areas are shown to accommodate these uses: Illinois Town, where a scattering of commercial uses exist, and an additional 3-3/4 acres at the major entrance to Colfax from the freeway. Special regulations regarding off-street parking, signs, lighting and landscaping will be necessary to ensure that an attractive entrance is developed rather than a chaotic neon and asphalt jumble. There is no reason why these uses, when properly developed, cannot be as attractive as any other. A sign ordinance, limiting size and brightness of illumination, will eliminate the possibility of a "sign war" (bigger and bigger signs as businesses compete to be seen). Such sign competition is destructive to the environment, does

* gross areas
little for the business involved and is of real benefit only to the sign companies. The goals of the Citizens' Committee clearly establish this order of control as a basic policy.

Some 10 acres of visitor-commercial use are shown along both sides of the proposed Grass Valley-Colfax Freeway. Motels and other types of visitor housing would be appropriate combined with a heavy concentration of retail uses such as restaurants, gift shops, and supply stores. At 15 units per acre, 150 motel units could be accommodated, along with the other uses.

The special study corridors shown along the Bear River and the North Fork of the American River are areas where special commercial recreation uses could be developed as well. The development of any uses in this area should be carefully regulated. Design review and use permits should be required in order to ensure that such development will be in harmony with the scenic surroundings and enhance, rather than destroy, the beauties of the mountainous scenery.

Industrial Areas

New industrial uses in Colfax will, very likely, be of the distributive and service nature or possibly light manufacturing. Approximately 140 acres of land between the freeway and the railroad are shown reserved for such uses. At 10 employees per acre, this area, if fully developed, would provide 1400 jobs. This is about double the number of the people in the Colfax Planning Area who are expected to be industrially employed and therefore represents a land reserve beyond that actually needed by 1990. In addition to reserving land for needs beyond 1990, the reserve will maintain a free market in industrial land for the coming decades. Prospective developers will have a choice of sites within the appropriate portion of the Planning Area.

Colfax should attempt to exploit its rail and highway facilities by encouraging distributive and warehousing uses to locate in the proposed industrial area. With the proposed freeway to Grass Valley and beyond, Colfax could become the most convenient and accessible location for distribution up and down Placer County and much of Nevada County as well.

Recreation Services

One of the nation's major transcontinental highways (U.S. 80) passes through the Colfax Planning Area. This is already a heavily traveled recreation route and in the future as the major traffic network is extended, more and more recreation-bound travelers will pass through Colfax. The amount of business to be derived from such potential customers should not be overestimated, and caution has been urged throughout this report concerning the potential for tourist business. However, the potential should not be underestimated either. Colfax might develop a group of recreation services - hotels, motels, camping and hiking supply, equipment rental, etc. - and become a gateway to the recreation country. As recommended, some of these uses should be located in the downtown area and areas for tourist residential uses are shown on the Plan. Should the demand for facilities exceed the capacity of the downtown area in the future, one of the high density residential areas in which tourist residential uses are included might be developed as a specialized recreation service center. The area shown just south of Rollins
Reservoir close to the intersection of U.S. Highway 80 and the proposed new freeway to Grass Valley is well located to become such a center if future demand warrants. Once again, such specialized commercial uses should be concentrated and not allowed to string out along the highways or scatter in unrelated, random locations.

Speculation as to the long-range future of recreation should consider the possibility that the railroad may sometime be utilized as a rapid transit line from the urban centers to the mountain area. Colfax might then become a point where people would leave the railroad and rent automobiles for trips into the recreation areas, begin hiking trips, or stop for short vacations. Rest homes and health resorts might flourish as a result of convenient public transportation.

Special Study Corridors

The General Plan defines certain areas as "Special Study Corridors". In these areas very careful attention should be given to protecting the natural, scenic and recreational resources and to encouraging limited development which will enhance the "corridor" and the entire region. Some parts of the corridor should be preserved in their natural state; in others, carefully controlled development for recreation - either public or private - should be encouraged. Institutions - a junior college, for instance - could be permitted where appropriate; on the other hand, billboards should be absolutely prohibited.

The preservation of scenic beauty in these areas is doubly important. First, since these rugged mountains, canyons and wooded slopes are the backdrop which make the foothills attractive, they are important to every resident of Colfax; second, properly controlled development which will harmonize with the natural setting and attract visitors to the area can be an economic asset to the community.

Examples of uncontrolled exploitation of areas of natural beauty are all too common in California. Polluted rivers, garish construction and ugliness have too often been the result. Rather than being a long-term asset, such development is often a liability to the community. This should not be allowed to occur in the Colfax Planning Area. Following the adoption of the General Plan, it is recommended that Colfax, in cooperation with the Placer County Planning Department, define the values it wants to preserve and move jointly to formulate an effectuation program for the conservation and enhancement of the Special Study Corridors. The program might include a development study, designation of county scenic highways, special zoning legislation and a program to improve access to isolated areas.

Circulation

As pointed out previously, Colfax is well located in relation to transportation facilities and future improvements could make Colfax a major junction in the regional circulation system. This strategic location should be exploited for the benefit of the community. One very important consideration, however, is the protection of the environment from the possible deleterious effects of increased traffic, congestion, noise, and highway clutter of all types. The Plan proposes a system of local major and collector roads integrated with the regional system. Such an integrated system would tend to channelize traffic,
separately purely local traffic from through traffic. Commercial development should not be permitted to string out along any of the major routes, whether local or regional. Where commercial development is permitted, strong controls over design and development should be exercised to protect the scenic qualities of the roadsides.

Regional Connections. A major proposal of the Plan is the new Grass Valley Freeway which would replace existing State Highway 174. This would connect Interstate 80 with State Highway 20 in Grass Valley. State Highway 20 will be developed as a freeway to Marysville and on to Fort Bragg. State Highway Division III states that although they have made no alignment studies, the proposed Grass Valley Freeway is feasible in the general area of alignment shown on the Plan. This route would provide a local convenience by allowing quicker and easier communication between Colfax and the neighboring cities of Grass Valley and Nevada City. It will also be a tourist route and provide improved access into the foothill country and into newly developing recreation areas. West of Interstate 80 and parallel to it, a major road is shown to give a direct connection from the Grass Valley Freeway into downtown Colfax.

Another major connection is proposed from Colfax east to Iowa Hill and into Tahoe National Forest where recreation development will occur. A major road is proposed in the southern part of the Planning Area on the existing alignment from Foresthill to Bunch Canyon and thence through Live Oak Canyon to Sleepy Hollow. The Weimar Cross Roads – New England Mills to Grass Valley should also be improved as a major road, as well as the road to Alta Sierra.

Internal Circulation. The Colfax Citizens’ Committee desires a second entrance from Interstate 80 into the City. The topography and the railroad both appear to economically preclude such a second entrance. However, the proposed connection from the proposed Grass Valley Freeway directly into Colfax would provide an alternate way into the City in addition to the existing route.

A system of major loop roads are shown to serve all parts of the Planning Area. Few, if any, of these major loops would ever be developed as high speed highways. They should be no more than two lanes through low density areas and in the hills. Closer in, four (and possibly six) lanes will be needed. The development of a rational and integrated system of major roads is of primary importance, for it will be instrumental in tying the Planning Area into a functional, unified whole. The major road network is the framework for all other development.

In most cases, the proposed major roads follow existing alignments. Some of these alignments are part of the County Select Road System. Some, however, such as the proposed route along Gillis Hill west of the North Fork of the American River, are now little more than dirt trails passable during only part of the year. However, these old trails are generally located on the best alignment and sometimes on the only feasible alignment for a future major road.

In the urban areas, the major street and road system will channel traffic around neighborhood units rather than through them. Where possible, in areas of urban density, residential lots should be laid out to “back up” on major streets rather than “front” on them. Within the neighborhoods, a system of collector streets is shown. These have the function of distributing traffic within the neighborhood as conveniently and as safely as possible. They
should be developed at a high standard with two lanes of moving traffic and parking lanes. Curbs, gutters and sidewalks should be required. Other minor residential streets should serve only the houses fronting them and should be laid out so that they will not provide short cuts which will attract traffic unrelated to the houses served.

Several studies will be made in the near future which will allow Colfax and Placer County to refine road alignments and to arrive at tentative conclusions regarding needed future highway capacities. The origin-destination study now being conducted by the County will be the most significant. Future studies by the United States Bureau of Reclamation and by the State Division of Beaches and Parks may make some additional alignments or modification of the proposed system advisable as well.
## APPENDIX A

### Table 1

**AGE COMPOSITION 1960**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Colfax No.</th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>Placer County % Total</th>
<th>California % Total</th>
<th>U.S.A. % Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-11</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-17</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-49</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-17 (school age)</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>915</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

COLFAX CITIZENS' COMMITTEE

Chairman: Charles Prince

From the City of Colfax:

C. L. Davidson
A. R. Chase
Clinton Haywood
J. B. McCleary
Armando Chelini
John H. Williams
Walter Haenny
Oswald Marson

From the Unincorporated Area:

William H. Fisher
Joseph Peart
Walter Woolley
Douglas Duff
Charles Prince
Richard Ballenger
Stella Reub
Darrell Payne

Goals and Policies
(As Adopted March 31, 1966)

HISTORY

- Emphasize railroad background.

APPEARANCE

- Need "Paint Up, Fix Up" program throughout older parts of City.
- Improve "entrance" to City from Highway 80.
- Clean-up--especially 2-acre lot has junk, debris, old building, water heaters, refrigerators, used cars. City will be widening block of Auburn Street this summer.

- Improve appearance of central area.
- Future development should respect natural topography.
- Signs should only be permitted where necessary (held to a minimum), and large signs should be avoided; provide for uniformity of size.

RESIDENTIAL

- Provide mixed lot sizes.
- Lot size range should be related to family income and use.
- Adequate off-street parking should be provided with all residential development.
- Community attractiveness and individuality are desired--especially re small houses on small lots, and apartment developments.
Mobile Home and Vacation (Dependent) Trailer Parks should be carefully located for the benefit of the over-all community. No trailers outside of trailer parks, at least within city limits.

Senior citizen housing should be integrated with other residential development; i.e., no special "areas" or "communities."

Cluster development with common green areas should be encouraged.

Logical and economic extension of the community should be encouraged.

"Overhead" utilities (electricity and telephone) should be underground where possible, otherwise should be located at rear of properties.

Pedestrian paths should be provided throughout the community.

Sidewalks should be provided in the central area (east to the freeway).

Ravines should be kept in their natural state and kept clean.

Motels and tourist accommodations should be located with a traffic and recreation orientation and should not intrude into the permanent residential areas.

COMMERCIAL

Commercial development should be grouped into customer-oriented centers.

Cluster-type development should be encouraged over strip commercial development.

Adequate off-street parking should be provided with all commercial development.

Commercial developments should be attractively landscaped.

Future development of the available Southern Pacific Railroad property in the central area ought to be reserved for commercial development, by use permit.

Tourist-oriented commercial sites ought to be reserved in the immediate area of freeway interchanges where the topography and access warrant.

Areas zoned for commercial development should relate directly with the population to be served (not on the basis of decades to come).

Should have architectural review to prevent ugly development. Aesthetics should be considered in granting a use permit.

INDUSTRIAL

Should provide adequate truck and rail access to avoid commercial, residential and tourist traffic conflict.
Sufficient appropriate industrial sites should be reserved for future development.

The most significant future employment impact will probably be the recreation industry and should be adequately provided for.

Should provide adequate off-street parking and loading.

Should have architectural review to prevent ugly development. Aesthetics should be considered in granting a use permit.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Recommend City Council create a civic complex, including the Justice Court, Post Office, Library and, in time, City Hall, and for any other County agencies.

Community Youth Center site should be improved for parking and attractively landscaped.

Community swimming pool and baseball field site should be improved with better access, parking and landscaping. Feasibility of opening alley down ravine to Culver Street should be considered.

Desire to provide for a college campus (if feasible in or near Colfax).

Urge second entrance to Colfax from freeway.

RECREATION AND TOURISM

Provide for Roadside Rest and Information Center at freeway interchange.

Provide for best development of tourist and recreation facilities consistent with the long-term betterment of the Colfax community.
THE FOLLOWING ARE SUGGESTIONS OF THE CITIZENS' COMMITTEE WHICH WERE GENERALLY NOT INCORPORATED INTO THE GENERAL PLAN, BUT SHOULD BE BROUGHT OUT AND DISCUSSED IN PUBLIC HEARING.

1. Reduce the downtown area west of Main Street from 10 acres, as shown on the Plan, to 5.1 acres. This includes parking.

2. Expand the parking east of Main Street from 0.7 acres to 1.9 acres.

3. Expand the Neighborhood Commercial east of the freeway from 8 acres to 16 acres.

4. Expand the New Commercial west of the freeway from approximately 5 acres, as shown on the Plan, to 32 acres.

5. Extend the existing Main Street south as a major artery through town.

NOTE: No exact figures were received from the Citizens' Committee's suggestions and the figures listed above were derived from measurement of rough sketches.
INTRODUCTION

A reconnaissance study has been made of sewage treatment facilities in the Colfax, California area with a view to determining the following information:

a. Determination of existing sewage treatment plant capacity.

b. Evaluation of existing sewage treatment plant in relation to future requirements.


d. Recommended location for future sewage treatment facilities.

EXISTING SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT

The existing sewage treatment plant consists of primary and secondary sedimentation tanks, digester and biofilter together with appurtenances such as sludge drying beds, chlorination equipment, measuring weir, pumps and minor appurtenances. The plant is approximately seventeen years old and was designed to serve a population of approximately 2,500. The capacity of the plant has been reviewed and the design population verified by current calculations.

The Colfax sewage treatment plant is exceptionally well maintained and the general housekeeping is of top quality. The plant is capable of operating at maximum design capacity. With proper routine maintenance of the quality that this plant is now receiving, the plant should give excellent service for at least 40 to 50 years insofar as its physical components are concerned.

POPULATION SERVED BY EXISTING SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT

The existing Colfax sewage treatment plant is presently serving a population of approximately 900. There are 311 sewer connections tributary to the plant; three of these connections consist of one 21-unit motel; one 25-unit trailer court and one 20-unit Southern Pacific Railroad housing facility; all other connections are either single residence connections, apartment connections or commercial type connections. There are no present industries being served by the plant.

PRESENT SEWAGE FLOW

Records maintained at the Colfax sewage treatment plant indicate that the inflow to the plant during peak hours is approximately 100 gallons per
minute. Observation of the inflow during offpeak hours and information received from the Colfax Director of Public Works indicate that the average flow is about 60 gallons per minute or a total of 86,400 gallons per 24 hours. The plant will easily treat a maximum flow of 250,000 to 300,000 gallons per 24 hours. On the basis of 250,000 gallons per 24 hours, the plant is presently at approximately 35 percent of capacity.

FUTURE SEWAGE TREATMENT REQUIREMENTS

Review of the General Plan for the Colfax area would indicate that the area immediately tributary to the existing sewage treatment plant will reach a population of approximately 2,500 by 1972 to 1975, after which additional sewage treatment facilities will be required.

In estimating the above date at which additional treatment facilities will be required, only those areas so situated that sewage flow to the existing plant will be by gravity are considered, with the exception of a small area below the plant from which the sewage may be pumped into the existing plant. Generally speaking, sewage treatment facilities are needed almost immediately in the areas southerly from Illinois Town, though it is probable that septic tanks can be used temporarily until such time as population growth justifies the provision of central treatment facilities in the southerly portion of the Colfax Planning Area.

It is probable that sewage treatment facilities to serve the southerly portion of the Planning Area will be required by approximately 1980. Such plant should be built by stage construction. The first increment should be programmed for construction in 1972 in order to serve excess sewage from area served by existing plant. The initial construction should provide for serving estimated population to perhaps the year 2000, including population over 2,500 in area served by existing plant. When capacity of the initial construction is reached, the plant should then be enlarged as may be dictated by population trends at that time.

Because of the mountainous terrain, the specific location for the future sewage treatment plant in the southerly end of the Colfax Planning Area will require a detailed engineering study of the terrain as compared to the population to be served. Such study should be designed to determine the best location topographically in order to receive as much of the sewage flow as possible by gravity flow and avoid the necessity for pumping. Also, the location should consider possible future reservoir construction and should consider the discharge of the final plant effluent in such manner as to avoid nuisance or water pollution. The study will no doubt determine that some areas can be served only by septic tanks or by small package type community plants.

The new treatment plant can be of the same general design as the existing plant only larger initially and arranged for additional expansion. It is not recommended that the existing plant be enlarged because of the location of the outfall and the atypical digester system employed.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that a detailed engineering study for the location of the future sewage treatment plant in the southerly end of the Planning Area should be undertaken not later than 1970.
In determining location for the future plant, consideration should also be given to the final disposal of the effluent from the existing Colfax sewage treatment plant. This effluent is now being discharged into a watercourse adjacent to the treatment plant and is of such quality that it is causing no nuisance whatever. However, it is possible that with increasing population the present point of discharge might come to be somewhat of a nuisance, even if only psychologically. It may be necessary in the future to pipe this effluent downstream and eventually discharge it in approximately the same location as may be chosen for the future plant in the southerly end of the area.

MAXIMUM SERVICE AREA

COLFAX SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT

Service Area
Secondary Service Area
(pumping necessary)
Possible Site for New Plant
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