



COUNTY OF PLACER
Community Development Resource Agency

John Marin, Agency Director

PLANNING

Michael J. Johnson, AICP
Planning Director

TO: Board of Supervisors
FROM: Michael J. Johnson, Planning Director
DATE: January 23, 2007
SUBJECT: ZONING TEXT AMENDMENTS - (ZTA 20050609)

ACTION REQUESTED

The Board of Supervisors is being asked to consider a staff-proposed Zoning Text Amendment related to the definition of "Public Utility Facilities", as recommended by the Planning Commission.

BACKGROUND:

Over the past year, staff has brought forward a series of proposed Zoning Text Amendments that implement new State regulations and bring clarity and consistency to the Zoning Code. As a result of meetings with the Placer County Water Agency, it was identified that amendments to the Zoning Code were necessary to give the Agency greater flexibility to locate offices in more zoning districts and in proximity to their water generation, treatment, and distribution facilities.

Project Description

Staff is proposing to amend the Placer County Zoning Ordinance as follows:

Article 17.04 (Definitions): Amend the definition of Public Utility Facilities to read as follows:

"Public Utility Facilities" (land use) means fixed-base facilities serving as junction points for transferring utility services from one transmission voltage to another or to local distribution and services voltages. These uses include any of the following facilities that are not exempted from land use permit requirements by California Government Code section 53091: electrical substations and switching stations; telephone switching facilities; natural gas regulation and distribution facilities; public water system wells, treatment plants and storage; and community wastewater treatment plants, settling ponds and disposal fields or solid waste transfer stations. These uses do not include ~~office or customer service centers (classified in "Offices"), or~~ equipment and material storage yards (classified in Storage yards and sales lots"). Equipment cabinets or enclosures less than 6 feet in height and 120 square feet in area are accessory building and uses and therefore exempt from special permit requirements.

On November 16, 2006, the Planning Commission considered the proposed Zoning Text Amendment and, after receiving public testimony, unanimously adopted a motion (7-0) to recommend approval of this Zoning Text Amendment.

ANALYSIS:

As noted above, two changes are proposed to the definition for "Public Utility Facilities." Currently, the definition indicates that offices and customer service centers are not permitted in conjunction with public utility facilities. The definition would be amended to modify the above language so that associated offices would be permitted under the Public Utility Facility definition. This change is proposed to allow greater opportunities for public utilities to locate their offices in proximity to their utility operations, rather than requiring offices to be placed solely within commercial and industrial zoning districts. If this definition is revised as proposed, public utility offices will be allowed in all zoning districts except Timberland Production and Water Influence. Public utility offices would be treated the same as other public utility uses and would be a permitted use in the Industrial zoning district, would require a Conditional Use Permit in the Commercial Planned Development zoning district, and would require a Minor Use Permit in all other zoning districts that allow public utility facilities. Accordingly, the County and the public will still have the opportunity to address each specific project to consider site-specific issues.

The second change amends the definition to indicate that equipment cabinets or enclosures less than six feet in height and 120 square feet in area are accessory buildings and uses and therefore exempt from use permit requirements.

CEQA COMPLIANCE:

The proposed project was addressed in a Negative Declaration addressing a series of Zoning Text Amendments. The Board of Supervisors adopted the Negative Declaration when approving Zoning Text Amendments on May 24, 2006. The currently proposed Zoning Text Amendment falls within the scope of the previously adopted Negative Declaration and no changes to existing circumstances have occurred that warrant further environmental review for this Zoning Text Amendment. The Board of Supervisors must make a finding to that effect.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Board of Supervisors approve the Zoning Text Amendments through adoption of the attached Ordinance.

FINDINGS:

The proposed project was addressed in a Negative Declaration addressing a series of Zoning Text Amendments. The Board of Supervisors adopted the Negative Declaration when approving Zoning Text Amendments on May 24, 2005. The currently proposed Zoning Text Amendment falls within the scope of the previously adopted Negative Declaration and no changes to existing circumstances have occurred that warrant further environmental review for this Zoning Text Amendment.

Zoning Text Amendments

The Zoning Text Amendments are consistent with the Placer County General Plan, and will serve the public's interests.

Respectfully submitted,



MICHAEL J. JOHNSON, AICP
Director of Planning

EXHIBITS:

- Exhibit 1 - Proposed Ordinance
- Exhibit A - Chapter 17 - Zoning Text Amendment
- Exhibit 2 - Negative Declaration

Copies sent by Planning:

- Cc: Wes Zicker - Engineering and Surveying Department
- Dana Wiyninger - Environmental Health Services
- Stephanie Holloway - Public Works Department
- Scott Finley - County Counsel
- Christa Darlington - County Counsel
- Holly Heinzen - CEO Office
- Christine Turner - Agricultural Commissioner
- CDRA - John Marin
- BIA
- Brigit Barnes
- Susan Rohan
- Tom McMahan
- Art Rangel
- All MAC's
- Subject/chrono files

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

In the matter of:

Ord. No.: _____

**AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE
DEFINITION OF PUBLIC UTILITY
FACILITIES IN SECTION 17.04.030 OF THE
PLACER COUNTY CODE (PZTA20050609)**

FIRST READING: _____
SECOND READING: _____

The following **Ordinance** was duly passed by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Placer at a regular meeting held _____, by the following vote on roll call:

Ayes:

Noes:

Absent:

Signed and approved by me after its passage.

Chairman, Board of Supervisors

Attest:
Clerk of said Board

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF PLACER, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, DOES HEREBY DOES ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Placer County Code, Chapter 17, Zoning Text is amended as shown on Exhibit A, attached hereto and incorporated by reference.

The Board finds the Zoning Text Amendment in compliance with the Placer County General Plan, and will serve the public's interests.

Amend Section 17.04.030 of the Placer County Code to read as follows:

17.04.030 Definitions of land uses, specialized terms and phrases

“Public utility facilities” (land use) means fixed-base structures and facilities serving as junction points for transferring utility services from one transmission voltage to another or to local distribution and service voltages. These uses include any of the following facilities that are not exempted from land use permit requirements by California Government Code Section 53091: electrical substations and switching stations; telephone switching facilities; natural gas regulating and distribution facilities; public water system wells, treatment plants and storage; and community wastewater treatment plants, settling ponds and disposal fields or solid waste transfer stations. These uses do not include ~~office or customer service centers (classified in “Offices”), or~~ equipment and material storage yards (classified in “Storage yards and sales lots”). Equipment cabinets or enclosures less than 6 feet in height and 120 square feet in area are accessory buildings and uses and therefore exempt from special permit requirements.



PLACER COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT
11414 B AVENUE
AUBURN, CA 95603

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

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

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

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

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

PROJECT INFORMATION:

Title: 2005 Placer County Zoning Ordinance Text Amendments

Description: Proposal to amend the Placer County Zoning Ordinance (see attached Initial Study for a detailed project description).

Location: Placer County

Project Proponent: Placer County

County Contact Person: Melanie Heckel (530) 886-3000

PUBLIC NOTICE:

The comment period for this document closes on 8/8/05. A copy of the Negative Declaration is available for public review at the Planning Department public counter and at the Auburn Library. Property owners within 300 feet of the subject site shall be notified by mail of the upcoming hearing before the Planning Commission. Additional information may be obtained by contacting the Placer County Planning Department at (530) 886-3000 between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. at 11414 "B" Avenue, Auburn, CA 95603.

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

RECORDER'S CERTIFICATION:

30

EXHIBIT 2



PLACER COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

11414 B Avenue, Auburn, CA 95603 (530) 886-3000/FAX (530) 886-3080

INITIAL STUDY

In accordance with the policies of the Placer County Board of Supervisors regarding implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, this document constitutes the Initial Study on the proposed project. This Initial Study provides the basis for the determination whether the project may have a significant effect on the environment. If it is determined that the project may have a significant effect on the environment, an Environmental Impact Report will be prepared which focuses on the areas of concern identified by this Initial Study

I. BACKGROUND

TITLE OF PROJECT: 2005 PLACER COUNTY ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENTS

Background:

The Planning Department is bringing forward revisions to the zoning ordinance in order to provide for certain types of uses not currently allowed to meet identified needs, to implement new State regulations, and to make assorted clarifications and minor changes to ease implementation and interpretation for staff and the public as follows:

1. Hotels in industrial zoning districts - There have been numerous requests for hotels in the Sunset Industrial Area, primarily zoned Industrial, Industrial Park or Business Park. Recent development patterns make the location of one or more hotels in this area desirable to meet the needs of existing and proposed development. Most particularly, the Thunder Valley Casino has generated a need for nearby overnight accommodations. In addition, proposed universities and associated commercial and industrial uses, particularly in the proposed Placer Ranch project, will similarly generate a need for overnight accommodations for parents of college students and for business travelers.
2. Revised density bonus provisions - As mandated by SB 1818 passed by the State Legislature last year, the County is required to revise our density bonus provisions to implement the provisions of the new state law.
3. Agricultural Directional Signs - The Agricultural Commission has requested that we establish provisions for directional signs to locations where agricultural products are available for sale on site.
4. Multi-service housing centers - In order to implement the provisions of the County Housing Element, provisions for multi-service housing centers (aka homeless shelters) will be established in several zoning districts.
5. Administrative citation process for code enforcement - A new administrative citation and hearing process is proposed for code enforcement activities in order to provide a more efficient enforcement process and avoid utilizing the county courts for this process.
6. Minor changes, clarifications and elimination of conflicts - Planning Department staff continues to analyze internal conflicts, difficulties in interpretation and minor suggestions for change to provide on-going updating of the zoning ordinance to meet current standards and practices and to make it more user friendly.

Location:

Placer County is located 80 miles northeast of San Francisco. The City of Auburn and the government center of Placer County, is located 120 miles southwest of Reno. The county encompasses 1,506 square miles (including 82 square miles of water) or 964,140 acres (including 52,780 acres of water). Placer County is bounded by Nevada County to the north, the State of Nevada to the east, El Dorado and Sacramento counties to the south, and Sutter and Yuba counties to the west. The amendments to the Placer County Zoning Ordinance will apply to the entire county with the exception of the incorporated Cities of Auburn, Roseville, Rocklin, Lincoln, Loomis and Colfax, and Tahoe Basin and Squaw Valley areas separately regulated through individual General Plans and Zoning ordinances.

Project Description:

Amend the Placer County Zoning Ordinance as follows:

1. **Hotels and motels** - Allow hotels and motels with a CUP in the Industrial and Industrial Parks districts and an MUP in the Business Park zoning district. They are currently allowed in the General Commercial, Heavy Commercial,

Environmental Issues

(See attachments for information sources)

No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
-----------	------------------------------	--	--------------------------------

Commercial Planned Development, Highway Services, Motel, Resort and Airport zoning districts. This ordinance revision is eliminating the Motel zoning district and special regulations that apply in that district because there are no properties with that zoning designation and there appears to be no reason to have such a limited use zoning district. The definition of hotels and motels has been revised to include conference facilities.

2. **Height limits** - Amend the Height Limit and Exception section to indicate that in those zoning districts that have a height limit of 50 feet (includes the Industrial, Industrial Park and Business Park zoning districts), higher structures may be approved for special uses, including hotels, with a Conditional Use Permit that includes environmental review and a visual impact analysis with photo simulations.

3. **Exceptions to lot coverage requirements for parking structures** - Exclude parking structures from lot coverage limitations in the Industrial and Industrial Park zoning districts as long as overall coverage does not exceed 75% with 15% of the site devoted to landscaping.

4. **Density bonus provisions** - Delete current density bonus provisions and replace with new provisions as mandated by the State. The new provisions are complex. Key provisions allow density bonuses for a wider range of affordable housing types at lower percentages, allow higher bonuses and greater concessions or incentives. However, such units are required to remain affordable through enforceable means for at least 30 years whereas the current ordinance is more flexible and requires 30 years for projects with County funding and 10 years for privately financed projects.

5. **Agricultural directional signs** - Establish a directional agricultural sign program to allow off-site signs that direct the touring public to agricultural businesses that sell agricultural products directly to the public. As proposed, these signs would be similar to winery signs located in several other counties but would direct the public to other types of agricultural products. The signs would be of uniform height, color and design and could be placed at corners or crossroads with arrows to indicate the direction of the agricultural product site. The signs would include a post and panels to depict each particular agricultural sales site.

6. **Multi-service housing centers** - Establish a definition for multi-service housing centers, otherwise known as homeless shelters and ancillary services, and allow them in each district that allows multi-family residential uses: Residential Multi-Family, Neighborhood Commercial, General Commercial, Commercial Planned Development, Highway Services and Resort.

7. **Administrative citation process for code enforcement** - Several changes are proposed to Article 17.62 of the Zoning Ordinance (Code Enforcement), primarily to add an Administrative Citation Ordinance that authorizes Code Enforcement staff to issue administrative citations, establishes fines, defines procedures for a request for a hearing, and allows a hearing before a Hearing Officer. Substantial changes to the sections regarding Recovery of Costs are also proposed to bring those sections in line with changes in the law, county practice, and the addition of the Administrative Citation process.

8. **Agricultural accessory structures** - Places limitations on the size of agricultural accessory structures on parcels that are less than 4 1/2 acres in size that are identical to size limitations for residential accessory structures. However, where zoning allows both uses, each type of structure (residential and agricultural) is permitted the allowable floor area as outlined in Section 17.56.180.

9. **Minor changes, clarifications and elimination of conflicts** - A long list of changes is proposed in this category, too numerous to list here. Examples include changes necessary to eliminate conflicts between the allowable use chart in Section 17.06.050, charts within each zoning district and Specific Use Requirements in Article 17.56, revisions to commercial and industrial zoning districts to provide greater consistency, clarifications to regulations on temporary structures and revisions to the public hearing process to allow the Planning Commission to conduct public hearings on projects before the Final EIR is prepared if subsequent approval is required by the Board of Supervisors.

Documents incorporated by Reference

This Initial Study has been compiled from a variety of sources, including published and unpublished studies, and applicable maps. The State CEQA Guidelines recommend that previously completed environmental documents, public plans, and reports directly relevant to a proposed project be used as background information to the greatest extent possible and, where this information is relevant to findings and conclusions, that it be incorporated by reference in the environmental document. The following documents are incorporated herein by reference and are available for review at the County of Placer, Planning Department, 11414 B Avenue, Auburn, CA 95603 and at the appropriate county offices identified herein.

1. Air Quality Thresholds of Significance, Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District, 1994, First Edition.
2. County of Placer General Plan Update, County of Placer, August 1994
3. County of Placer Zoning Code, County of Placer, <http://ordlink.com/codes/placer/preface.htm>.
4. Draft General Plan Background Report, Placer County General Plan Update, Volumes I and II, County of Placer, September 15, 1992.

32

Environmental Issues (See attachments for information sources)	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
---	-----------	------------------------------	--	--------------------------------

5. Final Environmental Impact Report, County of Placer Countywide General Plan Update Volume I, County of Placer, SCH#93082012, June 26, 1994.
6. Placer County Air Pollution Control Board, Rules and Regulation, <http://www.placer.ca.gov/airpollution/regs/complete-rules-regs.pdf>
7. Placer County Water Agency (PCWA) website, <http://www.pcwa.net>

II. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- A. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers.
- B. "Less than Significant Impact" applies where the project's impacts are negligible and do not require any mitigation to reduce impacts.
- C. "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The County, as lead agency, must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level (mitigation measures from Section IV, EARLIER ANALYSES, may be cross-referenced).
- D. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- E. All answers must take account of the entire action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts [CEQA, Section 15063 (a) (1)].
- F. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration [Section 15063(c)(3)(D)]. Earlier analyses are discussed in Section IV at the end of the checklist.
- G. References to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans/community plans, zoning ordinances) should be incorporated into the checklist. Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should include a reference to the pages or chapters where the statement is substantiated. A source list should be attached, and other sources used, or individuals contacted, should be cited in the discussion.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project.				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

33

Items b, c: The zoning ordinance revisions, in and of themselves, will not impact scenic resources. They may, however,

Environmental Issues (See attachments for information sources)	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact

authorize certain types of uses that could affect scenic qualities within Placer County. The three areas of revision that could affect scenic resources are: 1) allowance for certain types of uses (including hotels) to exceed the 50 foot height limit in the industrial zoning districts if a conditional use permit is granted, 2) establishment of a directional off-site agricultural sign program and 3) reduction in certain setback requirements in commercial zoning districts.

1) Higher heights - These would affect parcels that are industrially zoned which are not generally placed within scenic vistas, in scenic resources areas or along state scenic highways, but rather in areas devoted to industrial uses, away from residences and recreational and other visually sensitive use areas. However, several potential hotel sites are within views from Highway 65. These uses could potentially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the particular site and its surroundings. Although such hotels and other taller uses could be located on any industrially zoned parcels in unincorporated Placer County to date, interest has been primarily focused in the Sunset Industrial Area due to proximity to the Casino, the proposed university specific plan and to meet the needs of business travelers. At this time it is too speculative to determine how high such structures may be proposed or approved. The zoning text amendment indicates that higher than the 50 foot height limit may be approved only through the conditional use permit process, including environmental review with photo simulations. In this way, each individual proposal can be fully analyzed so that aesthetic considerations can be evaluated and mitigated. Therefore, the proposed text amendment would be considered less than significant.

2) Off-site directional agricultural signs - These signs would be located generally in rural areas. Their purpose is to direct members of the public to agricultural sites where products can be purchased where grown or processed. Examples include wineries, mandarin orange farms, etc. These signs would be of uniform size, color and design and would be located at intersections to direct the public which direction to go. They would include a sign post and individual panels with arrows. This type of directional sign can often be seen in wine growing regions like Napa and Sonoma Counties and has become an accepted part of the rural environment. With a uniformly designed sign program consisting of a post with panels, visual impacts are considered less than significant.

3) Reductions to setbacks - The front setback is proposed for reduction in the Highway Services district from 25 to 10 and in the Office Professional district from 20 to 10. The reason for the reduction is to make the front setback consistent with the other commercial zoning districts. Despite the reduction in setback requirements, proposed uses will still need to be consistent with the applicable Community Plan including design guidelines and in most cases will be subject to Design Review. Therefore, aesthetic impacts are considered less than significant.

Item d: The primary potential impact on light or glare would be due to allowing hotels in industrial zoning districts where they are not currently allowed. However, even without this change, a wide range of urban industrial and commercial uses are allowed in these areas. Streetlights will be included in any required street improvements. Because these areas are already urbanized and designated for industrial development, the incremental increase in lighting associated with new development would be less-than-significant. Any hotel proposal would be required to be in compliance with the county zoning ordinance standards and design guidelines. These standards ensure that all new lighting reduces light and glare in the project vicinity and that all exterior lighting would be directed away from and properly shielded to eliminate glare on existing land uses and roadways. Light and glare impacts would have a less than significant impact with adherence to county requirements.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES-- In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

Environmental Issues

(See attachments for information sources)

No Impact Less Than Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated Potentially Significant Impact

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Item c: Potential impacts on agricultural resources would be related to allowing hotels in industrial areas, providing agricultural directional signs in agricultural areas, and placing limits on the size of agricultural accessory structures on parcels less than 4.6 acres in size. Although some existing zoned industrial lands are adjacent to agricultural land on the urban fringe, zoning standards and general plan policies have been developed to manage the interface between the two land uses. None of the changes proposed would increase the land currently designated agricultural for potential conversion to a non-agricultural use. The agricultural sign program will not adversely affect agricultural resources, but can actually enhance economic viability of agricultural operations by directing customers to on site sales locations. The limitation on the size of agricultural accessory structures is appropriate in that it only affects parcels less than 4.6 acres in size where agricultural activities would be of a very small scale. If a parcel is less than an acre in size, an agricultural accessory structure is limited 2,000 sq. ft.; for parcels one acre to 2.29 acres, an agricultural structure can be 2400 sq. ft. and for parcels 2.3 acre to 4.59 acres in size, an agricultural accessory structure can be 3,000 sq. ft. in size. Each of these parcels could also contain a residence and a residential accessory structure with the same size limitations described above. With an unlimited size for agricultural accessory structures on small parcels the potential exists that there would be very little land left for actually growing farm products. Therefore the zoning ordinance revisions are appropriate and would have a **less than significant effect** on agricultural resources or operations.

Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

III. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Item a-e: The Placer County Zoning Ordinance is located within the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (District), a local governmental agency responsible for protecting the air quality in the county area. Placer County includes portions of three California air basins: Sacramento County, Mountain Counties and Lake Tahoe. Existing air quality varies substantially between these air basins. The Sacramento Valley and Mountain Counties basins are classified as non-B

Environmental Issues

(See attachments for information sources)

No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
-----------	------------------------------	--	--------------------------------

attainment areas for the state and federal ozone standards.

Before anyone builds, alters, replaces, operates, or uses machinery or equipment that may cause air pollution, that person must obtain a permit from the air pollution control officer of the District. (*California Health and Safety Code, Ch. 4, Art. 1, 42300*)

Since Placer County does not meet the air quality standards for PM-10 and ozone set forth by the United States Environmental Protection Agency or those of the California Air Resources Board the District issues permits allowing the District to work with businesses to be sure their operations follow federal, state and local regulations and are coordinated with the District's air quality strategy.

The proposed Zoning Ordinance revisions do not significantly alter the types of uses allowable within unincorporated Placer County. It would allow hotels to be located on industrially zoned land. This could potentially reduce stationary sources of air pollution by replacing potential industrial generators of air pollution with hotels that would not typically emit significant air pollution. The Air District permits and inspects stationary sources of air pollution, such as industrial operations. Permits are required of both small and large businesses by state and federal law for any operation or equipment that has the potential to emit air contaminants. They are required 1) before construction begins for a new operation; 2) whenever a change of ownership occurs; 3) before a modification takes place; or 4) before equipment is replaced or relocated. Permits are issued to ensure that all equipment and processes comply with federal, state, and District rules. Before any person builds, erects, alters, replaces, operates, or uses any article, machine, equipment, or other contrivance which may cause the issuance of air contaminants, such person must obtain a permit to do so from the air pollution control officer of the district (*California Health and Safety Code, Ch. 4, Art. 1, 42300*).

Development activities would also result in additional auto related emissions over existing conditions relating to both construction and operations. Again, no substantial increase in development activities is anticipated as a result of changes in the zoning ordinance. As indicated above, there would be new opportunities to construct hotels on lands already designated for industrial development. In addition, greater residential densities may be allowed due to changes in the residential density bonuses. However, increased densities allowed through bonuses would also include certain provisions for affordable housing. This could potentially reduce commuting necessary for workers in Placer County by providing more affordable housing near to jobs. Each development project within Placer County must be assessed against the following AQMD recommended significance criteria:

- **Criteria Pollutants:** Construction and operation impacts are considered potentially significant if the project would result in a net increase of 85 pounds per day (lbs/day) of reactive organic compounds (ROGs), 85 lbs/day of nitrogen oxides (NO_x), 275 lbs/day of PM₁₀ or 150 lbs/day of sulfur dioxide (SO₂). Operational impacts for carbon monoxide (CO) are considered potentially significant if CO "hot spots" exceeding state 1-hour and 8-hour State Ambient Air Quality Standards are generated near major thoroughfares and congested surface streets.

With future development, air pollutants would be emitted by construction equipment and fugitive dust would be generated during interior grading and site preparation. The county, as well as the Air Quality Management District regulates construction activities. Construction could include demolition of some structures and grading preparation for any new construction. PM₁₀ emissions in the form of fugitive dusts would vary from day to day, depending on the level and type of construction activity (demolition and grading), silt content of the soil, and prevailing weather. Phase I emissions from construction equipment (i.e. graders, back hoes, haul trucks etc.) would generate PM₁₀, NO_x, and ROG emissions.

Phase II construction emissions are primarily associated with construction, employee commute vehicles, asphalt paving operations, mobile construction equipment (i.e., bulldozers, forklifts, etc.), stationary construction equipment, and architectural coatings. Phase II construction emissions will principally be generated from diesel-powered mobile construction equipment as well as architectural coatings. Phase II construction emission mitigation measures involve the routine maintenance and tuning of all mobile and stationary powered construction equipment, as well as construction employee commute vehicle trip reductions. Construction paving materials and coatings are required to conform to the rules outlined in the PCAQMD's Rule 217 and Rule 218 governing the manufacture and use of asphalt and architectural coatings.

Employee, customer and/or delivery vehicle trips associated with new development would generate NO_x and ROG emissions, contributing to regional ambient ozone (O₃) concentrations, and would generate vehicular dust emissions that would contribute to regional ambient PM₁₀ concentrations. Additionally, the combustion of natural gas for space heating

Environmental Issues (See attachments for information sources)	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
---	-----------	------------------------------	--	--------------------------------

will contribute NO_x and ROG emissions.

However, facility-specific vehicle trip emissions that may be generated by new uses authorized by the zoning ordinance revisions (hotels in industrial areas, higher residential densities through change in the bonus provisions for affordable housing) may be offset by providing convenient locations, thus decreasing vehicular traffic. In the case of hotels in the Sunset Industrial Area, there is a demand for overnight accommodations for casino patrons closer to the casino than currently available. Higher residential densities with affordable housing provisions could reduce commuting between jobs and housing.

PCAQMD requires site-specific potential air quality impacts be assessed and mitigated to the extent feasible at the project level, as new development is proposed. Potential impacts to sensitive receptors would be analyzed at the project level, depending on adjacent land uses and the proposed uses for a given site.

The PCAQMD considers development projects to be cumulatively significant if the project requires a change in the existing land use designation (i.e., general plan amendment, rezone), and projected emissions (ROG, NO_x, or PM₁₀) of the proposed project are greater than the emissions anticipated for the site if developed under the existing land use designation. The proposed zoning text amendments provide for development that is consistent with the existing land use designations, thus **no cumulative impact** on air quality would result from the zoning text amendments.

e) The Zoning Text amendment does not authorize new uses that would generate objectionable odors. However, the proximity of hotel patrons to potential odor generating industrial uses could potentially create a conflict. However, the air district and jurisdictions require site-specific potential air quality impacts be assessed and mitigated to the extent feasible at the project level, as new development is proposed over time. The proposed zoning text amendments would have a **less than significant impact** on the creation of objectionable odors.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

37

Environmental Issues

(See attachments for information sources)

No Impact Less Than Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated Potentially Significant Impact

biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

Item a-c, e: The proposed zoning text amendment would not substantially change the types of uses allowed in unincorporated Placer County. It is possible that future hotel facilities could be proposed on biologically sensitive properties. However, such hotels would be located in areas specifically planned and zoned for industrial uses. Potential impacts to biological resources will be considered during planning approvals for those lands, specific project level review will be required at the project specific level. The Placer County Zoning Ordinance requires hotels to obtain a Conditional Use Permit or Minor Use Permit in the industrial zoning districts and an appropriate environmental document, which would include an assessment of biological resources.

Placer County has a Tree Protection Ordinance to preserve and protect the remaining native oak and other species of trees within the county. Placer County Zoning ordinance 12.16.010 states:

"The spirit of this article 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 article 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.

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 this article 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."

County policies encourage revegetation and landscaping with native plant species, avoidance of non-indigenous species and protection of native trees and oaks.

Potential impacts to environmental resources would be mitigated at the project specific level, therefore the changes to the zoning ordinance and site specific facility construction would have a *less than significant impact* on biological resources.

Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §5064.5?
- b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §5064.5?
- c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
- d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Item a No specific development is proposed as part of the zoning text amendment. If a project affecting historic

38

Environmental Issues (See attachments for information sources)	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact

resources were proposed, it would be required to assess potential impacts as part of the local permit review process, as required by CEQA. Potential impacts to historic resources would be mitigated at the project specific level. The proposed zoning text amendments would have a *less than significant impact* on historic resources.

Item b-d: The county has standard construction requirements that should any cultural resources, such as structural features, unusual amounts of bone or shell, artifacts, human remains, or architectural remains be encountered during any development activities, work shall be suspended and a qualified archaeologist shall be consulted to develop, if necessary, further mitigation measures to reduce any archaeological impact to a less than significant level before construction continues. Such measures could include, but are not limited to, researching and identifying the history of the resource(s), mapping the locations, and photographing the resource. In addition, Section 5097.98 of the State Public Resources Code, and Section 7050.5 of the State Health and Safety Code requires that in the event of the discovery of any human remains, all work is to stop and the County Coroner shall be immediately notified. If the remains are determined to be Native American, guidelines of the Native American Heritage Commission shall be adhered to in the treatment and disposition of the remains. Furthermore, site specific cultural resource studies are required in sensitive areas as part of the environmental review on specific project proposals. The County has adopted programs and have adequate safeguards to assure that such resources would not be impacted for new projects therefore, the proposed zoning text amendment would have a *less than significant impact* on cultural resources.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
1) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

39

Environmental Issues	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
<i>(See attachments for information sources)</i>				

Item a: Development authorized by the County General Plan could be exposed to potentially damaging seismically induced ground shaking. The zoning text amendments do not authorize any new land to be converted to or made available for any new use susceptible to damage from geologic, soils, nor seismic activity. Like any California community, the region is subject to potential seismic activity. The South Placer area, as designated by the State Division of Mines and Geology, is classified as a low-severity earthquake zone. Expected intensity on the Modified Mercalli Scale would range between VI and VII. Events typical of this intensity level would include cracks in weak masonry and chimneys, shaking or rustling of trees and bushes, furniture movement, and breaking of glassware.

A major seismic event in the South Placer area could occur from earthquake activity along faults some distance away and, in an extreme situation, could conceivably result in severe property damage and injury to building occupants or passersby. Further damage could result from breakage of electrical, water and gas lines, causing additional problems in the course of post-earthquake repairs. The last seismic event recorded in the South Placer area, measuring at least 4.0 on the Richter Scale, occurred in 1908 on a north-south fault line between Folsom and Auburn and on an east-west line between Placerville and Roseville. No significant seismic events have been recorded since that time within the Roseville vicinity. However, the State Division of Mines and Geology indicates that increased earthquake activity throughout California may cause tectonic movement along now "inactive" fault systems.

Several moderately large earthquakes have occurred within and near eastern Placer County within the past few years, and topographic, structural and hydrothermal evidence of recent faulting is also present.

Seismic and geologic hazards in Placer County result from potential surface rupture of faults, ground-shaking and liquefaction during earthquakes, landslides resulting from earthquakes, expansion and shrinking of soils, soil erosion, and snow avalanches. These conditions are identified below.

Seismicity

Placer County lies within a seismically active area of the western United States, but beyond the influence of the highly active faults of coastal California. The western and central parts of the county generally have generally low seismicity, while the eastern area in the vicinity of Lake Tahoe has rather high seismicity.

Surface Rupture Hazards From Faulting

Within the historical period, earthquakes in Placer County have not caused any surface rupture as a result of faulting. No inferred faults or fault zones in Placer County are considered well-defined enough to warrant designation as hazard zones requiring site-specific studies before land development. Although precise zones cannot be located, there is some potential for surface rupture along fault zones in the Tahoe-Truckee area.

Ground-shaking Hazards

During major earthquakes, ground-shaking is generally responsible for between 80 and 100 percent of total damage. Ground-shaking can cause severe damage even when faulting does not rupture the ground surface. The area of Placer County with the largest ground-shaking risk is in the vicinity of Stampede Valley and Tahoe faults in the Truckee-Tahoe area. Much of this area is governed by separate zoning ordinances and is therefore unaffected by these zoning text amendments.

Liquefaction Hazards

Liquefaction is the transformation of uncemented, saturated clay-free sand or silt to a liquefied state resulting from increased pore-water pressures caused by ground-shaking during an earthquake. Structures in area that are prone to liquefaction can be damaged by this failure in soil strength. Soils that are prone to liquefaction are located throughout the county.

Slope Instability

Landslides can occur in natural and manufactured slopes due to unstable soil and rock, undercutting, and unfavorable soil moisture or drainage conditions. Slope instability can occur throughout the hilly and mountainous parts of the county.

Expansive Soils

Certain soils with high clay content may expand or shrink under different soil moisture conditions. This could lead to structural damage unless this condition is anticipated and special features are incorporated into their design. Soils considered to have moderate to high shrink-swell potential are generally limited to the low-lying areas, which are

40

Environmental Issues

(See attachments for information sources)

No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
-----------	------------------------------	--	--------------------------------

concentrated in western Placer County, from the city of Rocklin to the county line.

Erosion

The hazard of soil erosion can lead to other hazards including slope instability and sedimentation of nearby streams and rivers. Most soils in eastern Placer County are subject to high erosion potential, although some soils have moderate to very-high erosion potential.

Avalanche Hazards

Avalanche hazards exist in certain locations throughout eastern Placer County where steep slopes, abundant snow, and certain weather and snow-pack conditions combine to cause an avalanche episode.

Structural Hazards

Historic and modern buildings that are not reinforced to meet current building codes could be substantially damaged by earthquake-induced ground-shaking. Un-reinforced masonry (URM) buildings, which are located throughout the county, present the most widespread structural hazard.

Additional information on seismic and geologic conditions in Placer County can be found in Chapter 10 of the General Plan Background Report (September 1992).

Any new development could be exposed to impacts from liquefaction of subsurface soils. Liquefaction of soils could result in partial or complete loss of support that could damage or destroy buildings or facilities. Liquefaction is the loss of soil strength due to seismic forces acting on water-saturated, granular material that leads to a "quicksand" condition generating various types of ground failure. The potential for liquefaction must account for soil types, soil density, and groundwater table, and the duration and intensity of ground shaking. Earthquakes of the magnitude expected to emanate from any of several nearby faults would be strong enough in the Sunset Industrial Area to induce liquefaction in susceptible sand layers.

The Placer County General Plan Update, August 1994, adopted policies as a part of their Health and Safety Elements that mitigate seismic and geological hazards, including liquefaction. Development authorized by the zoning ordinance would not occur across any currently identified fault. In addition, the county requires soils reports and geological investigations for determining liquefaction, expansive soils and subsidence problems on sites for new buildings as a condition of approval, and that such information be incorporated into the project design and construction to eliminate hazards. These policies are required for new construction projects and reduce potential seismic impacts to *less than significant* levels.

Item b: The proposed zoning text amendments could encourage new construction, resulting in the excavation, displacement, backfill and compaction of a significant amount of soil. Wind and water soil erosion could also occur. Adequate on-site drainage facilities will be required at the project level. Soil erosion would be limited to the construction period of the proposed improvements. This impact would be temporary and would be controlled by standard grading practices. *No significant impact* is anticipated to occur due to required compliance with local ordinances.

Item c-e: Soils in the appropriately zoned industrial areas are categorized as Urban Land and consist of areas covered by up to 70 percent impervious surfaces. In the western parts of the county, topography is generally flat, and there are no outstanding topographic or ground surface relief features that would be disturbed as a result of new development occurring as a result of the zoning text amendments.

Soils that have limitations for structural loading, i.e. weak or expansive soils, are scattered throughout the County. These limitations can usually be overcome through soil importation or specially engineered design for specific project construction. Adequate engineering studies are required at the project level in the County. As a result, the proposed zoning text amendments would have a *less than significant impact* relative to landslides or mudflows, erosion or changes in topography, expansive soils, or unique geologic or physical features.

41

Environmental Issues

(See attachments for information sources)

No Impact Less Than Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated Potentially Significant Impact

Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Less Than Significant impact No Impact

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:

- a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?
- b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?
- c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
- d) Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?
- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the PCRMDZ?
- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the PCRMDZ?
- g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
- h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

Item a-c: It is not anticipated that any new uses allowed by the zoning text amendments would likely generate hazardous materials.

Federal, state and local requirements must be considered for any new business permit that would be located within one quarter mile of any school, prior to issuance of a permit for operation.

The Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory Law of 1985 (or the Business Plan Act) requires that a business that uses, handles, or stores hazardous substances prepare a plan, which must include: 1) details, including floor plans, of the facility; 2) an inventory of hazardous substances handled or stored; 3) an emergency response plan; and 4) a training program in safety procedures and emergency response for new employees, including annual refresher courses.

Should any toxic and/or flammable materials be proposed for any new commercial uses authorized by the zoning ordinance, a disclosure statement must be filed with the Placer County Department of Environmental Health, which includes a list of these materials, the maximum amounts anticipated and how and where these materials are stored and used. The Fire Department prepares an emergency plan, which contains this information, thereby minimizing the release of hazardous substances in the event of an explosion or fire, and reducing potential impacts to a *less than significant* level.

Item d: The zoning text amendments do not authorize uses that involve unique or unusual human health concerns. Any

42

Environmental Issues <i>(See attachments for information sources)</i>	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
---	-----------	------------------------------	--	--------------------------------

new uses are not expected to result in the exposure of people to additional health hazards such as disease or exposure to hazardous materials.
 Existing federal, state and local regulations would mitigate any potential impacts to a *less than significant* level.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project.				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level, which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Item a.f: The proposed zoning text amendments do not authorize development on lands not previously designated for some level of development. New construction authorized by the current zoning ordinance and potentially encouraged by the zoning text amendments could include earth disturbing activities. This could result in increases in soil erosion leading to increased sediment loads in storm runoff, which could adversely affect receiving water quality. Construction activities may also contribute organic pollutants during the construction of infrastructure and improvements. Additional contamination may occur from increased traffic, which may contribute grease, oils, and other materials that may contaminate runoff from streets, driveways and parking lots

43

As of October 1, 1992, general storm water discharge permits are required by the State for storm water discharges

Environmental Issues

(See attachments for information sources)

No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
-----------	------------------------------	--	--------------------------------

associated with construction activities involving the disturbance of five acres or more. Landowners are responsible for obtaining and complying with the permits, but may delegate duties associated with them to developers and contractors by mutual consent

Permit applicants are required to prepare, and retain at the construction site, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan which includes a description of (1) the site, (2) erosion and sediment controls, (3) means of waste disposal, (4) implementation of approved local plans, (5) control of post-construction sediment and erosion control measures and maintenance responsibilities, and (6) non-storm water management controls. Dischargers are also required to inspect their construction sites before and after storms to identify storm water discharge associated with construction activity and to identify and implement controls where necessary.

The County conditions all construction activities that will disturb five acres or more of land. A Notice of Intent for coverage must be filed and requirements contained on the State General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit must be complied with. In addition, staging of heavy equipment must be established so that spills of oil, grease or other petroleum by-products are not discharged into the stream course. All machinery must be properly maintained and cleaned to prevent spills

The County also has a local grading, erosion and sediment control ordinance. These ordinances require that "Best Management Practices" (BMPs) be employed before, during, and after construction. BMP mechanisms minimize erosion and sedimentation, and prevent pollutants such as oil and grease from entering the stormwater drains. Minor increases in soil erosion leading to increased sediment loads in storm runoff from infrastructure improvements and development would be temporary and would be controlled by standard grading practices and the required BMPs, resulting in a *less than significant* impact.

Item b: Potential new development authorized by the zoning text amendment, particularly hotels in the Sunset Industrial Areas, would not affect the direction or rate of flow of groundwater or surface water. Water supplies for any project are provided by the appropriate water purveyor for that area, from surface water supplies that have been identified to supply planned growth. Future development must tie into public water systems and provide adequate fire flow to the satisfaction of the County Public Works Department and County Fire Marshal. The proposed zoning text amendments would have a *less than significant impact* on the direction or rate of flow of groundwater or surface water.

Item c-e: Drainage and flood control systems throughout Placer County vary widely across the county. System characteristics differ due to vast topographical and geological changes across the county, ranging from the eastern mountainous areas to the western, low elevation flat lands adjacent to Sacramento and Sutter Counties.

The Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District was established in 1984 by the State Legislature as a Special District, separate from county government, to address flood control issues arising with growth. District boundaries are the same as Placer County boundaries.

The primary purpose of the District is to protect lives and property from the effects of flooding by comprehensive, coordinated flood prevention planning, using consistent standards to evaluate flood risk, and by implementing flood control measures such as requiring new development to construct detention basins and operation and management of a flood warning system.

The District:

- Develops and implements master plans for selected watersheds in the county
- Provides technical support and information on flood control for the cities, the county, and the development community
- Operates and maintains the county flood warning system
- Reviews proposed development projects to see they meet District standards
- Develops hydrologic and hydraulic models for county watersheds

44

Environmental Issues

(See attachments for information sources)

No Impact

Less Than
Significant
Impact

Potentially
Significant
Unless
Mitigation
Incorporated

Potentially
Significant
Impact

- Provides technical support for Office of Emergency Services activities

The District Stormwater Management Manual includes the following goals and policies:

1. Provide protection from periodic inundation, which could result in loss of life and property.
2. Protect and enhance natural resources belonging to the stream environment.
3. Prevent significant erosion and adverse effects on water quality.
4. Provide a regional approach to stormwater management, which is both internally consistent and consistent with other community goals and plans.
5. Achieve maximum use of resources through multiple compatible uses.
6. Assure orderly growth and development and minimize its adverse effects.

Storm drainage planning and design in Western Placer County shall adhere to the criteria presented in the District Stormwater Management Manual. Governmental agencies and engineers shall utilize the manual in the planning of new facilities and in their reviews of proposed works by developers, private parties, and other governmental agencies, including the California Department of Transportation, other elements of the State Government and the Federal Government.

However, none of the criteria or guidelines are intended to substitute for the sound application of fundamental engineering or scientific principles or to conflict with stated goals and policies.

The 100-year flood shall be the criterion for measures intended to minimize property damage, injury, and loss of life. Improvements of any kind shall not transfer a problem from one location to another except when the transfer is part of a regional solution to flood problems.

Channel modifications that create problems downstream shall be avoided. Potential problems include erosion, downstream sediment deposition, increase of runoff peaks, and debris transport. Diversions from one watershed to another shall generally be avoided. The diversion of storm runoff from one watershed to another may introduce significant legal problems. All land development proposals shall be evaluated for their effects on runoff and flooding, both offsite and onsite.

Floodplain management is an important component of overall stormwater management strategies. Local jurisdictions are encouraged to adopt and implement measures which will lessen the exposure of property and facilities to flood losses, improve the long-range land management and use of flood-prone areas, and inhibit, to the maximum extent feasible, incompatible development and encourage compatible uses in such areas. Compatible uses are those which do not reduce instream flood storage, create higher flood elevations, or adversely effect riparian or aquatic resources. Compatible uses can include open space, parks and recreation, and agriculture.

Floodplain information will be reviewed and updated as necessary and appropriate to reflect changes due to urbanization, changed conditions, and new information, including the occurrences of extraordinary hydrologic events. Floodplain boundaries shall be shown on preliminary and final subdivision plats, and the area inundated should be indicated as a flow easement or dedicated in fee. This would encompass even the smaller streams which are often overlooked even though they may have a large flood damage potential.

The Flood Control District shall develop comprehensive plans and criteria for the maintenance of designated regional stream channels. In order to maintain their effectiveness, natural streams must be managed. Erosion, widening and meandering stream alignments are natural processes which may be accelerated by increased runoff due to development. Over time, selective improvements such as drop structures and bank protection may be required to help stabilize channels at specific locations to protect structures and public facilities. Vegetation may be used to help stabilize channels as well.

Flood Preparedness, Warnings, and Response Planning

The Flood Control District shall assist local jurisdictions and the Placer County Office of Emergency Services in the preparation of flood warning and response plans. The Flood Control District shall assist local jurisdictions in the planning,

45

Environmental Issues

(See attachments for information sources)

No Impact Less Than Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated Potentially Significant Impact

implementation, and operation of flood warning systems. The Flood Control District shall provide advise and consultation to local jurisdictions and the Placer County Office of Emergency Services in evaluating imminent or ongoing flood events.

Water Quality

The Flood Control District shall compile, evaluate and incorporate in this manual policies, criteria and guidelines for the planning and development of systems for the treatment of runoff to protect water quality.

The Flood Control District shall provide a regional forum to facilitate and participate in the development of programs and plans to satisfy the requirements of the Federal Non-Point Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit.

The Flood Control District will incorporate final rules and regulations when plans for nonpoint source management have been approved by the EPA and California State Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Based on the Flood Control District oversight, the proposed zoning text amendments would not result in a change in the direction of flow within local water bodies, and would have a *less than significant impact* on drainage patterns.

Item q: Flood zones are mapped on numerous Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) covering the county of Placer.

Any new uses authorized by zoning text amendments, although they do not expand areas where development can occur, could result in exposure of people and/or property to the risk of injury and damage in the event of a 100-year, or greater, flood. However, any development in these areas will be further studied on a project specific basis using the County and Cities Flood Zone Land Use Policies and all such projects are required to avoid or mitigate any direct or cumulative flooding impact within the 100-year floodplain and must comply with the County's Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance.

Item j: Placer County is not in a coastal zone. Changes in land uses authorized through the zoning text amendments are very limited. No hazard from seiche, tsunami or mudflow is anticipated.

Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:

- a) Physically divide an established community?
- b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?
- c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

Item a,b: The only notable land use change authorized by these zoning text amendments is allowance for hotels within the industrial zoning districts. These uses will require a Conditional or Minor Use Permit and an environmental document will be prepared when analyzing individual proposals. The Objectives, Goals and Policies of the General Plan and the Sunset Industrial Plan do not specifically authorize overnight accommodations in industrial areas, but they do not prohibit them as they do residential uses. The primary goal of the Sunset Industrial Plan is as follows: "To improve the opportunities for industrial and other employment-based development in the Sunset Industrial Area Plan in order to attract new industries, retain existing industries, to allow existing industries to expand, and to provide the necessary public and private sector services and facilities for all area employers, businesses and patrons." Circumstances have changed since the SIA Plan was adopted. These include the establishment of the Thunder Valley Casino as well as proposed large scale business developments and universities that would generate a need for overnight accommodations for casino patrons, visitors and business travelers. Hotel projects would be required to be consistent with county and city General Plan designations.

46

Environmental Issues

(See attachments for information sources)

No Impact Less Than Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated Potentially Significant Impact

zoning, and adopted plans and policies, and would not adversely impact the physical arrangement of the community.

Item c: The zoning text amendment would allow hotels in industrial zoning districts. No new lands are being made available for development as a result of these zoning text amendments. Protected lands to meet the habitat conservation or natural communities conservation plan objectives would not be directly affected by future development authorized by the zoning text amendments. Future projects in western Placer County may be required to contribute to or provide off-site mitigation to alleviate any on-site natural community habitat loss.

Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

X. MINERAL RESOURCES - Would the project:

- a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?
- b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

Item a-b: The proposed zoning text amendments would not affect properties zoned for resource extraction. The proposed zoning text amendment should not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource or a locally-important mineral resource recovery site. Since a Use Permit is required for siting a hotel in Industrial zones, a determination could be made as to any impacts on a locally-important mineral resource.

Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

XI. NOISE - Would the project result in:

- a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?
- b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?
- c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
- d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the PCRMDZ to excessive noise levels?

Item a-f: The industrial zoning districts where hotels would be allowed are located in an urbanized environment which is subject to noise from traffic corridors, trucks, aircraft, trains and other noise sources typical of a location near major arterials and commercial activities. Increased traffic and facility noise generated by hotels would be consistent with the underlying zoning where industrial uses were anticipated when the zoning for the area was adopted. To the extent that such uses may

47

Environmental Issues
 (See attachments for information sources)

No Impact Less Than Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated Potentially Significant Impact

be located in proximity to noise sensitive land uses, the county Noise Element must be adhered to as part of the project level review.

Construction activities, including the erection, excavation, demolition, alteration or repair of any building or structure, are conditionally exempt from the county noise ordinances but subject to limitations on construction hours. Construction noise resulting from any development authorized by the Zoning text amendments would not be expected to exceed typical construction levels anticipated with or without changes to the zoning ordinance. Therefore, the Zoning Text amendments would result in *less than significant* permanent or temporary noise impacts.

Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING - Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The County has developed policies and plans to provide for long-term population and housing needs, with documents such as the General Plan, community plans and redevelopment plans that guide planning and development in the area.

Item a: The Zoning Text amendment will have minimal effects on population and housing. The two amendments that could alter land uses are allowance for hotels in industrial districts and amendments to the density bonus provisions. The allowance for hotels in the industrial zoning districts should not induce residential growth, which is not allowed in industrial zones, nor generate substantial additional needs for housing units, as the Sunset Industrial Area is already intended to accommodate a large employment base. The density bonus changes are mandated by State legislation. Although they do allow increased density bonuses for lower percentages of affordable units, such increased incentives may not be feasible in many cases due to an increase in the length of required affordability provisions to 30 years. It is unlikely that the new provisions will substantially alter housing, growth patterns and population.

Item b,c: Development occurring as a result of allowing hotels in industrial zoning districts would occur in industrial areas, and would not be expected to reduce the supply of low- and moderate-income housing. Therefore, *no significant impacts* on housing would occur as a result of the Zoning text amendment.

Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the

48

Environmental Issues

(See attachments for information sources)

No Impact
 Less Than Significant Impact
 Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
 Potentially Significant Impact

construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1) Fire protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2) Police protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3) Schools? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4) Parks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5) Other public facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Item a 1-5: Police/fire personnel, schools, libraries and parks provide a wide range of services that are affected by population increases but impacts to public services are expected to be less than significant. The density of particular projects may be increased as a result of changes to the density bonus provisions. The placement of hotels in industrial zoning districts could affect fire protection, police protection and parks, but not as substantially as residential growth. Individual projects will be analyzed through a use permit and environmental review process and any potential impacts can be mitigated at that time.

Fire/police protection and emergency medical services: Any proposed new development authorized by zoning text amendments will be required to incorporate design features identified in the Uniform Building Code and the Uniform Fire Code. The city police and county sheriff departments and the fire departments are given the opportunity to review and comment on the design of any proposed new development that could affect public or fire safety. The incorporation of fire safety measures required by the Uniform Building Code and the Uniform Fire Code and county permitting requirements are expected to reduce any physical public safety impacts associated with development authorized by the zoning text amendments to a **less than significant** level.

Schools. Allowance for hotels in the industrial zoning districts will not affect schools. Additional residential units that may be approved as a result of the new density bonus program will be dispersed and located in areas zoned for residential units and should not substantially impact any particular school district. Therefore there would be a **less than significant impact** on schools.

Parks. The County General Fund and Parks Mitigation fees provide the financial support to achieve basic park services. The Zoning text amendments will not generate substantial growth or demand for parks facilities. Thus, the proposed Zoning Text amendment would have a **less than significant impact** upon the quality or quantity of park facilities.

Potentially Significant Impact
 Less Than Significant with Mitigation
 Less Than Significant Impact
 No Impact

XIV. RECREATION

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Environmental Issues (See attachments for information sources)	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
---	-----------	------------------------------	--	--------------------------------

Item a,b: No substantial additional demand for Parks facilities is anticipated as a result of the Zoning Text amendment. No recreational facilities are proposed by the text amendment, so no physical effects are anticipated.

The proposed Zoning Text amendment would have *no significant impact* upon the quality or quantity of recreational facilities.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC- -- Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections?)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Items a,b,d,e: The proposed Zoning Text amendment to allow hotels in the industrial zones will generate additional traffic, but this may be offset by making overnight accommodations locally available to casino patrons, business travelers or parents of students who would otherwise have to travel out of the area to stay. This additional development could generate some additional vehicular movements throughout the industrial zoning districts over existing conditions. At the time general plan and zoning designations were adopted, the public infrastructure required to accommodate growth consistent with the land use designations was identified, and the county adopted transportation plans consistent with planned growth. Any site specific circulation issues relating to a future project's design and location must be analyzed at the time a project is proposed, consistent with the County's development review process. On a programmatic level, the addition of vehicle trips generated by development allowed by the Zoning Text amendments would be consistent with the County general plan. The proposed Zoning text amendment would have a *less than significant impact* on area roadways.

Item c: The proposed zoning text amendments have no effect on air traffic patterns

Item f: Any new development allowed by the Zoning text amendments would be required to meet county parking requirements. The proposed Zoning Text amendments would have a *less than significant impact* on parking. **50**

Item g: Placer County Transit (PCT) provides transit service for western Placer County residents with a goal to provide a safe and direct means of travel. PCT serves the areas of Roseville, Granite Bay, Loomis, Rocklin, Auburn, Colfax, and

Environmental Issues (See attachments for information sources)	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact

Alta. The Tahoe Area Regional Transit systems serves the eastern portions of the county and connects to Greyhound and Amtrak at the Truckee Depot. The proposed Zoning text amendments would have a *less than significant impact* on alternative transportation modes.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Item a,b,e: Wastewater. Wastewater collection, treatment and disposal in Placer County takes two forms: community systems and individual onsite systems. Community wastewater systems range in complexity from simple flow systems to highly technical, large capacity systems serving extended areas.

The Placer County General Plan Background Report (Volume 1, September 1992) outlines wastewater management methodologies generally available and the types, conditions and capacities of the existing wastewater facilities used in Placer County. The Background Report describes thirty-seven (37) community wastewater systems included in the regional Water Quality Control Board's permitted facility list.

Community facilities must continue to comply with changing regulations that mandate technological upgrades to meet increasingly stringent discharge requirements. Design and technological advancements will assist in improving the use of community facilities and will, thereby, reduce some of the detrimental impacts associated with their use. Commercial/industrial dischargers will continue to be required to employ pretreatment systems to assist in source reduction of contaminants being exported to community wastewater facilities.

The County General Plan includes several policies and programs related to wastewater collection, treatment and disposal that are intended to protect public health and water quality.

51

These policies provide for new development only where it can be served by adequate wastewater treatment systems, promote water conservation to reduce the need for unnecessary wastewater facility capacity, promote improvements in

Environmental Issues (See attachments for information sources)	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
---	-----------	------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------

existing wastewater treatment systems including improvements to areas that currently have failing onsite systems. Policies also limit newer onsite sewage treatment and disposal to areas where the soils and other characteristics will allow for such facilities without threatening surface or groundwater and where such facilities can meet all other County requirements and standards.

As development occurs, any necessary collection system upgrades are required prior to the issuance of building permits. The zoning text amendments would have a *less than significant impact* on wastewater services.

Item b, d: Water Service. Currently in Placer County, coordination and planning for water resources countywide is not under any one agency or jurisdiction. Groundwater and surface water management is accommodated through various combinations of public and private water agencies and districts, all eventually governed by state and federal regulations.

Most water provided to the community is from surface supplies from water rights held by the Bureau of Reclamation, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, or the Nevada Irrigation District. Well water or combinations of well and reservoir water account for the remainder. The Pacific Gas and Electric Company and Bureau of Reclamation are major suppliers that wholesale water to Placer County.

The Yuba and Bear Rivers supplying Lake Spaulding are Placer County's largest sources of surface water. The Placer County Water Agency (PCWA) subsequently purchases this water from PG&E. A second source appropriated to PCWA is from the American River. A third source is through the Reclamation Central Valley Project. Nevada Irrigation District provides a fourth source of surface water, however contracts expire in the year 2013. Lake Tahoe provides the fifth significant surface water source. Groundwater is also available in much of the County; however, quantities can be limited and is used primarily in rural areas.

PCWA Water System Division supplies irrigation and treated drinking water in four service zones in central and western Placer County, generally located along the Interstate 80 corridor between Roseville and Alta; and one service zone in the Martis Valley, south of Truckee, in eastern Placer County. PCWA has determined that it has sufficient water rights to meet the projected demand of projects likely to develop in western Placer County through 2030.

Although PCWA seeks to obtain sufficient water supplies to serve the build-out of all local General Plans in its service areas, the agency satisfies requests for water service only on a first come, first-serve basis. PCWA follows a policy of extending water pipelines only when an adequate supply of water exists, thus ensuring that it does not take on new customers without a firm supply of water needed to serve them.

New projects in the PCWA service area would be subject to water use and conservation measures as provided for in applicable codes. These include regulations concerning required fire flows in the Uniform Fire Code, low flush toilets and low water use fixtures. Water demands for new projects will be evaluated by PCWA, and a determination made in each case as to whether the Agency has adequate water supplies to meet the long-term demands for water service.

Additionally, uses authorized by the zoning text amendment would be required to contribute towards its share of expanding any necessary water treatment facilities to accommodate increases in flow through the system, thus water supply impacts would be *less than significant*.

Item c: See Section VIII: Hydrology and Water Quality

Item f, g: Solid waste from the western portion of the county is currently transported to the Western Placer Waste Management Authority's Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) located at the intersection of Athens Road and Fiddymont Road for sorting. The Western Placer Waste Management Authority (WPWMA), a regional agency comprised of the cities of Lincoln, Rocklin, Roseville and the County of Placer.

The WPWMA provides recycling and waste disposal services to the County and cities. The MRF is the region's predominant recycling strategy because of its potential to achieve high levels of diversion at a lower rate of processing cost-per-ton than other recycling strategies. The MRF has the flexibility to handle all waste, whether mixed waste from the Auburn-Placer Disposal Service, or source-separated recyclables from other recycling programs in the communities. The MRF recovers recyclable materials such as glass, metals, paper, plastics, wood waste and other compostable materials (e.g., yard waste, food scraps) from the incoming waste stream. The MRF has a composting facility that processes yard wastes and other organic materials into high-quality materials suitable for use as a soil amendment or mulch. A Buy

Environmental Issues

(See attachments for information sources)

No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
-----------	------------------------------	--	--------------------------------

back/Drop-off Center for source-separated recyclables, as well as a Household Hazardous Waste Drop-off Facility, are located at the MRF. Un-recyclable solid waste received at the MRF is then disposed of at the adjacent Western Regional Landfill that has a disposal acreage of 291 acres. An additional 465 acres for landfill expansion are located to the west of the current landfill site, which is not yet permitted for landfill uses by the Integrated Waste Management Board. In addition to Municipal Solid Waste from the MRF, the landfill directly accepts sewage sludge and other materials. The landfill is permitted to accept Class II and Class III wastes. The landfill may accept about 2,400 cubic yards per day or 861,600 cubic yards per year (1,200 tons per day or 430,800 tons per year).

The service life of the landfill is calculated and permitted at this time to the year 2025. The Placer County Health Department serves as the Local Enforcement Agency for the landfill.

The Zoning Text amendments would have a less than significant impact on solid waste generation and landfills.

III. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

- A. Does the project have the potential to 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 rare or endangered plants or animals, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? NO YES

- B. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects) NO YES

- C. Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? NO YES

IV. EARLIER ANALYSIS

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration [State CEQA guidelines Section 15063(c)(3)(D)]. In this case a discussion should identify the following on attached sheets.

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

Authority: Public Resources Code Sections 21083 and 21087.

Reference: Public Resources Code Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21082.1, 21083, 31083.3, 21093, 21094, 21151; *Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino*, 202 Cal. App. 3d 296 (1988); *Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors*, 222 Cal. App. 3d 1337 (1990).

V. OTHER RESPONSIBLE AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Fish and Game | <input type="checkbox"/> Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Transportation (e.g. Caltrans) | <input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Health Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> California Regional Water Quality Control Board | <input type="checkbox"/> California Integrated Waste Management Board |
| <input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Forestry | <input type="checkbox"/> Tahoe Regional Planning Agency |
| <input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Army Corp of Engineers | <input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Toxic Substances |
| <input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> National Marine Fisheries Service | |

VI. DETERMINATION (to be completed by the Lead Agency)

I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

VII. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW STAFF

Planning Department

Signature: Melanie Heckel
MELANIE HECKEL, ASSISTANT PLANNING DIRECTOR

7/6/05
Date