7. Biotic Resources

Setting

This section of the EIR describes the potential effects of the Community Plan on the vegetation and fish and wildlife of the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan area. The information used in this section of the EIR was taken from the Draft Auburn/Bowman Community Plan, Conservation and Open Space component of the Environmental Resource Management Element (Appendix E of the Auburn/ Bowman Community Plan Background Report)

Vegetation/Wildlife Habitat The vegetation types described in the Community Plan Environmental Resources Management Element and in the paragraphs below are based on the "California Wildlife Habitat Relationship System" (WHR) which is used primarily to predict the presence of wildlife species. Various other vegetation classification systems are available, one of which is used by the California Natural Diversity Data Base in listing special plant communities such as "Valley Oak Woodland" (Cheatham & Haller (1975) as modified by Holstein, Jensen and Holland).

The vegetative habitats in the Auburn/Bowman area are broken into ten types:

valley-foothill riparian
annual grassland
pasture
orchard/vineyard
blue oak woodland
blue oak-digger pine
montane hardwood
montane hardwood-conifer
mixed chaparral
urban and barren

The valley-foothill riparian habitat is found primarily around low velocity stream flows, floodplains, and gentle topography such as the Dry Creek Area. The dominant tree species are cottonwood, California sycamore, and valley oak; white alder, box-elder and Oregon ash are also present in the subcanopy. Typical understory plants include wild grape, wild rose, California blackberry, blue elderberry, poison oak, buttonbrush, and willows. Herbaceous plants include sedges, rushes, grasses, miner's lettuce, Douglas sagewort, poison hemlock, and hoary nettle. Riparian vegetation is habitat for many wildlife species and is rapidly disappearing.

Valley-foothill riparian habitats provide food, water, mitigation and dispersal corridors, escape, nesting, and thermal cover for an abundance of wildlife, including as many as 50 amphibians and reptiles, 147 birds, and 55 mammals.

The annual grasslands are found on the flat plains and gently rolling hills. The open areas, often thought of as dry pasture, are good examples of grassland

habitat. Introduced annual grasses are the dominant plants of this habitat, but numerous wildflowers are also present. Vernal pools, which often contain rare plants, are found within the broad category of annual grassland. Many wildlife species, including some raptors of special concern, use annual grasslands for foraging.

Pasture land is located on flat and rolling plains similar to the grassland habitat. The primary difference is that pasture land is planted and often irrigated. Pasture is habitat for ground-nesting birds such as waterfowl, pheasant, and sandhill crane.

Blue oak woodland is usually found on shallow, rocky infertile, well-drained soils and is well-adapted to drought. The form of this woodland ranges from nearly closed in better soils, to open and savanna-like in other areas. Shrubs are typically present, but not extensive, and the understory layer often consists of annual grassland. A lack of regeneration has been observed in the sapling stage (1-10 feet) and concern exists over the long-term viability of the blue oak woodlands. These woodlands provide breeding habitat for as many as 29 amphibian and reptile species, 57 species of birds, and 10 species of mammals. Acorns provide a valuable food source for many species of birds and mammals.

Blue oak-Digger pine woodland is a habitat diverse in structure, with a mix of hardwoods, conifers, and shrubs. As in the case of blue oak woodland, regeneration is a concern. Like blue oak woodland, this habitat is important for breeding, food supply, and cover.

Montane hardwood habitat type consists of canyon live oaks and other oaks growing in a variety of situations. Many species use this habitat (see the Conservation and Open Space Component of the Environmental Resources Management Element for a description).

Montane hardwood-conifer habitat typically occurs on coarse, well-drained soils in mountainous terrain with narrow valleys. It often occurs as a closed forest with at least one-third of the trees being conifer of various types and one-third being broad leaf trees of various types. Many wildlife species use this habitat.

Mixed chaparral is a brushland which generally occurs on steep slopes and ridges with relatively thin, well-drained soils. No wildlife species are restricted to this habitat type.

The urban landscape consists of tree groves, street strips, shade tree/lawn, lawn and shrub cover. Both native and exotic plant species can be found in the urban environment. Animal species increase in diversity as one moves from downtown to urban residential, to suburban areas.

Wetlands. Wetlands constitute a habitat of special significance. The following excerpt from the Draft Community Plan Conservation and Open Space Component of the Environmental Resources Management Element (Appendix E of the Community Plan Background Report) explains the importance of wetlands:

Wetlands are an important vegetative and wildlife resource, as well as a vital link in the maintenance of water resources. Issues and topics concerning wetlands have been brought to "center stage" in the last few years. Our nation's emphasis on food and fiber production in the 1960's and 1970's saw the conversion of several million acres of wetlands to farmland. In the 1980's, the rapid urbanization of farmland and rangeland further complicated the situation. There is now a strong awareness in this country that wetland areas are a part of our national heritage and environmental well being and, as such, we can no longer directly or indirectly promote their demise. Protection and enhancement of wetlands is now recognized as being of local, state and federal importance.

There are numerous definitions of what constitutes a wetland. Four federal agencies (the U.S. fish and Wildlife Service, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the Army Corps of Engineers, and the USDA Soil Conservation Service) whose jurisdiction and/or programs impact wetlands, have come to a general agreement on a unified definition:

> "Wetlands are defined as areas that have a predominance of hydric soils and that are inundated or saturated by surface or ground water at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and under normal circumstances does support, a prevalence of hydrophytic vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions".

This definition specifies hydrology, hydrophytic vegetation, and hydric soils. The Corps of Engineers, EPA, and Soil Conservation Services wetland definitions include only areas that are vegetated under normal circumstances. The Fish and Wildlife Service definition encompasses both vegetated and non-vegetated areas. For purposes of simplification, the characteristics and their technical criteria for identification are not described here.

The map following this page shows wetlands as determined by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service prior to 1977 based on satellite photographs, this wetlands map is overlayed onto the proposed Land Use Plan (Figure 21):

Special Plant Species. Table 54 contains a description of the sensitive plants of the general Auburn area (Canyon View Draft EIR, January, 1992). As shown on the list, these sensitive plants occur in a variety of habitats at varying elevations. Those habitats which appear to best predict the presence of sensitive plants are vernal pools, other wetlands, and those occurring on special soil types, such as gabbro (which includes serpentine).

Of the thirty plants listed, only five are legally protected (State of California). However, the Department of Fish and Game considers "Special Plants" to be on an equal footing with those which are legally protected in terms of environmental significance. Special Plants include candidate species, California Native Plant Society listed species, and others as shown in Table 55.

Table 54
SENSITIVE PLANTS OF THE GENERAL AUBURN REGION

PLANT TAXON	COM. NAME	LIST	R-E-D	FWS	CDFG	ELEV.	HABITAT
SPECIES OF PRIMARY CONCERN:							
Calystegia stebbinsii	Stebbins' morning-glory	1b	3-3-3	C2	E	800 - 1600'	gabbro, (serpentine?) open chaparral
Ceanothus roderickii	Pine Hill ceanothus	1b	3-1-3	C2	R	500 - 3000' ?	chap., woodland; serp./gabbro, Pine Hill area
Chamaesyce (Euphorbia) hooveri	Hoover's spurge	1b	3-2-3	C1	-	below 500'	vernal pools, dried mud flats
Eschscholzia rhombipetala	diamond - petaled Calif. poppy	1b	2-1-3	C2	-	below 5000'	dry flats, brushy slopes ?
Gratiola heterosepala	Bogg's Lake hedge-hyssop	1b	3-3-2	C2	E	2900'	vernal pools, shallow marshy ground
Hellanthemum suffrutescens	Bisbee Peak rock rose	1b	2-2-3	C2	-	about 500'	chaparral
Juncus leiospermus var. ahartii	Ahart's dwarf rush	1b	3-1-3	C1	-	150'	vernally moist valley grassland
Juncus leiospermus var. leiospermus	Red Bluff rush	1b	3-2-3	C2	-	150 - 2000'	vernal pools, low vernally moist places, red clay so
Legenere limosa	legenere	1b	3-3-3	C2	-	low elevations	vernal pools, valley grassland
Lewisia cantelowii	Cantelow's lewisia	1b	2-2-3	C3c	-	3000'	wet cliffs, shaded outcrops
Phacelia stebbinsii	Stebbins' phacelia	1b	2-2-3	C2	-	3000 - 5000'	metamorphic rock cliffs and ledges
Senecio layneae	Layne's butterweed	1b	2-2-3	C2	R	about 800'	open chaparral, foothill woodland
Sidalcea stipularis	Scadden Flat checkerbloom	1b	3-3-3	C1	E	2400'	freshwater seep, wet meadow
Wyethia reticulata	El Dorado Co. mule ears	1b	2-2-3	C2	-	1200 - 1500'	stoney red clay so chaparral, foothill woodland
SPECIES OF SECONDARY CONCERN:							
Drosera anglica	English sundew	2	2-2-1	-	-	4300 - 6000'	bogs, montane marshes
Eriogonum nutans var. glabrum	glabrous nodding buckwheat	2	2-1-1	-	-	4300 - 5500' ?	dry places
Arctostaphylos truei	True's manzanita	3	?-?-3	-	-	mid elevations ?	chaparral
Fritillaria eastwoodii	Butte Co. fritillary	3	1-2-3	C2	-	mid elevations ?	chaparral, foothill woodland
Plagiobothrys glyptocarpus var. modesta	Cedar Crest popcorn flower	3	3-1-3	C2	-	1500 to 4000' ?	foothill woodland; Cedar Crest area
Trillium kurabayashii	Kurabayashi's wakerobin	3	?-?-2	-	-	no data	no data
Clarkia mildrediae	Mildred's clarkia	4	1-1-3	-	-	mid- to upper forest	lower montane coniferous forest
Cypripedium fasciculatum	clustered lady's-slipper	4	1-1-2	C3c	-	middle forest zones	open rocky woods, redwoods to yellow pine
Darlingtonia californica	California pitcher plant	4	1-2-1	C3c	-	300 - 6000'	bogs, marshy places
Dichelostemma lacuna-vernalis	vernal pool brodiaea	4	1-1-3	C3c	-	below 800' ?	vernal pools
Haplopappus lucidus	sticky haplopappus	4	1-1-3	-	-	mid elevations ?	lower montane coniferous forest
Navarretia prolifera ssp. lutea	yellow bur navarretia	4	1-1-3	C3c	-	2700 - 4500'	yellow pine forest
Perideridia bacigalupii	Bacigalupi's perideridia	4	1-2-3	C3c	-	1500 - 5000'	red clay soil; chap., yellow pine and foothill woodland
Perideridia pringlei	Pringle's yampah	4	1-1-3	C3c	-	1000 - 3500'	open slopes and canyons
Quercus lobata	valley oak	4	1-2-3	-	-	below 2000'	foothill and valley woodland, riparian
Rhynchospora alba	white beaked rush	4	1-1-1	-	-	low elevations	bogs, freshwater marsh

LEGEND Table 18

Plant Taxon: as listed by Smith and Berg (1988).

List: refers to the list number on which the plant is included in Smith and Berg (1988; California Native Plant Society's sensitive plant inventory). 1a: Plants presumed extinct (PE) in California with date last seen, 1b: Plants rare or endangered in California and elsewhere, 2: Plants rare or endangered in California, but more common elsewhere, 3: Plants about which we need more information, and 4: Plants of limited distribution [a watch list]. Appendix 1 Plants considered, but not included.

R-E-D: rarity (R), endangerment (E), and distribution (D) code from Smith and Berg (1988) :

Rarity :
- 1 = Rare, but found in sufficient numbers and distributed widely enough that the potential for extinction or extirpation is low at this time
- 2 = Occurrence confined to several populations or to one extended population
- 3 = Occurrence limited to one or a few highly restricted populations, or present in such small numbers that it is seldom seen

Endangerment :
- 1 = Not endangered
- 2 = Endangered in a portion of its range
- 3 = Endangered throughout its range

Distribution :
- 1 = More or less widespread outside California
- 2 = Rare outside California
- 3 = Endemic to California

FWS: C1 = A candidate taxon, Category 1: information sufficient for federal listing by FWS (1985). C2 = Also a candidate, Category 2: information insufficient for formal proposal for listing. C3c = Previously considered, but currently considered to be too common for listing.

CDFG: E = Endangered, R = Rare as designated by CDFG (1988).

Habitat, Elevation, Flowering Period: As reported in Munz and Keck (1959), Munz (1968), Smith and Berg (1988), and/or Abrams and Ferris (1923 - 1951).

Table 55
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
NATURAL HERITAGE DIVISION
NATURAL DIVERSITY DATA BASE
Special Plants
August 1991

"Special Plants" is a broad term used to refer to all the plant taxa inventoried by the Natural Diversity Data Base, regardless of their legal or protection status. Special Plant taxa are species, subspecies or varieties that fall into one or more of the following categories:

* Officially listed by California or the Federal Government as Endangered, Threatened or Rare;
* A candidate for state or federal listing as Endangered, Threatened or Rare;
* Taxa which meet the criteria for listing, even if not currently included on any list, as described in Section 15380 of the CEQA Guidelines;
* A Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or U.S. Forest Service Sensitive Species;
* Taxa listed in the California Native Plant Society's Inventory of Rare and Endangered Vascular Plants of California;
* Taxa that are biologically rare, very restricted in distribution or declining throughout their range but not currently threatened with extirpation;
* Population(s) in California that may be peripheral to the major portion of a taxon's range but are threatened with expiration in California;
* Taxa closely associated with a habitat that is declining in California at an alarming rate (e.g. wetlands, riparian, old growth forests, desert aquatic systems, native grasslands, valley shrubland habitats, vernal pools, etc.).

SOURCE: California Dept. of Fish and Game

Endangered, Threatened, and Special Animal Species. The potential exists for endangered and threatened species to occur in the Plan area. Specifically, the wildlife listed in Table 56 should be the subject of protection as should their habitat. As shown in the table, habitat types for these special species vary widely, but generally have the common denominator of riparian habitat.

As in the case of plants, the California Department of Fish and Game considers special animals to be on an equal footing with those which are legally protected, "Special Animals" are defined in Table 57.

Table 56
ENDANGERED, THREATENED AND SPECIAL ANIMAL SPECIES
AUBURN/BOWMAN COMMUNITY PLAN AREA

Species and Status[1]	Principal Habitat[2]
Endangered:	
Bald Eagle	Large bodies of water or free-flowing rivers w/adjacent snags (feeding); large, stoutly-limbed trees, snags, or rocks near water (cover); charge. open-branched trees, especially ponderosa pine (reproduction)
Threatened:	
Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle	Low elevation elderberry bushes often at woodland margins.
Giant Garter Snake	Permanent to semi-permanent bodies of water.
Greater Sandhill Crane	Wet meadows, lakes, and emergent wetlands (summers; winters in Central Valley)
Federal Category 2 Candidate:	
Ferruginous Hawk	Open grasslands.
Red Legged Frog	Streams, marshes and ponds.
Species of Special Concern:	
Golden Eagle	Grasslands, savannas, and early successional stages of forest and shrub habitats (feeding), cliffs and large trees (cover and nesting).
Coopers Hawk	Dense stands of live oak, riparian or other forest habitats near water.
Sharp-shinned Hawk	Ponderosa pine, black oak, riparian deciduous, and mixed conifer.
Long Eared Owl	Riparian, live oak, and other defense stands of trees.
Purple Martin	Variety of wooded low elevation habitats, including riparian.
Yellow Breasted Chat	Valley foothill riparian.
Yellow Warbler	Riparian, ponderosa pine, chaparral and other.
California Horned Lizard	Valley foothill hardwood, conifer, riparian and annual grassland habitats.
Fully Protected:	
Black Shouldered Kite	Grasslands, pastures where trees present.

Legal Status (See the Federal Register for legal definitions of federal status)

FED: Endangered = Federally listed Endangered
FED: Threatened = Federally Listed Threatened
FED: Prop Endang = Proposed for Federal Listing as Endangered
FED: Prop Threat = Proposed for Federal Listing as Threatened
FED: Candidate 1 = Candidate for Federal Listing, Category 1
FED: Candidate 2 = Candidate for Federal Listing, Category 2
FED: List 3A = Withdrawn from candidacy for Federal Listing
FED: List 3B = Withdrawn from candidacy for Federal Listing
FED: List 3C = Withdrawn from candidacy for Federal Listing

CALIF:Endangered = California Listed Endangered
CALIF: Threatened = California Listed Threatened
CALIF: Rare = California Listed Rare

[1]SOURCE: Auburn/Bowman Community Plan Draft Conservation & Open Space Component of the Environmental Resources, Management Element (Appendix E of the Background Report)

[2]SOURCE: *California's Wildlife*, Vol. I,II. California Statewide Wildlife Habitat Relationships System, Dept. of Fish and Game, April 1990. (Except Valley Elderberry, Longhorn Beetle)

Table 57
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
NATURAL DIVERSITY DATA BASE
Special Animals
August 1991

"Special Animals" is a broad term used to refer to all the vertebrate and invertebrate taxa of concern to the Natural Diversity Data Base (NDDB), regardless of their legal or protection status. Special Animals listed with a code fall into one or more of the following categories:

- Officially listed or proposed for listing under the State and/or Federal Endangered Species Acts.
- State or Federal candidate species for possible listing.
- California Department of Fish and Game Species of Special Concern.

[Note: The NDDB breaks these categories down into the following subcategories:]

Listed as Endangered
Listed as Threatened by the State of California
California Candidate for listing as Endangered
California Candidate for listing as Threatened
California Department of Fish and Game "Species of Special Concern"
Listed as Endangered by the Federal Government
Listed as Threatened by the Federal Government
Proposed as Endangered by the Federal Government
Proposed as Threatened by the Federal Government
Federal (BLM and USFS) Sensitive Species
Category 1 Candidate for Federal listing (Taxa for which the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has sufficient biological information to support a proposal to list as Endangered or Threatened)
Category 2 Candidate for Federal listing (Taxa which existing information indicates may warrant listing, but for which substantial biological information to support a proposed rule is lacking)
"Recommended" for Category 1 status by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
"Recommended" for Category 2 status by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

---

SOURCE: California Dept. of Fish and Game

Important Wildlife Species. In addition to the special animals described above, the following species are identified in the Community Plan Environmental Resources Management Element as being worthy of protective measures (Table 58):

Table 58
AUBURN/BOWMAN COMMUNITY PLAN
WILDLIFE SPECIES DESCRIPTIONS

Conservation and Open Space

1. **Big Game** - Deer within the planning area are non-migratory Columbian Black-Tailed Deer. These deer live in the same area year-round and do not have wintering and summering areas. Deer have been observed throughout the planning area and are numerous in some locations.

2. **Wild Turkey** - The Department of Fish and Game has planted wild turkeys in Placer County because of excellent habitat. The original plants were made in the Coon Creek drainage near Garden Bar Road. This was determined successful and a viable population has been established. The birds have spread along different water courses and are continuing to be observed in new areas. The primary habitat types suitable for turkeys include hardwoods (deciduous oaks, live oak, and madrone), and woodland-grass (hardwoods associated with herbaceous elements).

3. **California Quail** - California quail are common. Preferred habitat for these game birds is woodland-brush areas interspersed with grassy areas. Quail numbers vary from area to area depending upon the amount, quality, and distribution of food, water and cover. Excellent habitat occurs in the berry-covered areas.

4. **Band-Tailed Pigeon** - Band-Tailed Pigeons are very common. Flocks numbering in the hundreds have been observed during the fall at various locations in the process of feeding and resting during their migration to southern California and Mexico. Large flocks spend the winter on ridges along the American and Bear River drainages.

   The presence of pine-oak woodlands and other mast producing trees determine the abundance of Band-Tailed Pigeons. Nearby chaparral stands are also important, providing seeds and berries.

5. **Mourning Dove** - The Mourning Dove is a common upland game species. Numbers are generally high until cold weather occurs in the fall when most migrate south.

6. **Raptors** - The Golden Eagle and the Bald Eagle use both the American River and Bear River canyons for wintering areas, and nesting sits likely exist in both drainages.

Impact Evaluation Criteria

The existing 1978 Auburn Area and Bowman General Plans contain a number of goals and policies on the protection of vegetation, fish and wildlife which have been used as evaluation criteria in past environmental and project review (for example: Natural Resource Conservation Goals 1 and 3 accompanying policies of the Auburn Area General Plan). More recent policies have been adopted as part of the County's Tree Preservation Ordinance (October 1991) and Wetland Mitigation Banking Resolution (#92-39, 2/4/92).

The Tree Preservation Ordinance recognizes both the importance of trees and the pace of their removal as described in the excerpt shown in Table 59 (pp. 1-4). Important features of the ordinance include a direction to protect groves, corridors and stands of native trees within project boundaries and a provision for off-site mitigation.

The Wetland Mitigation Banking Resolution is excerpted in Table 60.

Table 59
PLACER COUNTY TREE PRESERVATION ORDINANCE
INTENT AND POLICY EXCERPTS

I. PURPOSE AND INTENT

For centuries native oak trees have existed as dominant and magnificent features of the landscape of the Sierra Foothill region. Over the years trees have been cleared to accommodate agriculture, burned as firewood and removed to facilitate development. Only a portion of the original oak woodland forest remains today. The removal of oak and other native trees continues to the present time and occurs at a much faster pace than natural revegetation in areas of development.

Trees are key elements in our living system, the boundaries of which do not conform to the arbitrary property lines of individual lots and parcels, and upon which the continued health and welfare of this community depends. It is acknowledged that the preservation of trees enhances the natural scenic beauty, improves air quality, water quality, reduces soil erosion, preserves significant natural heritage values, preserves wildlife habitat, and helps to reduce energy consumption for air cooling by providing shade. Trees in a community or neighborhood also provide a sense of identity and tradition, and they enhance property values which encourages higher quality development.

As development of vacant land occurs, loss of some tree cover may be unavoidable. However, it is the County's intent to reduce the loss of trees to reasonably acceptable levels while at the same time providing for fuel reduction and fire prevention activities to protect the residents of the County from such catastrophic losses that can occur. Therefore, it has become necessary for an ordinance to be established to preserve and protect the remaining native oak and other species of trees within Placer County. The spirit of this Ordinance is to encourage an atmosphere of mutual cooperation between members of the development community, private citizens, and County officials in attempting to retain tree cover within the County. Furthermore, the ordinance is to provide for educational programs and materials to promote an awareness of the value of trees, and provide information to the public relating to the care, maintenance, and planting of trees.

Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
October 29, 1991

Table 59 (Continued)
PLACER COUNTY TREE PRESERVATION ORDINANCE
INTENT AND POLICY EXCERPTS

Thus, it shall be the policy of this County to preserve trees wherever feasible, through the review of all proposed development activities where trees are present on either public or private property, while at the same time recognizing individual rights to develop private property in a reasonable manner. In the spirit of reasonableness the Tree Ordinance does not categorically prohibit tree removal and contains numerous exemptions for specific types of activities. It is also recognized, that due to the extremely diverse terrain and vegetation within the County, different policies may be applicable to specific areas of the County.

II. TREE PRESERVATION POLICIES

To assist in the implementation of the Placer County Tree Preservation Ordinance, the following has been adopted by Resolution of the Board of Supervisors as a set of policies relating to Tree Preservation.

A. Where groves of native trees, native tree corridors, or significant stands of native tree habitats are located within a project boundary, efforts should be made to preserve the groves, corridors, or stands of trees. This approach is particularly appropriate for planned unit developments but may include other residential, commercial, or industrial projects as well.

B. In lieu of penalties/replacement on large projects, mitigation could include preservation of an area on or off-site through dedication of open space easements, rezoning to open space, or public ownership.

C. In certain cases, the County may consider the relocation of Native Oak Trees from one area in a project to another. Credit shall be given for relocation on the same basis as replacement. The guidelines and limitations for relocation are as follows:

1. The tree(s) being recommended for relocation must be approved by the Approving Body whose decision will be based upon factors relating to health, type, size, time of year and proposed location.

2. The size of the relocated tree may not exceed six inches (6") in diameter. Exceptions to this policy may be made if a larger diameter nursery-grown Native Oak Tree is available and can be reserved for a period of one (1) year.

D. **Application Evaluation Criteria** - When evaluating tree removal, the following criteria will be considered:

1. The proposed building's gross floor area in relation to the "usable" size of the site, and the amount of usable space on the parcel which does not require the removal of Protected Trees.

2. Design features in comparison with other existing or approved building developments in the same vicinity and zone which have or had Protected Trees on the parcel.

3. Factors that are unique to the proposed property such as topographic constraints, lot configuration and other physical limitations.

4. The overall health, age and structural condition of the potentially impacted Protected Trees.

5. The percentage of trees removed as compared to the existing trees on-site.

6. Whether or not the tree removal conforms to the policies contained in approved community plans and general plans.

7. Whether or not the degree of encroachment is likely to result in the subsequent decline of the affected Protected Tree or create a future risk to public safety or pose a hazard to adjacent structures.

8. The approximate age of the Protected Tree compared with the average life span for that species.

9. Age of the Protected Tree with regard to whether or not removal of the Protected Tree would encourage healthier, more vigorous growth of younger similar trees in the area.

10. The number of existing Protected Trees in the area.

11. If the tree has the potential of being designated as a "Landmark Tree."

12. The effect of removal on soil stability/erosion, particularly near water courses or on steep slopes.

13. The potential for the Protected Tree to be a public nuisance, or interfere with utility service, as well as the proximity of existing structures.

14. Present and future shade potential with regard to solar heating and cooling.

15. Whether or not there are any alternatives that would allow for the preservation of the Protected Tree.

16. Any other information the Approving Body finds pertinent to the decision, including, if necessary, information obtained at a public hearing.

Table 60
PLACER COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS RESOLUTION

Before the Board of Supervisors
County of Placer, State of California

In the matter of: REFINING WETLAND MITIGATION POLICY AND AUTHORIZING A PILOT PROJECT FOR WETLAND MITIGATION BANKING

Resol. No: 92-39

Ord. No: .....

First Reading: .....

The following RESOLUTION was duly passed by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Placer at a regular meeting held FEBRUARY 4, 1992, by the following voto on roll call:

Ayes: BELAND, HOGG, FLUTY

Noes: FERREIRA

Absent: OZENICK

Signed and approved by me after its passage.

Chairman, Board of Supervisors

Attest:
Clerk of said Board
Georgia Flake

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors of the County of Placer has recognized that wetlands represent a significant, scarce, natural resource worthy of protection, whose total acreage and habitat resource values are affected by the development and improvement of public and private lands in the County, and;

WHEREAS, the County proposes to mitigate the loss and/or impact of wetlands and their related habitat values, and;

WHEREAS, appropriate mitigation must first be preceded by avoidance and protection of existing resources, and where avoidance is not possible, wetlands are to be mitigated with in-kind, on-site resources and when in-kind, on-site mitigation is not possible, in-kind, off-site mitigation shall be required. Where in-kind, off-site mitigation is not possible or preferable, then out-of-kind, on-site shall be required and when out-of-kind, on-site is not feasible or practical, out-of-kind, off-site is acceptable, and;

WHEREAS, the County has determined that, for those circumstances when off-site mitigation must be used, such mitigation shall occur at designated wetland mitigation bank sites once a wetland mitigation banking program has been established, and;

WHEREAS, the County has determined that in order to successfully establish a wetland mitigation banking program, it is necessary to first establish and monitor a pilot project concurrent with the establishment of a regional banking program, and;

WHEREAS, the County has determined that the greatest need for mitigation banking is in those areas of the County currently being developed with resultant impacts on significant wetland resources, and;

WHEREAS, considerable effort has been directed towards identifying suitable sites for a pilot project in the impacted areas of the southern portion of the County, and that the sites which have been reviewed and found to be acceptable to the relevant state and federal trustee agencies, are sites located within the Granite Bay Community Plan;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Placer County, that the County shall encourage the acquisition and development of a pilot wetland mitigation bank site within the Granite Bay Community Plan area on one or more sites previously evaluated and determined to be acceptable and that said pilot program shall be established and monitored concurrent with the establishment of a County-wide wetland mitigation banking program with the intent of mitigating impacts on wetland habitat acreage and values throughout the County.

It advances the concept of a wetland mitigation bank, which has been implemented to the point where fees are being collected. The concept allows for off-site mitigation of significant wetland impacts, but only after on-site alternatives have been evaluated. Wetland banking has been implemented in other locations and may be carried out at the State level if pending legislation is successful.

A related County directive is Minute Order 90-09 which sets a significance threshold of one acre under specified conditions (see Table 61). Item #3 implies that wetland banking would be an appropriate mitigation tool for the less-than-significant wetlands defined in the Minute Order.

Table 61
PLACER COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

PLACER COUNTY

BOARD MEMBERS

ROBERT P. MALAN, District 1 — GEORGE DELANO, District 3
ALEX FERREIRA, District 2 — SUSAN HOGG, District 4
MIKE FLUTY, District 5

GEORGIA FLAKE
CLERK OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
175 FULWEILER AVENUE, RM. 101 / AUBURN, CALIFORNIA 95603 / (916) 889-4020

MINUTE ORDER

During a special meeting held Monday, July 23, 1990, the Placer County Board of Supervisors directed the following:

LAND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS/ALTERATION OF WETLANDS

1. By Minute Order No. 90-09 of the Board of Supervisors, the following criteria is to be used by County staff to determine when a project involving the alteration of wetlands is considered less than significant (thus permitting the preparation of a Negative Declaration where adequate mitigation has been proposed).

   a. The size of the wetland is less than one acre, and;

   b. The wetland does not contain or will not significantly affect a rare, threatened, or endangered species of plant or animal or the habitat of the species, and;

   c. The wetland is not part of an existing natural, continuous and substantially unaltered drainage system, and;

   d. Proposed alteration of the wetland will not degrade the water quality of an on-site or off-site water source, and;

   e. The proposed project complies with the flood management standards contained in the Placer County Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance, and;

   f. The work/alteration can be conducted in a manner which complies with the Placer County Grading Ordinance, and;

   g. The project is consistent with the Placer County General Plan or any adopted Community or Specific Plan, and;

   h. The wetland is not part of a hydrologic system which serves as a public recreation facility which would be degraded by alteration of the wetlands.

-1-

It would be recommended that any project proposed in a wetland area which met the above requirements of "less than significant" would be issued a Negative Declaration (assuming other significant impacts had not been identified). Other projects involving alteration of wetland area(s) may require an Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

2. Staff is directed to incorporate the following mitigation measures into the project review process:

The following mitigation measures shall be considered for any project adversely affecting wetlands. (It should be noted that although a project affecting a wetland area may not be considered significant for environmental review purposes, during the project review phase, mitigation measures for preservation of the wetland area may be required.) There are three main types of mitigation measures which should be considered. They are listed here in order of preference: (1) onsite, (2) offsite, and (3) site banking.

a. Onsite mitigation would include redesign of the project to avoid or minimize degradation of the wetland. It could also include duplication of the physical nature of the wetland within the project site. Onsite mitigation is believed to be environmentally superior in almost all cases. However, retention of small, isolated wetland areas within development has proven to be risky, sometimes futile, in the lasting preservation of those areas. In these cases, mitigation banking may be the preferred alternative.

b. Offsite mitigation would consist of the recreation or rehabilitation of a wetland area outside the project site.

c. Mitigation banking is the process by which a mitigation fee is assessed and then applied to the purchase and/or development of a superior wetland site to be held in perpetuity under public ownership. Mitigation banking could be used when an alternative project site does not exist or, as stated above, a small, isolated wetland area would remain. Drawbacks to mitigation banking are the resulting reduction in the diversity of wetlands, and riparian corridors.

3. Staff is authorized to work with the Resource Conservation District, Department of Fish and Game, Corps of Engineers, Fish and Wildlife Services, cities, and the development community to establish a Placer County wetland mitigation banking program. The goal is to identify areas which could be acquired and set aside for the permanent protection of wetlands. Attention will be focused on sites which can be protected over the long term from outside influences which would eventually result in the loss of wetland resources.

MOTION: Hogg/Fluty/Unanimous
SUPERVISORS VOTING AYE: Mahan, Ferreira, Hogg, Fluty, Beland
SUPERVISORS ABSENT: None

ATTEST:

Georgia Flake
Georgia Flake
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

c: CDD/Planning Division & Building Division
Public Works Department
County Counsel
File

At the State level, the Department of Fish and Game is responsible for implementing the California Fish and Game Code and the California Native Plant Protection Act which include protection for rare and endangered species. The Department also has a policy protecting wetlands, which are defined in similar terms as those used by the US Army Corps of Engineers as discussed below. The first statement in that policy reads: "I. California's remaining wetlands provide significant and essential habitat for a wide variety of important resident and migratory fish and wildlife species." Finally, the Department manages an information program called the California Natural Diversity Data Base which records sitings of rare, threatened, endangered and otherwise sensitive species, as well as occurrences of natural communities. The Data Base considers natural communities as being species equivalents in rating their status (such as rarity, endangeredness, etc.). The basis for this practice is that natural communities have value by themselves and that they may harbor sensitive species which have not yet been identified and which might not be identified and protected before they are eliminated. While this consideration of natural communities is not a matter of formal Department policy, it is sufficiently supported by experts in the field to be used as criteria for impact evaluation.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines state that a project may have a significant effect on the environment when any of a number of conditions occur including the following one related to biological resources:

> (a) The project has the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below-self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal . . . .

Additionally, Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines state that "a project will normally have a significant effect on the environment if it will:"

> (a) Conflict with adopted environmental plans and goals of the community where it is located; . . .
>
> (c) Substantially affect a rare or endangered species of animal or plant or the habitat of the species;
>
> (d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species; (Only the biology related items are listed.)

At the Federal level, both the Army Corp of Engineers and the Fish and Wildlife service are responsible for implementing federal legislation, most notably the Endangered Species Act and the Federal Clean Water Act. A key issue with both agencies is wetland protection.

The Fish and Wildlife Service has a wetland policy calling for the protection of native wetlands. The policy begins with the following sentence: "Wetlands provide important fish and wildlife benefit as well as other significant functions (flood control, water quality maintenance, water supply recreation, scientific research) to the nation."

Impacts

1. **Impacts to oak woodlands.** The Placer County Tree Preservation Ordinance implies that the total loss of native trees on a property would be regarded as a significant impact, one which could potentially be mitigated by off-site plantings. Blue oak woodlands in particular are of concern because of the lack of observed regeneration.

The Proposed Community Plan contains the Goals, Policies, and Implementation Measures related to vegetation which are shown in Table 62 Goals 1 and 2, and Policies 10 and 11 directly speak to the preservation of trees and wooded areas. For example, Policies 10 and 11 are:

> Policy 10: Conserve representative areas of undisturbed oak woodlands and valley grasslands that have significant value as wildlife habitat.
> Policy 11: Preserve and protect landmark trees and major groves of native trees.

Fish and Wildlife Implementation Measure t (p. 128) notes that parcels from 2.5 to 5 acres or larger should be sought in open woodland areas. The Tree Preservation Ordinance and the project/environmental review process are other obvious implementation tools.

Table 62
AUBURN/BOWMAN COMMUNITY PLAN
GOALS AND POLICIES RELATED TO VEGETATION

Vegetation

a. GOALS

1) PRESERVE OUTSTANDING AREAS OF NATIVE VEGETATION AND TREES, NATURAL TOPOGRAPHIC FEATURES, WILDLIFE HABITATS AND CORRIDORS AND RIPARIAN CORRIDORS.
2) CONSERVE SIGNIFICANT GRASSLAND AND WOODED AREAS AS ESSENTIAL ECONOMIC, NATURAL, AND AESTHETIC RESOURCES.
3) PROTECT, RESTORE, AND ENHANCE THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES AND THE HABITAT WHICH SUPPORTS THOSE SPECIES.

b. Policies

1) Conserve vegetative resources due to their importance for wildlife habitat, watershed protection, climate moderation, erosion control, and for their many other values.
2) Conserve the natural landscape, including minimizing disturbance to natural terrain and vegetation, as an important consideration in the design of any subdivision or land development project.
3) Require field studies as part of "major" project review or where the habitat of special status species is known to exist in order to document the possible occurrence of special status plant species and provide a method of protecting, monitoring, replacing or otherwise mitigating the impacts of development in and around these sensitive habitats.

4) Support the "no net loss" policy for wetland areas administered by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish and Game. Coordination with these agencies at all levels of project review shall continue to ensure that their concerns are adequately addressed. Review the success of this policy every five years and make changes as appropriate.

5) Identify, protect, and enhance riparian corridors and vegetation; encourage preservation and maintenance of these areas in as natural a state as possible.

6) Require 100' building setbacks from the centerline of perennial streams and 50' building setbacks from the centerline of intermittent streams as specifically shown on Figure 14 (Watersheds Map).
Based on more detailed information supplied as a part of the review for a specific project, the County may determine that such setbacks are not applicable in a particular instance or should be modified based on the new information provided.
If different setback standards are adopted in the Placer County General Plan, the setback standards stated above should be considered for amendment to be consistent with the Placer County General Plan setback standards.

7) Provide mitigation where impacts to stream environment zones or wetland areas are unavoidable. Measures shall include but not be limited to the identification of vegetation impacted; the preparation of vegetation plans; and the specific monitoring of plantings to assure that successful mitigation/revegetation has occurred.

8) Encourage landowners and developers to preserve the integrity of existing terrain and natural vegetation in visually sensitive areas such as hillsides, ridges and along important transportation corridors and designated scenic highways.

9) Use native and compatible non-native species, specially drought resistant species, to the extent possible in fulfilling landscaping requirements imposed as conditions of discretionary permits.

10) Conserve representative areas of undisturbed oak woodlands and valley grasslands that have significant value as wildlife habitat.

11) Preserve and protect landmark trees and major groves of native trees.

12) Establish procedures for identifying and preserving threatened or endangered plant species, when they are adversely affected by public or private development projects.

This policy framework is capable of partially limiting impacts on oak woodlands. However, the overall extent of urbanization envisioned makes the impact unmitigable.

The Land Use Plan generally avoids oak woodlands by concentrating urban uses in previously disturbed areas in grassland/abandoned orchards, grasslands, irrigated pasture, and mixed shrubs/serpentine (see Figure 22). However, there are a number of exceptions where proposed small lots

[minimum lot size 0.9 acres (Rural Low-Density Residential) or smaller] and urban uses fall within areas shown on the aerial photograph as densely treed or noted on the Vegetation Map as "Oak Woodland—Dense Oak Stands" or "Oak-Ponderosa Pine" ("Oak Grassland" is more open and its trees are more avoidable). Some of the larger areas of potential development/woodland conflict are listed in Table 63 and shown in Figure 22.

Table 63
DEVELOPMENT/WOODLAND CONFLICTS

Map Location #	Proposed Designation	Vegetation Type
1	LDR	OP
2	RLDR	OP/OW
3	RLDR/MU	OP
4	RLDR/LMDR	OW
5	RLDR/MDR	OP
6	LMDR	OP
7	LMDR/OS	OP
8	LMDR	OP
9	LMDR	OP
10	RLDR	OP/OW
11	RLDR	OW
12	RLDR	OW
13	RLDR/LMDR	OW
14	LMDR	OP
15	COMM	OW*
16	LDR	OW/OP
17	IND	OW*
18	MDR	OW*
19	RLDR	OP

* Determined from aerial photograph.

At these locations, it is likely that impacts on oak woodlands will be significant unless the off-site mitigation envisioned in the Tree Preservation Ordinance can be implemented. Some of the areas of oak woodlands encompass entire parcels and it is unlikely that urban development on those parcels would leave viable stands intact.

The difficulties with off-site mitigation include:

a__ Control of off-site private property on which to accomplish the necessary plantings cannot be assured.

b__ Recreation of a native oak woodland entails more than just the trees themselves and may take many years to accomplish.

c__ Creation of oak woodlands may displace another valuable habitat.

d__ A monitoring and managing entity is needed for several years.

The Tree Preservation Ordinance establishes a Replacement Program which requires as much as an inch-for-inch replacement of trees in the context of a tree permit or discretionary approval; it also establishes a "Tree Preservation Fund" which receives monies from illegal removal or from project applicants if the project site is not capable of supporting all of the

replacement trees. The purposes of the fund are to plant or maintain trees on publicly owned property, easements, or right-of-way; to fund ". . . educational programs or materials;" or to fund ". . . enforcement and land acquisition." The Ordinance also requires irrigation and maintenance for a period of three years with replacement for those which die. These provisions address some of the potential difficulties described above, but do not provide a complete answer to the problem of suitable lands on which to plant the replacement trees. It is unlikely that there will be sufficient suitable public lands and easements upon which to replace the woodlands that will be eliminated. A possible solution to this problem would be to require project applicants to secure replacement land if the amount of woodland to be lost exceeds a certain acreage, but this approach results in only partial mitigation and cannot be assured.

Conclusion: Based upon the above criteria and analysis, impacts on oak woodlands will be significant and unmitigable.

2. **Impacts to wetlands.** The Community Plan contains firmly-worded Goals and Policies which call for the protection of wetlands; the most direct policies support the no-net loss policy of other agencies (Vegetation #4), protect and enhance riparian areas (Vegetation #5), require setbacks from streams (Vegetation #6), and provide mitigation where impacts are unavoidable (Vegetation #7). Implementation measures include grading and erosion controls, Department of Fish and Game Stream Alteration Agreements, Clean Water Act Section 404 permits (U.S Army Corps), and wetland banking.

The Community Plan Land Use Map designates "permanent waterways" as open space; wetlands along intermittent streams and other wetlands are indicated with a dash line for information on the Land Use Map, but are not included in the Open Space category. The indication of Environmentally Sensitive Areas alerts the reader to policies to protect wetlands, including those associated with intermittent streams (see Vegetation Policy #6). These policies have been effective wetland protection mechanisms in other County locations, such as Granite Bay (Debra Andaloro, personal communication, 6/22/92).

The Land Use Map mapping related to wetlands generally reflects the wetlands mapping done by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) and that done by the Soil Conservation Service (SCS) for the Community Plan. A comparison of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Wetlands map to the proposed Land Use Map indicates that a total of approximately 84 acres of wetland falls outside of the zones explicitly designated open space or indicated to be environmentally sensitive areas. However, 58 of these acres are man-made ponds, primarily made up of open water rather than wetland vegetation. The remaining 26 acres is composed of intermittent streams, primarily located in low density residential areas. (This acreage is approximated based on an assumed average of 20 feet of width since the USFWS Wetlands Map shows them as lines with no width indicated). Because the Plan contains a policy explicitly protecting intermittent streams (Vegetation #6) and because this protection is feasible in low density areas, significant impacts generally will be avoided.

The Community Plan Vegetation map done by the SCS shows broad areas of riparian forest which are not always depicted on the FWS Wetlands maps. There are 23 principle areas where riparian forest is not explicitly protected by Open Space designation or indicated to be environmentally sensitive. On the scale of the Community Plan maps, these omissions are minor given that open space or environmentally sensitive identification is applied to almost all of the stream corridors. Additionally, most of these forests are in areas designated for rural uses where the Plan policies calling for avoidance can be effective. However, there are two areas of potential significant impact which may not be mitigable on-site due to the intensity of the use designations proposed there. These are areas 2C and 3 on Figure 23. Area 2C is part of an intermittent tributary to Rock Creek Reservoir; it is shown within an Open Space/Business Park Designation. Area 3 is a riparian forest and associated riparian thicket in the northeast corner of Bell Road and Highway 49. This 7-acre wetland is partially contained within a commercially designated area which has been the subject of past development proposals. The Land Use Map shows open space surrounding but not entirely including the wetland. This is an area of the Plan where on-site or off-site replacement will be required in return for development approvals which are expected to destroy a portion of the existing on-site wetlands.

In both of these cases, the existing riparian forest may be difficult to replace—repositioning of the open space designation would be the most assured means of mitigating the impact.

A third significant wetland is the loss of riparian woodland along Dry Creek due to proposed channel improvements to reduce flooding. This impact is described in the Hydrology section.

As described previously, the County has established a wetland mitigation bank and begun taking fees for this purpose. This is a feasible mitigation for a variety of wetland losses. However, at this time it cannot be considered proven mitigation, especially for difficult replacement projects such as riparian forest. Questions still remain such as:

- Is there adequate replacement land available in the area?
- Can the land be secured?
- Are the fees being collected sufficient?

These factors, in combination with Plan policies calling for avoidance of riparian forest, indicate that impacts may occur which will not be mitigated.

Plan impacts at 20-year projected buildout per economic projections. The principal difference between the impacts of full buildout and those projected to occur in 20 years based on economic projections is related to wetlands. One of the areas of riparian forest which will be significantly impacted and difficult to mitigate (without open space designations) is located in a proposed business park area.

The Recht Hausrath study estimates a 251 year buildout period for the Plan's industrially-designated lands. This reduces the likelihood that the riparian forest described above will be impacted. However, at least one area of concern still remains.

Conclusion: Based upon the above criteria and analysis, impacts to wetlands will be significant and unmitigable.

3. **Impacts to special plant species and natural communities.** As described in the setting section, the presence of special plant species is not possible to predict based on broad mapping of vegetation types. However, some preliminary indication that impacts may occur is that small lots and urban uses are designated in areas of serpentine soils and that some wetland impacts may occur. Any significant impacts could be mitigated through environmental review and avoidance of special plants if they exist. The procedures for this are outlined by the following goal and policies:

Table 64
AUBURN/BOWMAN COMMUNITY PLAN
GOALS, POLICIES RELATED TO SPECIAL PLANT SPECIES

VEGETATION

Goal

3) PROTECT, RESTORE, AND ENHANCE THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES AND THE HABITAT WHICH SUPPORTS THOSE SPECIES.

Policies

3) Require field studies as part of "major" project review or where the habitat of special status species is known to exist in order to document the possible occurrence of special status plant species and provide a method of protecting, monitoring, replacing or otherwise mitigating the impacts of development in and around these sensitive habitats.

12) Establish procedures for identifying and preserving, threatened or endangered plant species, when they are adversely affected by public or private development projects.

Special natural communities are rare or unique assemblages of plants which are tracked along with special species by the Natural Diversity Data Base. Two of the better known examples are Valley Oak Woodland and Vernal Pool. Others which may occur in the Plan area include:

- Gabbroic Northern Mixed Chaparral
- Mixed Serpentine Chaparral
- Leather Oak Chaparral
- Serpentine Bunchgrass
- Others

The recognition of these natural communities requires the presence of a botanist with familiarity with the particular classification system used by the Natural Diversity Data Base. Because special language is not present on natural communities in the policies, it is possible that one of the lesser known special natural communities, if present, could be impacted. This could be avoided by requiring that special natural plant communities be considered during the project environmental review process.

Conclusion: Based upon the above criteria and analysis, impacts to special plants will be less than significant; impacts to special natural communities have the potential for significance, but can be avoided.

4. **Impacts to special animal species.** The presence of special animal species is even more difficult to predict than special plant species based on broad habitat mapping (except that wet habitats are consistently important). The Community Plan requires the use of field studies during project review to identify special species present and ways to mitigate impacts to those species (see Policy #10 below):

Table 65
AUBURN/BOWMAN COMMUNITY PLAN
GOALS AND POLICIES RELATED TO THREATENED ANIMAL SPECIES

FISH AND WILDLIFE

Goal

2. PROTECT, RESTORE AND ENHANCE HABITATS FOR NATIVE ANIMALS AND PROTECT THREATENED AND ENDANGERED AND SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES.

Policies

9) Give special consideration to the habitats of rare, threatened, endangered, and/or other special status species in the Plan area. Federal and State agencies, as well as other resource conservation organizations, shall be encouraged to acquire and manage endangered species' habitats.

10) Require field studies as part of "major" project review or where the habitat of a special status species has been identified. These studies shall document the possible occurrence of special status wildlife species and provide a method for their protection, monitoring, replacement, or for otherwise mitigating development near their sensitive habitats.

Given these policies in combination with the consolidation of new development in and around existing urban areas, it appears that effects on special animal species will be avoided.

Conclusion: Based upon the above criteria and analysis, impacts to special animals will be less than significant.

5. **Impacts to the other Important Wildlife Species.** As shown in Table 66, the Community Plan contains a number of policies protecting wildlife habitat. Policy #2, for example reads: "Identify and protect important spawning grounds, migratory routes, waterfowl resting areas, oak woodlands, wildlife corridors, and other unique wildlife habitats critical to protecting and sustaining wildlife populations." However, because of the habitat losses noted under impact discussions #1 and #2 above (oak woodlands and wetlands), it appears that major habitat features cannot be fully protected.

Table 66
AUBURN/BOWMAN COMMUNITY PLAN
GOALS AND POLICIES RELATED TO FISH AND WILDLIFE

Fish and Wildlife

a. GOALS

1. CONSERVE THE QUALITY OF HABITATS WHICH SUPPORT FISH AND WILDLIFE SPECIES SO AS TO MAINTAIN POPULATIONS AT SUSTAINABLE LEVELS.

2. PROTECT, RESTORE AND ENHANCE HABITATS FOR NATIVE ANIMALS AND PROTECT THREATENED AND ENDANGERED, AND SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES.

b. **Policies**

1) Conserve large, continuous expanses of native vegetation as the most suitable habitat for maintaining abundant and diverse wildlife.
2) Identify and protect important spawning grounds, migratory routes, waterfowl resting areas, oak woodland, wildlife corridors, and other unique wildlife habitats critical to protecting and sustaining wildlife populations.
3) Carefully plan development areas known to have particular value for wildlife and, where allowed, locate development so that the reasonable value of the habitat for wildlife is maintained.
4) Recognize that stream channels, riparian corridors, natural drainage and the high quality of waters therein, are important as regional wildlife and fishery corridors.
5) Encourage the use of Best Management Practices (BMPs) to protect perennial streams from the adverse effects of livestock grazing.
6) Encourage a program for the control of residential pesticides to prevent potential damage to birds, water quality, vegetation and wildlife.
7) Encourage private landowners to adopt good wildlife habitat management practices, as recommended by California Department of Fish and Game officials and the Placer County Resour ce Conservation District.
8) Require mitigation for development projects where isolated segments of stream habitat are unavoidably altered. Such impacts should be mitigated on-site or elsewhere in the Plan area through stream or riparian habitat restoration work.
9) Give special consideration to the habitats of rare, threatened, endangered, and/or other special status species in the Plan area. Federal and State agencies, as well as other resource conservation organizations, shall be encouraged to acquire and management endangered species' habitats.

10) Require field studies as part of "major" project review or where the habitat of a special status species has been identified. The se studies shall document the possible occurrence of special status wildlife species and provide a method for their protection, monitoring, replacement, or for otherwise mitigating development near their sensitive habitats.

Conclusion: Based upon the above criteria and analysis, impacts to important wildlife species will be significant and unmitigable.

6. **Impacts of cumulative City and County buildout.** The cumulative effects of City and County development are similar to those reported for the County, only more pronounced. For example, the effect of tree loss becomes substantially more adverse when City losses are included. For example, the Southwest Sector of the City has large areas of Oak-Ponderosa Pine Woodland and Oak Woodland which may be affected. These additional losses may be large enough to prevent meaningful mitigation. Similarly, the City contains stream corridors which may be impacted and could be difficult to replace.

Conclusion: Based upon the above criteria and analysis, the cumulative impacts of combined City/ County buildout may be significant and unmitigable.

Additional Discussion

The following discussion is provided for informational purposes only; it does not relate to an impact of the project at hand – the adoption and implementation of the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan.

Impacts of the Updated Plan compared to the Existing Plan. The existing Auburn Area and Bowman General Plans (1978) are substantially more impacting than the updated Plan because of the following factors:

- The Land Use map of the existing Plans do not show streams in open space. This has lead in the past to heightened expectations for development of properties and consequent impacts to riparian areas.
- The policies of the existing Plans are not as specific as those of the updated Plan, and
- The land use designations are more intensive in the existing plan and allow for greater intrusion into less developed areas.

Mitigation Measures

1. **Impacts to oak woodlands - Supplemental oak woodland replacement requirements.** The following requirements should be considered for incorporation into the Tree Preservation Ordinance or into the environmental review process:

a. **Developers should be required to provide off-site lands, or adequate fees earmarked for those lands, for tree plantings if woodlands over one acre will be lost.**

b. **Oak woodland restoration plans should include consideration of effects on habitat at the off-site locations.**

c. **Oak woodland restoration plans should incorporate native understory plantings in order to create a plant community rather than a simple stand of trees, and**

d. **The restoration plans should be prepared by qualified consultants experienced in restoration ecology.**

Effectiveness of Measures/Relevant Plan Provisions: These measures, if implemented, would help ensure that the proposed Plan policies and existing ordinance are effective in mitigating impacts. Relevant Plan provisions include Vegetation Goals 1 and 2, Vegetation Policies 10 and 11, and Fish and Wildlife Implementation Measure t. However, due to the extent of urbanization proposed, impacts will still be unmitigable.

Implementation: These measures were not incorporated in the Plan because they are generally recommended in the Tree Preservation Ordinance. Implementation can also occur incrementally through the project review and environmental review procedures. Unmitigable regardless.

2. **Impacts to wetlands - Apply the Open Space designation or identify as environmentally sensitive those remaining riparian forests which occur in other designations.** The 22 riparian forests shown in Figure 23 should be protected with the Open Space designation or identified in the Land Use Plan as environmentally sensitive.

Effectiveness of Measure/Relevant Plan Provisions: This measure would help assure that impacts to riparian forests are reduced to the extent feasible, but they cannot be reduced below the level of significance. Relevant Plan provisions include Vegetation Goal 1, and Vegetation Policies 4-7.

Implementation: This measure is not included in the Community Plan because it is regarded as being infeasible and because the measure is partially accomplished by Vegetation Policy 5.

3. **Impacts to special plant species and natural communities - Require that special plant natural communities be considered as part of the project/environmental review process. (No additional measures are needed specifically for impacts to special plants.)** Project/environmental review should include consideration of those special natural plant communities of concern to and tracked by the State Natural Diversity Data Base.

Effectiveness of Measure/Relevant Plan Provisions: This measure will be effective in avoiding significant effects on special natural plant communities. Relevant Plan provisions include Vegetation Goal 3, and Vegetation Policies 3 and 12.

Implementation: Project/environmental review

4. **Impacts to special animal species - No additional mitigation measures are necessary for impacts to special animals** beyond those contained in the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan.

Effectiveness of Measure/Relevant Plan Provisions: This impact is less than significant because of Community Plan Fish and Wildlife Goal 2 and Policies 9 and 10.

Implementation: Not applicable.

5. **Impacts to other important wildlife species - No additional measures are available to address unmitigable impacts to wildlife beyond those described above (#s 1-3).**

Effectiveness of Measure/Relevant Plan Provisions: See Nos. 1-3 above.

Implementation: See Nos. 1-3 above.

6. **Cumulative impacts - No additional mitigation measures are available to the County to address the cumulative City/County development** beyond those described above (#s 1-3).

Effectiveness of Measure/Relevant Plan Provisions: See Nos. 1-3 above.

Implementation: See Nos. 1-3 above.