Final

AUBURN/BOWMAN COMMUNITY PLAN
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

State Clearing House No. 91102084

May, 1994

Prepared by:

Planning Concepts

Lead Planners:	Greg DeYoung, AICP and Laurie Oberholtzer, AICP
Planning Associate:	Dave Vintze
Landscape Architect:	Scott Doss
Planning Assistant:	Cindy Barry

309 Commercial St, Nevada City,Ca 95959 916/265-8068

Assisted by:

Placer County Planning Department

Hydrology

James M. Montgomery, Inc.
Consulting Engineers

Conservation & Open Space

Placer County
Resource Conservation District

Economic & Fiscal

Recht Hausrath & Assoc.

Public Education

Placer County
Office of Education

Noise

Brown-Buntin & Assoc.
Consultants

Public Facilities

(Police, Fire, Water, Sewer)
QUAD Consultants

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION 1-1

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION 2-1

3. SUMMARY 3-1

Significant Impacts which are Mitigable 3-1
Significant Cumulative Impacts which are Mitigable . . . 3-1
Unavoidable Significant Impacts 3-1
Unavoidable Significant Cumulative Impacts 3-3
Relationship to Plans and Regulations 3-4
Growth Inducement 3-7
Issues to be Resolved 3-7
Areas of Controversy 3-7
Speculative Impacts 3-7
Alternative Summary. 3-9
Relative Impact of Alternatives – Conclusion 3-10
Mitigation Monitoring 3-10

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

4. Land Use 4-1
5. Geology / Landforms 5-1
6. Hydrology / Water Quality 6-1
7. Biological Resources 7-1
8. Air Quality 8-1
9. Archaeology/Cultural Resources 9-1
10. Traffic 10-1
11. Noise 11-1
12. Public Facilities and Services 12-1
    Schools 12-2
    Parks & Recreation 12-17
    Telephone 12-22
    Gas and Electric 12-23
    Solid Waste 12-31
    Waste Water 12-33
    Police Protection 12-42
    Water Supply 12-45
    Fire Protection 12-52
13. Fiscal Impacts 13-1
14. Visual 14-1

Table of Contents

15. ALTERNATIVES 15-1
No Project/No Development 15-4
Year 2002 Development Only 15-9
Year 2012 Development Only 15-15
No Project/Previous Plan 15-17

Alternative 1 15-20
Alternative 2 15-23
Alternative 3 15-25
Alternative 4 15-28
Increased High Density Residential/ Downscaled
Bowman Area/Upper Rock Creek Watershed 15-30

16. SHORT-TERM USES vs LONG TERM PRODUCTIVITY
IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE 16-1

17. SOURCES AND AGENCIES CONTACTED 17-1

VOLUME II - APPENDICES Separately Bound
Notice of Preparation Comments
Response to Comments on Draft EIR

List of Tables

1. Introduction

Table 1 Auburn/Bowman Community Plan Assumptions 1-5

2. Project Description

Table 2 Auburn/Bowman Community Plan Holding Capacity Spreadsheet 2-10

3. Summary

Table 3 Land Use Implementation Regulations 3-6
Table 4 Updated City of Auburn General Plan Land Use Analysis . . 3-7
Table 5 Summary - Impact/Mitigation Measures 3-12

4. Land Use

Table 6 Auburn/Bowman Existing Land Use 4-2
Table 7 Potential Suburbanization and Urbanization 4-4
Table 8 Auburn-Bowman Community Plan Comparative Land Use, Housing Units, & Population . . . 4-9
Table 9 Auburn/Bowman Community Plan Economic Employment Related Goals, Policies and Programs 4-10
Table 10 Potential Jobs/Housing Ratio at Buildout 4-11
Table 11 Auburn/Bowman Community Plan Area Hobs/Housing Ratio Projection Based on Market Absorption Expected 4-12
Table 12 Potential Jobs/Housing Rate City + County at Buildout 4-13
Table 13 Auburn/Bowman Community Plan Potential New Units by Land Use Pattern 4-14
Table 14 Existing and Potential Total Units (Existing & New) by Land Use Pattern 4-14
Table 15 Fair Share Projection by Income Level Unincorporated Placer County 4-15
Table 16 Draft Placer County Housing Element Supply Related Policies 4-16
Table 17 Plan Policies/Programs Implementation Targets Low and Very Low Income Affordability 4-17
Table 17a Existing and Potential Total Units City of Auburn 4-18

List of Tables

4. Land Use (continued)

Table 18	Placer County Agricultural Element Goals Related to Auburn/Bowman Community Plan	4-20
Table 19	Auburn/Bowman Community Plan Agricultural Lands	4-22
Table 20	Specific Soil Types within Plan Area Soil Series	4-23
Table 20a	Auburn/Bowman Community Bell Road Mixed Use Area Provisions	4-26
Table 20b	Auburn/Bowman Community Dewitt Property Mixed Use Area Provisions	4-29
Table 20c	Auburn/Bowman Community Plaza Way Provisions	4-30
Table 20d	Auburn/Bowman Community Drive In Way Industrial Provisions	4-32
Table 20e	Auburn/Bowman Community Bohemia Property Provisions	4-35
Table 20f	Auburn/Bowman Community Land Use Compatibility Concern Provisions	4-38
able 21	Growth in Selected Indicator Areas	4-41

5. Geology

Table 22	Auburn/Bowman Community Plan Goals, Policies, Implementation Measures Related to Geologic/Landform Issues	5-9
Table 23	Estimated Grading Impacts for Large-Footprint Structures at Various Slopes	5-24
Table 24	Plan Area Cut/Fill Areas of Concern	5-25
Table 25	Estimated Grading Impact Area on Lots of Various Slopes	5-27
Table 26	Plan Area Residential Grading Areas of Concern	5-28
Table 27	Additional Areas of Erosion Potential Concern	5-30
Table 28	{Deleted}	
Table 29	Recommended Land Use Plan Revisions	5-34
Table 30	Recommended Special Treatment Areas	5-35

6. Hydrology Section

Table 31	Watersheds in Auburn/Bowman Community	6-1
Table 32	Generalized Land Use Codes	6-5
Table 33	Canals in Auburn/Bowman Community	6-5
Table 34	Reservoirs in Auburn/Bowman Community	6-6
Table 35	List of Stream Crossings & Major Points of Interest	6-9
Table 36	HEC-1 Model Calibration Results	6-10
Table 37	1991 Base Condition Subbasin Hydrologic Data	6-12

List of Tables

6. Hydrology (continued)

Table 38	Future Condition Subbasin Hydrologic Data	6-15
Table 39	2-, 10-, 25-, and 100-Year Peak Flows	6-18
Table 40	Potential Sources of Pollutants in Plan Area	6-25
Table 41	Existing and Future Impervious Surfaces	6-30
Table 42	Locations in Community Plan Area Flooding Due to Plan Buildout	6-35
Table 43	Problem Access Roads to Plan Area	6-35
Table 44	Bridge and Culvert Overtopping Locations	6-36
Table 45	Goals and Policies Related to Flooding	6-39
Table 46	Bridge and Culvert Replacement	6-40
Table 47	Public Road Crossings not Recommended for Expansion	6-41
Table 48	Results of Plan Implementation	6-46
Table 49	Average Flow-weighted Concentrations of Pollutants from Metropolitan Washington NURP Study (1980-81)	6-51
Table 50	Overall Land Use Chances by Watershed	6-51
Table 51	Canal Protection Measures - Nevada Irrigation District	6-54
Table 52	Community Plan Goals and Policies Related to Water Quality	6-56
Table 53	Best Management Practices (BMPs) for The Auburn/Bowman Area	6-59

7. Biological Resources

Table 54	Sensitive Pants of the General Auburn Region	7-6
Table 55	California Department of Fish and Game Natural Heritage Div. Natural Diversity Data Base	7-7
Table 56	Endangered, Threatened and Special Animal Species Auburn/Bowman Community Plan Area	7-8
Table 57	California Department of Fish and Game Natural Diversity Data Base	7-9
Table 58	Auburn/bowman Community Plan Relevant Policies for Protection of Wildlife Species Excerpts	7-10
Table 59	Placer County Tree Preservation Ordinance Intent and Policy Excerpts	7-11
Table 60	Placer County Board of Supervisors Resolution	7-13
Table 61	Placer County Board of Supervisors Minute Order	7-14
Table 62	Auburn/Bowman Community Plan Goals and Policies Related to Vegetation	7-17
Table 63	Development/Woodland Conflicts	7-20
Table 64	Auburn/Bowman Community Plan Goals and Policies Related to Threatened, Endangered Plant Species	7-24
Table 65	Auburn/Bowman Community Plan Goals and Policies related to Wildlife Habitat	7-25
Table 66	Auburn/Bowman Community Plan Goals and Policies Related to Fish and Wildlife	7-26

List of Tables

8. Air Quality

Table 67	Ambient Air Quality Standards	8-3
Table 68	Ozone Data Rocklin- Sierra College	8-6
Table 69	Ozone Data - Auburn-Dewitt Center	8-6
Table 70	Ozone Data - Colfax-Church Street	8-7
Table 71	Ozone Data - Blue Canyon	8-7
Table 72	PM-10 Data	8-8
Table 73	Typical Estimated Construction Equipment Emissions	8-9
Table 73a	Goals and Policies that Benefit Air Quality	8-10
Table 74	Estimated Plan Buildout Auto Emissions	8-11
Table 75	Wood Heater Particulate Emission Limits	8-12
Table 76	Community Plan A/BCP Policies With Air Quality Benefits	8-14
Table 77	Policies Recommended in the Placer County 1991 Air Quality Attainment Plan	8-15
Table 78	Additional Policies Recommended in this EIR	8-17

9. Cultural Resources

Table 79	Auburn/Bowman Plan Area Cultural Areas of Concern	9-6
Table 80	Auburn/Bowman Community Plan Relevant Cultural Policies/Programs	9-6
Table 81	Potential Loss of Cultural Resources Resulting from Plan Buildout	9-9
Table 82	Sites to be Specifically Protected and Included within Future Development	9-10

10. Traffic / Circulation

Table 83	Road Network Improvement Projects Included in Placer County's in 5-year Transportation Improvement Program	10-4
Table 84	Level of Service Definitions	10-6
Table 85	Comparison of Future Traffic Congestion Resulting from Different Road Network Configurations in Auburn-Bowman Community Plan Area	10-9
Table 86	Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis Summary	10-11
Table 87	Improvement Cost Breakdown	10-13
Table 88	Impact Avoidance Strategies	10-14
Table 89	Auburn Area General Plan Capital Improvement Program Project List	10-15
Table 90	Auburn/Bowman Community Plan Circulation Element Goals & Policies	10-17
Table 91	{Deleted}	
Table 92	Auburn Area General Plan Capital Improvement Project - Initial Identification of Impacts	10-22

List of Tables

10. Traffic / Circulation (continued)

Table 93 {Deleted}

11. Noise

Table 94 Comparison of FHWA Model to Measured Noise Levels . . 11-2
Table 95 Distance from Center of Roadway to 60 dB Ldn Contours (ft) . 11-5
Table 96 Traffic Noise Adjustments for Various Topographic Conditions 11-10
Table 97 Railroad Noise Measurement Results 11-14
Table 98 Aircraft Noise Measurement Results
Rock Creek mph June 27-30, 1991 11-19
Table 99 Summary of Measured Noise Levels and Estimated Day-Night Average
Levels in Areas Containing Noise Sensitive Land Uses 11-26
Table 100 Areas of Potential Impacts to Sensitive Receptors 11-30
Table 101 Auburn/Bowman Community Plan
Noise Impact Related Policies 11-30
Table 102 Approximate Distance to Railroad Noise Contours 11-32
Table 103 Auburn/Bowman Community Plan
Policies Related to Stationary Noise Sources 11-33

12. Public Facilities

Table 104 School Facilities in Auburn/Bowman Community Plan Area . 12-2
Table 105 Auburn Union School District Capacity 12-3
Table 106 Auburn Union School District Classrooms 12-3
Table 107 Ackerman Elementary School District Capacity 12-4
Table 108 Ackerman Elementary School District Classrooms 12-4
Table 109 Placer Hills Union School District Capacity 12-5
Table 110 Placer Hills Union School District Classrooms 12-5
Table 111 Placer Union High School District Enrollment 12-5
Table 112 Auburn/Bowman Community Plan
School Funding Related Policies 12-9
Table 113 Auburn/Bowman Community Plan
School Financing Plan Related Policies 12-10
Table 114 Placer Hills Union School District Projected Enrollment . . . 12-12
Table 115 Placer Union High School District Projected Enrollment . . . 12-13
Table 116 Existing Recreation Facility Inventory 1991 12-18
Table 117 Park Development Costs Update of Information
Used by Planning Department 11-19
Table 118 Recreation Facility Demand 12-20
Table 119 EMF Related Requirements 12-27
Table 120 Magnetic Field (mG) 12-28
Table 121 {Deleted}

List of Tables

12. Public Facilities (continued)

Table 122 Summary of District Water Treatment Plant Capacity 12-46
Table 123 Hook-up Charge and Water Use Rate Trend 12-49
Table 124 Placer Foothills Consolidated Fire Protection District Stations and Locations 12-52

13. Fiscal Impacts

Table 125 Existing per Capita Service Costs Auburn/Bowman Area 13-2
Table 126 Revenues to the County Under Buildout of the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan 13-3
Table 127 County Service Costs Auburn/Bowman Community Plan 13-3
Table 128 Cost/Revenue Balance Auburn/Bowman Community Plan . . 13-4
Table 129 Revenues to the County Auburn/Bowman Previous Land Use Plan 13-4
Table 130 Average Housing Price Auburn/Bowman Community Plan Area 13-5
Table 131 Cost Revenue Balance Auburn/Bowman Previous Land Use Plan 13-5
Table 132 County Service Costs Auburn/Bowman Previous Land Use Plan 13-5

14. Visual

Table 133 Degree of Visual Change Tolerable by Viewers 14-2

15. Alternatives

Table 134 Auburn/Bowman Alternatives Holding Capacity Spreadsheet . 15-3
Table 135 Auburn/Bowman Alternatives Air Quality Impact Comparison . 15-5
Table 136 Comparison of Preliminary Land Use Alternatives 15-6
Table 137 Road System Characteristics — Development Through Year 2002 15-12
Table 138 Potential Previous Plan Buildout Jobs/Housing Ratio 15-17
Table 139 Woodland Acreage Potentially Lost to Development 15-19
Table 140 Potential Alternative #1 Plan Buildout Jobs/Housing Ratio . . 15-21
Table 141 Potential Alternative #2 Plan Buildout Jobs/Housing Ratio . . 15-23
Table 142 Potential Alternative #3 Plan Buildout Jobs/Housing Ratio . . 15-26
Table 143 Potential Alternative #4 Plan Buildout Jobs/Housing Ratio . . 15-28
Table 144 Potential Alternative Downscaled Plan Buildout Jobs/Housing Ratio 15-30
Table 145 Percent Urbanization Under Each Alternative Compared . . 15-32
Table 146 Alternatives Summary Comparison Chart 15-33

List of Figures

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

FIGURE 1 UPDATED PLAN (Full Plan Area) 2-3
FIGURE 2 UPDATED PLAN, NORTHEAST 2-4
FIGURE 3 UPDATED PLAN, NORTHWEST 2-5
FIGURE 4 UPDATED PLAN, SOUTHEAST 2-6
FIGURE 5 UPDATED PLAN, SOUTHWEST 2-7
FIGURE 6 AUBURN/BOWMAN AREA ZONING MAP - REVISIONS . . . 2-8
FIGURE 7 UPDATED CITY OF AUBURN LAND USE MAP 2-9

4. LAND USE SECTION

FIGURE 8 PREVIOUS LAND USES MAP (Aerial) 4-3
FIGURE 9 PREVIOUS BOWMAN LAND USE MAP 4-5
FIGURE 10 PREVIOUS AUBURN AREA LAND USE MAP 4-6
FIGURE 11 PREVIOUS PLAN vs UPDATED PLAN MAP 4-7
FIGURE 12 CITY PLAN vs COUNTY PLAN: Differences in Updated Land Use Designations for Undeveloped, Underdeveloped Land 4-8
FIGURE 13 IMPORTANT FARMLANDS MAP 4-21
FIGURE 14 TIMBER RESOURCES MAP 4-24
FIGURE 15 AREAS OF LAND USE COMPATIBILITY CONCERNS 4-40

5. GEOLOGY / LANDFORMS

FIGURE 16 KEY AREAS OF LANDFORM DISTURBANCE 5-26

6. HYDROLOGY SECTION

FIGURE 17 AUBURN/BOWMAN COMMUNITY AREA HYDROLOGY MAP . 6-2
FIGURE 18 PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN COVERAGE DUE TO PLAN BUILDOUT 6-33
FIGURE 19 AVERAGE PERCENT OF INCREASE IN IMPERMEABLE AREA FROM PLAN BUILDOUT 6-34

7. BIOTIC RESOURCES

FIGURE 20 VEGETATION MAP 7-3
FIGURE 21 AUBURN/BOWMAN AREA WETLANDS 7-5
FIGURE 22 POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT/WOODLANDS CONFLICTS . . 7-19
FIGURE 23 POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT/WETLANDS CONFLICTS . . . 7-23

List of Figures

10. CIRCULATION

FIGURE 24 AUBURN/BOWMAN COMMUNITY PLAN EXISTING CONDITIONS (Daily Counts Only) 10-2
FIGURE 25 CIRCULATION SYSTEM IMPACTS 10-10
FIGURE 25a EASTERLY BYPASS 10-12

11. NOISE

FIGURE 26 TRAFFIC NOISE MEASUREMENT LOCATIONS 11-4
FIGURE 27 TRAFFIC NOISE PREDICTION NOMOGRAPH 11-8
FIGURE 28 EXISTING (1988) TRAFFIC NOISE CONTOURS 11-9
FIGURE 29 FUTURE TRAFFIC NOISE CONTOURS 11-11
FIGURE 30 RAILROAD NOISE MEASUREMENT LOCATIONS 11-12
FIGURE 31 RAILROAD NOISE MEASUREMENT RESULTS 11-13
FIGURE 32 INDUSTRIAL/FIXED NOISE SOURCES & CONTOURS . . . 11-17
FIGURE 33 EXISTING AIRPORT NOISE CONTOURS 11-20
FIGURE 34 FUTURE AIRPORT NOISE CONTOURS 11-21
FIGURE 35 AIRPORT NOISE MEASUREMENT RESULTS 11-22
FIGURE 36 COMMUNITY NOISE MEASUREMENT LOCATIONS 11-24
FIGURE 37 COMMUNITY 24 HOUR NOISE MEASUREMENT RESULTS . 11-25
FIGURE 38 LAND USE COMPATIBILITY FOR COMMUNITY NOISE ENVIRONMENTS 11-29

12. PUBLIC FACILITIES

FIGURE 39 WASTEWATER AGENCY SERVICE AREAS 12-35
FIGURE 40 AREAS NEEDING COMMUNITY SEWER SERVICE 12-36
FIGURE 41 WATER SERVICE AREAS 12-47
FIGURE 42 FIRE PROTECTION AREAS 12-53

13. VISUAL

FIGURE 43 POTENTIAL URBANIZATION 14-3
FIGURE 44 VIEWSHEDS 14-7

1. Introduction

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) assesses the anticipated effects of the 1994 updated Auburn/Bowman Community Plan and concurrent Zoning Map adoption. As presented in the Project Description, the Community Plan includes new goals, policies, and implementation measures and a land use map and is intended to implement the County-wide General Plan and replace the previous Auburn and Bowman Area General Plans. The concurrent rezoning is intended to specifically implement the Community Plan.

The EIR has been prepared by Placer County as the "lead agency" in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970 and adopted by the California Resource Agency amended through June, 1993. Section 15050 of the State EIR Guidelines (1992) defines the lead agency as the ". . . public agency with the greatest responsibility for supervising or approving the project as a whole."

This consultant and Placer County have attempted to contact all affected agencies, organizations, and individuals through the Notice of Preparation and public meetings and hearings. The responsibility of the lead agency and its consultant, if any, is to ensure that the two basic functions of the EIR, reporting and project modification, are realized.

> An EIR is an informational document which will inform public agency decision-makers and the public generally of the significant environmental effect of a project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project (CEQA Guidelines, 1992).

In addition, an EIR on a general plan cannot contain the degree of specificity possible in an EIR on a development project as described below:

> The degree of specificity required in an EIR will correspond to the degree of specificity involved in the underlying activity which is described in the EIR.
>
> (a) An EIR on a construction project will necessarily be more detailed in the specific effects of the project than will be an EIR on the adoption of a local general plan or comprehensive zoning ordinance because the effects of the construction can be predicted with greater accuracy.
>
> (b) An EIR on a project such as the adoption or amendment of a comprehensive zoning ordinance or a local general plan should focus on the secondary effects that can be expected to follow from the adoption or amendment, but the EIR need not be as detailed as an EIR on the specific construction projects that might follow . . .

Discussion: . . . While CEQA requirements cannot be avoided by chopping the proposed project into pieces to render its impacts insignificant the EIR need not engage in a speculative analysis of environmental consequence for future and unspecified development. (Atherton v. Board of Supervisors of Orange County, (1983) 146 Cal. 3d 346.) (Section 15146, CEQA Guidelines, 1992).

A number of technical documents prepared by various public agencies and County departments as well as the background information assembled by the Placer County Planning Department in preparing the Community Plan were used in writing this EIR. These documents are referred to throughout the EIR and listed in the Sources section at the end of this document.

The organization of the report is depicted in the following schematic outline. Basically, each chapter is divided into three categories: Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures. The Impacts and Mitigation Measures sections have a numbering system which correlates each mitigation measure specifically to the impact it is intended to address.

SAMPLE: ORGANIZATION OF EIR CHAPTERS

SUBJECT

(Example: Hydrology)

Setting A description of the environment which may be affected by the project.

Impacts Impact Evaluation Criteria. The standards against which impacts are measured, with the goal being to determine whether or not impacts will be significant.

Impact #1: For example, a specific type of impact such as degradation of water quality...

Conclusion: The final statement on whether the impact is significant, and if so, a determination of whether or not the impact can be reduced below the level of significance.

Impact #2: A different type of hydrologic impact such as changes in groundwater levels...

Conclusion: Significant, less than significant, unmitigable, mitigable . . .

Impact #3: And so on . . .

Mitigation Measures 1. Recommendation to reduce the severity of Impact #1. (For example, methods to improve water quality.)

Effectiveness of Measure/Related Plan Provisions: A statement on whether or not the recommended measure will reduce the impact below the level of significance and listing of related Plan provisions which also provide mitigation. Whether or not the measure was included in the final Plan is discussed here also. If not included, the reasons are stated which are, in part, a brief summary of the Findings used in adopting the Plan.

Implementation: A statement of how the measure will be implemented if applicable.

All of these conclusions are listed in table format in the Summary

---

In addition, as appropriate, an attempt is made in each issue discussion to address the following impacts:

1. Plan Impacts
   - At end of Plan period: Year 2010
   - At ultimate buildout

2. Cumulative impacts, City plus County buildout combined
   - This discussion assumes buildout of the unincorporated area in County land use designations and combines City buildout of the current city limits under updated land use designations and thus constitute cumulative analysis.

3. Previous Plan vs Updated Plan. This comparison is provided for informational purposes only since the impact of the adoption of the Plan relates to the physical development pattern it will provide for rather than how it differs from the previous plan.

Contents of Final EIR

This final EIR meets the requirements of CEQA Section 15132 in the following manner:

Requirements	Where Located
§15132. The final EIR shall consist of:	
(a) The draft EIR or a revision of the draft.	This final EIR is a revision of the draft EIR and includes changes made resulting from the original Response to Comments on the Draft EIR, September 1993.
(b) Comments and recommendations received on the draft EIR either verbatim or in summary.	Comments on the draft EIR are separately bound in Volume II
(c) A list of persons, organizations, and public agencies commenting on the draft EIR.	Separately bound in Volume II
(d) The responses of the Lead Agency to significant environmental points raised in the review and consultation process.	Separately bound in Volume II
(e) Any other information added to the Lead Agency.	Changes which have been made by the Lead Agency are incorporated into this fully revised document.

Limitations

This document addresses the impacts of the February, 1994 Proposed Auburn/Bowman Community Plan as approved in concept by the Placer County Board of Supervisors and associated concurrent Zoning Map adoption. If there are any major changes in the Plan goals, policies, implementation measures, or land use map, further environmental review may be required.

In addition, over time if any of the basic assumptions on which the Plan was built change significantly, the Plan may require adjustment and further environmental review may be necessary.

Table 1
AUBURN/BOWMAN COMMUNITY PLAN ASSUMPTIONS

1. Residents of the Auburn area locate here primarily because of the small-town atmosphere, central location, and the rural environment of the surrounding area.

2. Population and employment in the Auburn area will continue to grow at a moderate rate (2.1% to 3% annual growth rate).

3. Higher densities will locate in areas where public services are available.

4. While the demand for single family homes will likely remain significant, either on large lots in the outlying areas or on smaller lots in urban areas, there will likely be a considerable increase in multiple-family units as well.

5. While the private auto will continue to be a significant means of transportation, strong efforts will be made during this period to encourage the use of public transportation and other non-auto forms of transportation.

6. An Auburn Dam project or some version may be constructed during the next 20 year plan period.

7. The primary commercial centers will continue to be the Auburn central business district (including the historic Auburn commercial area), the existing commercial corridor along Highway 49, and the existing highway service districts along Interstate 80.

8. The Auburn Airport will remain in existence with limited expansion within the plan period.

9. The Dewitt Center will continue to be a major County governmental complex.

10. Route 102 will not be constructed within the Auburn/Bowman Plan area within the 20 year period.

11. The issues related to State Route 102, the State Highway 49 Bypass North of Auburn, and State Highway 49 relocation in conjunction with the Auburn Dam are interrelated. The Community Plan – together with other studies already in progress – will contribute to providing direction to the resolution of these issues.

12. Highway 49 will be widened to 6 through lanes from I-80 to Dry Creek Road within the Plan period and to 4 lanes from Dry Creek Road to the Nevada County line within the next 3 years.

13. The demand for parks, recreation facilities, and trails for use by hikers and bicyclists will continue to grow at a rate higher than the rate of population growth.

14. The need to protect and conserve natural resources and remaining open space will become more important with a growing population.

15. The demand for all public services will continue to grow, especially in more densely developed areas.

16. Natural constraints, such as steep slopes, riparian areas, watersheds, and dense woodland areas, will be an important factor in determining where more intense development (commercial, industrial, high-density residential) should be allocated within the Plan area.

17. The relationship between air quality, transportation and land use will play an increasingly important role in development decisions in the future.

Intended Uses of this EIR / Program EIR

This EIR will be used by the Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to determine whether or not implementation of the Community Plan and concurrent rezoning of the Plan area will result in significant environmental impacts. This EIR should be considered a Program EIR as described in Section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines.

The individual activities which are connected to the Community Plan because of the logical sequence of implementation of the Plan and which have generally similar environmental effects which can be mitigated in similar ways are listed below:

1 Activities for which no additional environmental review will be necessary:

Concurrent adoption of Zoning Map.

2 Subsequent activities which are part of the overall Community Plan program but which will need to be reviewed for potential new effects when proposed:

Revisions to Ordinances

a. Zoning Ordinance text consistent with General/ Community Plans
b. Revisions to Subdivision Ordinance consistent with General/Community Plans
c. Revisions to Grading Ordinance consistent with General/ Community Plans
d. Revisions to Environmental Review Ordinance consistent with General/Community Plans
e. Revisions to the Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance consistent with General/Community Plans

Revisions to Guidelines

f. Revisions to Design Review Guidelines consistent with General/Community Plans
g. Revisions to Landscape Guidelines consistent with General/Community Plans

Revisions to Other rules adopted to protect health and safety and promote General Welfare of the County

3 Development Projects

In addition, this EIR can be used to:

a. Determine whether or not additional environmental review is needed for individual project applications as part of Initial Environmental Studies. (The Initial Environmental Study may point to the need for a Negative Declaration, supplemental EIR, EIR addendum or a full EIR.)

b. Focus topics to be discussed in future EIRs or to simplify discussions in future EIRs (particularly cumulative impact discussions).

c. Certain types of projects as referenced in Section 15183 of the CEQA Guidelines may rely on this EIR for a large part of the normally required issues to be addressed as part of the environmental review process.

The Placer County Environmental Review Ordinance provides for this "tiering" of EIRs:

31.6.12 **TIERING** - The Lead Department shall encourage the tiering of EIRs whenever feasible. EIRs of broad scope shall be prepared for broad plans, policies, and programs. Subsequent EIRs shall incorporate by reference the general discussions contained in broader EIRs, and focus on significant effects not examined in the broader EIR and on site-specific issues. The project Initial Study shall be used to determine the extent to which the broader EIR is sufficient for the narrower project under consideration.