



**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT/RESOURCE AGENCY  
ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATION SERVICES**  
County of Placer

**NOTICE OF INTENT  
TO ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

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

**PROJECT:** Auburn Equipment Company, LLC Rezone and GPA (PLN21-00489)

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** Rezone from OP-Dc-FH-AO (Office Professional, Combining Design Scenic Corridor, Combining Flood Hazard, and Combining Aircraft Overflight) to CPD-Dc-FH-AO (Commercial Planned Development, Combining Design Corridor, Combining Flood Hazard, and Combining Aircraft Overflight), and a General Plan Amendment to change the existing land use designation from Professional Office/Riparian Drainage to General Commercial/Riparian Drainage. No physical development is proposed.

**PROJECT LOCATION:** KOA Way approximately 0.15-mile northeast of the corner of Rock Creek Road and Highway 49, Auburn, Placer County

**APPLICANT:** Larry Farinha

The comment period for this document closes on **May 10, 2022**. A copy of the Mitigated Negative Declaration is available for public review at the County's web site:

<https://www.placer.ca.gov/2826/Negative-Declarations>

A copy of the Mitigated Negative Declaration is available for public review at the Community Development Resource Agency public counter, and at the Auburn Public 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 Environmental Coordination Services, at (530)745-3132, between the hours of 8:00 am and 5:00 pm. Comments may be sent to [cdraecs@placer.ca.gov](mailto:cdraecs@placer.ca.gov) or 3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190, Auburn, CA 95603.

Delivered to 300' Property Owners on April 11, 2022.



**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT/RESOURCE AGENCY**  
**Environmental Coordination Services**  
 County of Placer

<b>MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION</b>
---------------------------------------

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: Auburn Equipment Company, LLC Rezone and GPA	Project # PLN21-00489
Description: Rezone from OP-Dc-FH-AO (Office Professional, Combining Design Scenic Corridor, Combining Flood Hazard, and Combining Aircraft Overflight) to CPD-Dc-FH-AO (Commercial Planned Development, Combining Design Corridor, Combining Flood Hazard, and Combining Aircraft Overflight), and a General Plan Amendment to change the existing land use designation from Professional Office/Riparian Drainage to General Commercial/Riparian Drainage. No physical development is proposed.	
Location: KOA Way approximately 0.15-mile northeast of the corner of Rock Creek Road and Highway 49, Auburn, Placer County	
Project Owner: Auburn Equipment Company, LLC	
Project Applicant: Larry Farinha	
County Contact Person: Shirlee I. Herrington	530-745-3132

**PUBLIC NOTICE**

The comment period for this document closes on **May 10, 2022**. A copy of the Mitigated Negative Declaration is available for public review at the County's web site (<https://www.placer.ca.gov/2826/Negative-Declarations>), Community Development Resource Agency public counter, and at the Auburn Public Library. Property owners within 300 feet of the subject site shall be notified by mail of the upcoming meeting before the **Planning Commission**. Additional information may be obtained by contacting the Environmental Coordination Services, at (530)745-3132 between the hours of 8:00 am and 5:00 pm at 3091 County Center Drive, 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.



**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT/RESOURCE AGENCY**  
**Environmental Coordination Services**  
 County of Placer

## INITIAL STUDY & CHECKLIST

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

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

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

Project Title: Auburn Equipment Company, LLC Rezone and GPA	Project # PLN21-00489
Entitlement(s): Rezone and General Plan Amendment	
Site Area: 1.9 Acres	APN: 052-270-037-000
Location: KOA Way approximately 0.15-mile northeast of the corner of Rock Creek Road and Highway 49, Auburn, Placer County	

**A. BACKGROUND:**

**Project Description**

The project proposes a Rezone from OP-Dc-FH-AO (Office Professional, Combining Design Scenic Corridor, Combining Flood Hazard, and Combining Aircraft Overflight) to CPD-Dc-FH-AO (Commercial Planned Development, Combining Design Corridor, Combining Flood Hazard, and Combining Aircraft Overflight). In addition to the Rezone, the project proposes a General Plan Amendment to change the existing land use designation from Professional Office/Riparian Drainage to General Commercial/Riparian Drainage. No physical development is proposed with this Rezone and General Plan Amendment.

**Project Site** (Background/Existing Setting):

The 1.9-acre proposed project site is undeveloped and is bound to the east by KOA Way and to the west by an unnamed tributary to Rock Creek. KOA Way runs through the southeast corner of the property. The site has a mild grade and slopes downhill from KOA Way toward the unnamed tributary to the west. The site is moderately vegetated with oaks, pines, chaparral, and grassland. Redwood trees have been planted along the west side of KOA Way.

Multifamily residential uses and a Seventh-Day Adventist church are located immediately south of the site. The Auburn Gold Country RV Park is adjacent to the proposed project site to the north. The adjacent parcels to the west are undeveloped, and Highway 49 is approximately 600 feet to the west. Two parcels are adjacent to the proposed project site's eastern boundary, the southern of which is developed with an animal clinic and the northern of which is undeveloped.

The proposed project site is within a larger commercial area of North Auburn. The immediate surrounding area supports three shopping centers, a hospital, an elementary school, a large retailer (Target), churches, professional and medical offices, government services, storage facilities, and multifamily developments. The below aerial shows the boundary of the proposed project site in blue and the surrounding zoning:



**Figure 1: Project Site**

The purpose of the proposed project is to provide for a wider range of permissible land uses than is currently allowed under the Office Professional (OP) zoning designation. The current zoning designation of Office Professional and its complimentary land use designation, Professional Office, was established in 1994 with adoption of the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan by the Board of Supervisors. The Auburn/Bowman Community Plan Community Development Element notes that the Professional Office designation was established to address concerns with commercial zoning being over-utilized for retail-related uses rather than office use, which tend to have higher wages than retail jobs. The goal of the designation was to incentivize office uses. The Professional Office designation is also intended to act as a transitional zoning between more traditional commercial uses and residential development.

The goal of the OP zone district, to incentivize office uses, has not been met. Some medical offices have been built in the OP zone district east of the proposed project site on Bell Road, however the other OP zoned properties are either undeveloped, or are developed with non-office uses such as the church that is south of the proposed project site. Indeed, since 1994, many large retail projects have been built or approved in North Auburn including Target, The Plaza shopping center, Willow Creek shopping center, and the Auburn Creekside shopping center.

Since the time the zoning designation was changed, the proposed project site has not been developed. Compared to other commercial zone districts, the OP designation is limited in allowable uses. The Commercial Planned Development (CPD) zone district allows over 25 uses that are not allowed in the OP zone district, primarily retail, service, and residential uses. The Purpose and Intent of this zoning designation as described in the Zoning Ordinance is "intended primarily for the development and operation of professional and administrative offices and professional services, rather than retail trade. New development in such areas is intended to be planned and designed so as to be relatively compatible with residential uses." As such, office uses are allowed by right, and retail uses are limited to drive-in and drive thru sales, mail order and vending, and restaurants and bars. The proposed change from OP to a CPD zone district would accommodate additional allowable uses that are not allowed in the OP zone district. Nearly all uses in the CPD zone district require either a Minor Use Permit or a Conditional Use Permit, and the combining Design Scenic Corridor zoning designation further requires all development to undergo a Design/Site Review

Agreement. Though no physical development is proposed with this Rezone and General Plan Amendment, future development would be required to undergo a permit review process including subsequent environmental review and public hearings. The below table compares the allowable land uses and permit requirements for the CPD and OP zone districts:

**Table 1: Allowable Land Use Tables**

Allowable Land Uses	Land Use Permit	
	CPD	OP
<b>Agricultural, Resource, and Open Space Uses</b>		
Crop Production	A	A
Forestry	A	A
Grazing	A	A
Plant nurseries, retail	A	Section 17.56.165
Water extraction and storage (commercial)	CUP	-
Winery	Section 17.56.330	
<b>Manufacturing and Processing Uses</b>		
Printing and Publishing	CUP	MUP ( <i>CUP if parcel is 10 acres or larger</i> )
Recycling collection stations	Section 17.56.170	-
<b>Recreation, Education and Public Assembly Uses</b>		
Community Center	CUP	CUP
Commercial event center	CUP	CUP
Houses of worship	CUP	MUP
Libraries and museums	CUP	MUP
Membership organization facilities	CUP	-
Outdoor commercial recreation	CUP	-
Parks, playgrounds, golf courses	CUP	MUP
Recreation and fitness centers	CUP	MUP
Schools – College and university	CUP	CUP
Schools - Elementary	CUP	MUP
Schools – Secondary	CUP	MUP
Schools – Specialized education and training	CUP	C
Ski lift facilities and ski runs	CUP	-
Sport facilities and outdoor public assembly	CUP	-
Temporary events	MUP	MUP
Theaters and meeting halls	CUP	-
<b>Residential Uses</b>		
Accessory and junior accessory dwelling units	C	-
Caretaker and employee housing	C	C
Emergency shelter, 60 or fewer clients	CUP	-
Emergency shelter, 60 or more clients	CUP	-
Home occupations	C	C
Multifamily dwellings, any size	CUP	-
Residential accessory uses	CUP	-
Senior housing projects	CUP	-
Single-room occupancy residential housing, 30 or fewer units	C	-
Single-room occupancy residential housing, 31 or more units	MUP	-
<b>Retail Trade</b>		
Auto, mobile home, vehicle and parts sales	CUP	-

Building material stores	CUP	-
Drive-in and drive-thru sales	CUP	MUP
Furniture, furnishings and equipment stores	CUP	-
Grocery and liquor stores	CUP	-
Mail order and vending	-	C
Outdoor Retail Sales	CUP	-
Restaurants and bars	CUP	MUP
Restaurants, fast food	CUP	-
Retail stores, general merchandise	CUP	-
Secondhand stores	CUP	-
Shopping centers, any size	CUP	-
<b>Service Uses</b>		
Banks and financial services	CUP	C
Business support services	CUP	MUP
Child/Adult day care, centers	CUP	MUP
Child day care, family care homes	CUP	-
Drive-in and drive-thru services	CUP	MUP
Medical services – Clinics and laboratories	CUP	C
Medical services – Hospitals and extended care	CUP	MUP
Medical services – Veterinary clinics and hospitals	CUP	MUP
Offices	CUP	C
Offices, temporary	C	C
Personal services	CUP	MUP
Public safety facilities	CUP	C
Public utility facilities	CUP	MUP
Repair and maintenance – Accessory to sales	CUP	-
Repair and maintenance – Consumer products	CUP	-
Service stations	CUP	-
Storage, accessory	A	A
Storage, mini storage facilities	CUP	MUP <i>(Only permitted as a secondary use when a primary use (office, etc.) exists on the same parcel)</i>
Storage of petroleum products for on-site use	CUP	-
<b>Transient Lodging</b>		
Hotels and motels	CUP	-
<b>Transportation and Communications</b>		
Antennas, communications facilities	Section 17.56.060	Section 17.56.060
Broadcasting studios	CUP	MUP
Heliports	CUP	CUP
Pipelines and transmissions lines	A	A
Transit stations and terminals	CUP	-
Vehicle storage	CUP	-

**B. Environmental Setting:**

Location	Zoning	General Plan/Community Plan Designations	Existing Conditions and Improvements
Site	Office Professional, Combining Design Corridor, Combining Flood	Professional Office/Riparian Drainage	Undeveloped

	Hazard, and Combining Aircraft Overflight (OP-Dc-FH-AO)		
North	Industrial Park, Combining Design Corridor, Combining Aircraft Overflight (INP-Dc-AO)	Industrial	Auburn Gold Country RV Park
South	Same as project site	Same as project site	Multifamily Residential, Church
East	Same as project site and Commercial Planned Development. Combining Design Corridor, Combining Flood Hazard, and Combining Aircraft Overflight (CPD-Dc-FH-AO)	Commercial/Riparian Drainage	Undeveloped
West	Office Professional, Combining Design Corridor, Combining Aircraft Overflight (OP-Dc-AO)	Professional Office	Animal clinic and undeveloped parcels

**C. NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES:** Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

*Pursuant to Assembly Bill 52, invitations to consult were sent on December 17, 2021, to tribes who requested notification of proposed projects within this geographic area. On January 6, 2022, the United Auburn Indian Community declined consultation and requested inclusion of mitigation measures for Inadvertent Discoveries that would be applied to future project environmental reviews.*

**NOTE:** Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

#### **D. PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT:**

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

Section 15168 relating to Program EIRs indicates that where subsequent activities involve site-specific operations, the agency would use a written checklist or similar device to document the evaluation of the site and the activity, to determine whether the environmental effects of the operation were covered in the earlier Program EIR. A Program EIR is intended to provide the basis in an Initial Study for determining whether the later activity may have any significant effects. It will also be incorporated by reference to address regional influences, secondary effects, cumulative impacts, broad alternatives, and other factors that apply to the program as a whole.

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

- ➔ Placer County General Plan EIR
- ➔ Auburn/Bowman Community Plan EIR

#### **E. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

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

questions as follows:

- a) A brief explanation is required for all answers including “No Impact” answers.
- b) “Less Than Significant Impact” applies where the project’s impacts are insubstantial and do not require any mitigation to reduce impacts.
- c) “Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less than Significant Impact.” The County, as lead agency, must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level (mitigation measures from earlier analyses may be cross-referenced).
- d) “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- e) All answers must take account of the entire action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts [CEQA Guidelines, Section 15063(a)(1)].
- f) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, Program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration [CEQA Guidelines, Section 15063(c)(3)(D)]. A brief discussion should be attached addressing the following:
  - ➔ **Earlier analyses used** – Identify earlier analyses and state where they are available for review.
  - ➔ **Impacts adequately addressed** – Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of, and adequately analyzed in, an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards. Also, state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - ➔ **Mitigation measures** – For effects that are checked as “Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- g) References to information sources for potential impacts (i.e. General Plans/Community Plans, zoning ordinances) should be incorporated into the checklist. Reference to a previously-prepared or outside document should include a reference to the pages or chapters where the statement is substantiated. A source list should be attached and other sources used, or individuals contacted, should be cited in the discussion.



**I. AESTHETICS** – Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (PLN)				X
2. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, within a state scenic highway? (PLN)				X
3. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? (PLN)				X
4. Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (PLN)				X

**Discussion Item I-1, 2, 3, 4:**

No physical development is proposed with this Rezone and General Plan Amendment, and KOA Way is not a scenic vista. The site is somewhat visible from Highway 49, however the riparian vegetation along the unnamed tributary provides a natural visual screen for portions of the site. The site is undeveloped and there are no rock outcroppings, vistas, or other scenic qualities inherent to the site. The surrounding area is developed with commercial, residential, and retail uses, and the uses allowed with the proposed rezone would be consistent with existing developed character.

The site's combining Design Scenic Corridor zoning designation requires future development to undergo a site/design review application with Placer County, and all future development would be required to comply with the design standards of the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan, the Placer County Landscape Design Guidelines, and the development standards including height, setbacks, and lot coverage of the Commercial Planned Development (CPD) zone district. Future development would be required to be consistent with the surrounding visual character of the North Auburn area. The proposed Rezone and General Plan Amendment would not have an impact to aesthetic resources. Therefore, there is no impact.

**II. AGRICULTURAL & FOREST RESOURCES** – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? (PLN)				X
2. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, a Williamson Act contract or a Right-to-Farm Policy? (PLN)				X
3. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? (PLN)				X

4. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? (PLN)				X
5. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? (PLN)				X
6. Conflict with General Plan or other policies regarding land use buffers for agricultural operations? (PLN)				X

**Discussion Item II-1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6:**

The Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program has mapped the proposed project site as "Urban and Built-Up Land". The site is not enrolled in a Williamson Act contract, and no existing agricultural activities are in the vicinity of the proposed project site. The site is not zoned for agricultural or timber uses and the proposed Rezone and General Plan Amendment would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land and farmland to a non-forest land and farmland use. No agricultural uses are in the vicinity that would require adherence to the General Plan agricultural buffer policies. Therefore, there is no impact.

**III. AIR QUALITY – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (AQ)				X
2. 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? (AQ)				X
3. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (AQ)				X
4. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people? (AQ)				X

**Discussion Item III-1, 2:**

The proposed project is located within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB) portion of Placer County and is under the jurisdiction of the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD). The SVAB is designated non-attainment for the federal and state ozone standards (ROG and NO<sub>x</sub>), and nonattainment for the state particulate matter standard (PM<sub>10</sub>). The applicant is requesting approval of a Rezone and General Plan Amendment (GPA) to change the existing land use designation from Professional Office/Riparian Drainage to General Commercial/Riparian Drainage. The purpose of the rezone and GPA is to allow for more options for development at a future date. Future development of the site would require an entitlement applicant and subsequent environmental review. The approval of the proposed rezone and GPA would not require any on or offsite improvements to the parcel, or new uses. The proposed project would not generate any construction or operational emissions. Therefore, there is no impact.

**Discussion Item III-3:**

Certain air pollutants are classified by the ARB as toxic air contaminants, or TACs, which are known to increase the risk of cancer and/or other serious health effects. Localized concentrations of Carbon Monoxide (CO) can be a TAC and are typically generated by traffic congestion at intersections. The proposed project does not propose any new uses that would result in traffic. and therefore would have no impact.

The California Air Resources Board (ARB) has identified DPM from diesel exhaust as a toxic air contaminant, with both chronic and carcinogenic public health risks. The proposed project, however, does not include any construction activity and therefore would not generate diesel particulate matter (DPM) emissions from heavy-duty onsite equipment and off-road diesel equipment. There would be no impact.

Naturally occurring asbestos (NOA) was identified as a TAC in 1986 by the ARB. For individuals living in areas of NOA, there are many potential pathways for airborne exposure. Exposure to soil dust containing asbestos can occur under a variety of scenarios, including children playing in the dirt, dust raised from unpaved roads and driveways covered with crushed serpentine rock/soil, grading and earth disturbance associated with construction activity, quarrying, gardening, and other human activities. People exposed to low levels of asbestos may be at elevated risk of lung cancer and mesothelioma.

Naturally occurring asbestos (NOA) was identified as a TAC in 1986 by the ARB. NOA, often found in serpentine rock formations, is present in many areas within Placer County. When material that contains naturally occurring asbestos is disturbed, asbestos fibers may be released and become airborne, thereby creating a potential health hazard. Exposure to asbestos may result in inhalation or ingestion of asbestos fibers, which over time may result in damage to the lungs or membranes that cover the lungs, leading to illness or even death.

The California Geological Survey (CGS) has identified areas of Placer County that are more or less likely to contain naturally occurring asbestos, based on available soil and geologic studies and some field verification. Based on the mapping conducted for Placer County by CGS, the proposed project site is located within an area that is considered “most likely to contain NOA” (CGS 2008). The proposed project does not propose any construction activity that would result in the release of airborne NOA, or new uses that would pose a risk to sensitive receptors. Therefore, there is no impact.

**Discussion Item III-4:**

The proposed project would not generate odorous producing air pollutant emissions during the construction or operational phases. Therefore, there is no impact.

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish & Wildlife, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service or National Marine Fisheries Service? (PLN)				X
2. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community, identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or regulated by the California Department of Fish & Wildlife, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, or Regional Water Quality Control Board? (PLN)				X
3. Have a substantial adverse effect on federal or state protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) or as defined by state statute, through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (PLN)				X
4. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? (PLN)				X
5. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (PLN)				X
6. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (PLN)				X

7. Substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number of restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species? (PLN)				X
8. Have a substantial adverse effect on the environment by converting oak woodlands? (PLN)				X

**Discussion Item IV-1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8:**

The 1.9-acre property is undeveloped. An unnamed tributary to Rock Creek crosses the southwest corner of the site. The site has a mild grade and slopes downhill from KOA Way to the south and west. The site is moderately vegetated with oaks, pines, chaparral, and grassland.

No physical development is proposed with this Rezone and General Plan Amendment. Future projects would be required to undergo environmental review including a biological resources assessment to determine the potential presence or absence of special-status plants and animals, determine potential impacts to onsite habitat, and identify appropriate mitigation measures. Furthermore, the proposed project site is located within the Placer County Conservation Program (PCCP) area with an Oak Woodland/Savannah PCCP land cover type, and any future project proposing ground disturbance would be required to mitigate land conversion impacts per the PCCP avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures and obtain a PCCP Land Conversion Authorization prior to ground disturbance. Future potential impacts to biological resources including special status species and their habitats, oak woodland, and the unnamed tributary would be addressed and mitigated when a development project is proposed. Therefore, there is no impact.

**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5? (PLN)				X
2. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5? (PLN)				X
3. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries? (PLN)				X
4. Have the potential to cause a physical change, which would affect unique ethnic cultural values? (PLN)				X
5. Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? (PLN)				X

**Discussion Item V-1, 2, 3, 4, 5:**

Physical site development is not proposed with this Rezone and General Plan Amendment. Future projects would be required to undergo environmental review including a cultural resources assessment to determine the potential presence or absence of cultural resources including historic and pre-historic subsurface materials and to determine potential impacts and identify appropriate mitigation measures. Therefore, there is no impact.

**VI. ENERGY** – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation? (PLN)				X
2. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency? (PLN)				X

**Discussion Item VI-1:**

The proposed project for a Rezone and General Plan Amendment does not propose physical site development. Future projects would be required to comply with the California Building Code, which includes multiple requirements for energy-saving and energy-reducing building materials and design. Therefore, there is no impact.

**Discussion Item VI-2:**

The Placer County Sustainability Plan (PCSP), adopted by the Placer County Board of Supervisors on January 28, 2020, includes goals and policies for energy efficiency. The proposed project for a Rezone and General Plan Amendment does not propose physical site development. Future development projects would be required to be consistent with the PCSP. Therefore, there is no impact.

**VII. GEOLOGY & SOILS** – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (ESD)			X	
2. 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? (ESD)			X	
3. Be located on expansive soils, as defined in Section 1802.3.2 of the California Building Code (2007), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property? (ESD)			X	
4. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? (EH)				X
5. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or unique geologic or physical feature? (PLN)				X
6. Result in significant disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcrowding of the soil? (ESD)			X	
7. Result in substantial change in topography or ground surface relief features? (ESD)			X	
8. Result in exposure of people or property to geologic and geomorphological (i.e. Avalanches) hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, seismic-related ground failure, or similar hazards? (PLN, ESD)			X	

**Discussion Item VII-1, 3, 6, 7:**

The proposed project site is an approximately 1.9-acre parcel proposed to be rezoned from OP-Dc-FH-AO to CPD-Dc-FH-AO, in addition to a General Plan Amendment to change the existing land use designation from Professional Office/Riparian Drainage to General Commercial/Riparian Drainage to facilitate the proposed rezone. No improvements are proposed or required to be constructed with this GPA and rezone. The existing parcel is undeveloped and has no existing improvements. Any access to future development will be from KOA Road, a County maintained road, which fronts the east side of the parcel.

The Natural Resource Conservation Service Web Soil Survey identifies the predominant soil types on the site as Auburn-Rock outcrop complex, 2 to 30 percent slopes, along the eastern 2/3 of the parcel, and Henneke-Rock outcrop complex, 5 to 50 percent slopes, on the remaining eastern 1/3 of the parcel.

Auburn-Rock Outcrop Complex (2 to 30 percent slopes) consists of Auburn soil, which is a shallow, well-drained soil formed in residuum from vertically tilted metabasic bedrock. The surface layer is strong brown silt loam about 4 inches thick. The subsoil is yellowish red silt loam. At a depth of 20 inches is weathered basic schist. The permeability is moderate, the surface runoff is medium or rapid, and the erosion hazard is slight to high. The rock outcrop consists of areas of hard metamorphic rock. Some of the outcrop is 1 to 2 feet high, and some covers up to 100 square feet. Surface runoff is very rapid and there is no erosion hazard. The major limitations of this material are rock outcrop, the depth to rock and slope.

The Henneke-Rock outcrop (5 to 50 percent slopes) is about 60 percent Henneke soil and 20 percent serpentine Rock outcrop. The Henneke soil is a shallow, well-drained soil that formed in residuum from hard serpentine rock. Typically, the surface layer is reddish brown gravelly loam about 3 inches thick. The subsoil is yellowish red very gravelly clay loam and reddish brown very gravelly clay. At a depth of about 18 inches is serpentine rock. The permeability is moderately slow, the surface runoff is medium to rapid, and the erosion hazard is high. The Rock outcrop consists of areas of hard serpentine rock ranging up to 2 acres. Surface runoff is very rapid, and there is no hazard of erosion. The major limitations of this material are rock outcrop, slope, very low fertility, and shallowness over hard rock.

The proposed project would not result in construction of new improvements. The applicant is requesting a rezone and GPA, and any proposed future improvements would be subject to additional CEQA review to reduce impacts related to soils. Therefore, impacts to soil erosion, expansive soils, soil disruptions, displacements, or expansions, and topography changes are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion Item VII-2, 8:**

The proposed project is not located in a sensitive geologic area or in an area that typically experiences soil instability. Soils on the site are capable of supporting residential structures. Any proposed future improvements would be subject to additional CEQA review to reduce impacts related to instability, including on or offsite landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. The Soil Survey does not identify significant limitation of the soil types present on the site.

The proposed project is located within Placer County. The California Department of Mines and Geology classifies the proposed project site as a low severity earthquake zone. The proposed project site is considered to have low seismic risk with respect to faulting, ground shaking, seismically related ground failure and liquefaction. There is a potential for the site to be subjected to at least moderate earthquake shaking during the useful life of any future buildings. Any future construction would be required to be constructed in compliance with the California Building Code, which includes seismic standards.

Therefore, impacts of unstable soil and geologic/seismic hazards are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion Item VII-4:**

The proposed project is a rezone and GPA which does not propose physical site development. Any future development would be served by public sewer, and would not require or result in the construction of new on-site sewage disposal systems. Therefore, there is no impact.

**Discussion Item VII-5:**

The proposed project for a Rezone and General Plan Amendment does not propose physical site development. Future projects would be required to submit a Paleontological Resources database review to determine the potential presence of paleontological resources. Therefore, there is no impact.

**VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS** – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? (PLN, Air Quality)				X
2. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? (PLN, Air Quality)				X

**Discussion Item VIII-1, 2:**

Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions of primary concern from land use projects include carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), and nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O). Construction related activities resulting in exhaust emissions may come from fuel combustion for heavy-duty diesel and gasoline-powered equipment, portable auxiliary equipment, material delivery trucks, and worker commuter trips. Operational GHG emissions would result from motor vehicle trips generated by the residents and visitors, as well as on-site fuel combustion for landscape maintenance equipment. The proposed project does not include any construction or operational uses at this time. Therefore, there is no impact.

**IX. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS** – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? (EH)			X	
2. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (EH)			X	
3. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (AQ)				X
4. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (EH)				X
5. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area? (PLN)			X	
6. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (PLN)				X
7. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires? (PLN)				X

**Discussion Item IX-1, 2:**

The proposed project for a Rezone and General Plan Amendment does not propose physical site development. The use of hazardous substances during normal construction and residential activities is expected to be limited in nature,

and would be subject to standard handling and storage requirements. Accordingly, impacts related to the release of hazardous substances are considered less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion Item IX-3:**

The proposed project for a Rezone and General Plan Amendment does not propose physical site development. The proposed project does not propose a use that involves activities that would emit hazardous substances or waste that would affect a substantial number of people. Therefore, there is no impact.

**Discussion Item IX-4:**

The proposed project for a Rezone and General Plan Amendment does not propose physical site development. The proposed project is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Therefore, there is no impact.

**Discussion Item IX-5:**

The proposed project site is approximately 0.64 mile southwest of the Auburn Municipal Airport and is located in Compatibility Zone C1 of the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. Compatibility Zone C1 covers the extended approach/departure corridor and also includes land beneath the primary traffic pattern. This zone is affected by moderate degrees of both noise and risk, and projects within the C1 Compatibility Zone require an Airport Land Use Compatibility Consistency Determination. Uses that are incompatible with this zone include uses that have the potential to disrupt flight (i.e., poles, cranes, trees, and towers exceeding 150 feet in height); uses that propose large groups of people in one space such as amphitheaters, children's schools, penal institutions, and multifamily residential; hazardous materials production and storage and heavy industrial uses; and solid waste transfer and disposal facilities. The purpose of limiting uses in the compatibility zones is to ensure that safety hazards are not created and to reduce potential conflicts between the airport and surrounding uses.

The proposed project was reviewed for consistency by the Airport Land Use Commission and was determined to be consistent on February 23, 2022. Future projects would be required to comply with the following Conditions of Approval:

- A. *The project (and subsequent entitlements) shall meet the nonresidential intensity land use criteria depicted in ALUC Table AUB-4A for "Commercial, Office, and Service Uses."*
- B. *The project (and subsequent entitlements) shall ensure that an airspace review be completed for any building proposal that exceeds seventy feet in height pursuant to ALUCP Table AUB-4A for "General Characteristics."*

Compliance with the standards of the C1 Compatibility Zone and the above conditions would ensure that future projects would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people working in a future building. Therefore, the impact is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion Item IX-6:**

The proposed project for a Rezone and General Plan Amendment does not propose physical site development. Therefore, the proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, there is no impact.

**Discussion Item IX-7:**

The proposed project for a Rezone and General Plan Amendment does not propose physical site development. The site is not within a High Fire Severity zone, and the surrounding area is not densely vegetated. Future development would be required to comply with the California Building Code including fire safe requirements such as installing sprinklers, fire-resistance-rated walls, and ensuring adequate circulation for emergency vehicle apparatus including fire engines. Future development of the site would not expose people or structures, directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. Therefore, there is no impact.



**X. HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY – Would the project:**

<b>Environmental Issue</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
1. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade ground water quality? (EH)				X
2. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin? (EH)				X
3. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would: a) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite; b) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems? (ESD)			X	
4. Create or contribute runoff water which would include substantial additional sources of polluted runoff or otherwise substantially degrade surface water quality either during construction or in the post-construction condition? (ESD)			X	
5. Place housing or improvements within a 100-year flood hazard area either as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map which would: a) impede or redirect flood flows; or b) expose people or structures to risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding c) risk release of pollutants due to project inundation? (ESD)			X	
6. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan? (EH)				X

**Discussion Item X-1:**

The proposed project for a Rezone and General Plan Amendment does not propose physical site development. This proposed project would not rely on groundwater wells as a potable water source. Potable water for this project would be treated water from Nevada Irrigation District. The proposed project would not violate water quality standards with respect to potable water. Therefore, there is no impact.

**Discussion Item X-2, 6:**

The proposed project for a Rezone and General Plan Amendment does not propose physical site development. The proposed project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge since no water wells are proposed. Because of this, there would be no impact upon groundwater supplies as a result of the proposed project. Therefore, there is no impact.

**Discussion Item X-3:**

The proposed project rezone and GPA will not result in the construction of additional improvements on the parcel, therefore the overall parcel drainage patterns will not be changed. No additional impervious surfaces will be created, therefore no downstream drainage facility or property owner will be impacted by an increase in surface runoff.

Therefore, the impacts to substantially altering the existing drainage pattern of the site, substantially increasing the

surface runoff, or exceeding the capacity of drainage systems are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion Item X-4:**

The proposed project for a Rezone and General Plan Amendment does not propose physical site development. The proposed rezone and GPA will not create additional impervious surfaces or construction that will substantially increase pollutants or significantly degrade long term surface water quality beyond the existing conditions. Therefore, the impact of substantially increasing polluted runoff or substantially degrading surface water quality is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion Item X-5:**

The proposed project for a Rezone and General Plan Amendment does not propose physical site development. The proposed project parcel is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area as defined and mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The proposed project rezone and GPA will not result in the construction of any improvements on the parcel within a local 100-year flood hazard area and no flood flows will be impeded or redirected. Therefore, there are less than significant impacts of/to flood flows and exposing people or structures to flooding risk. No mitigation measures are required.

**XI. LAND USE & PLANNING – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Physically divide an established community? (PLN)				X
2. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (EH, ESD, PLN)			X	
3. Result in the development of incompatible uses and/or the creation of land use conflicts? (PLN)				X
4. Cause economic or social changes that would result in significant adverse physical changes to the environment such as urban decay or deterioration? (PLN)				X

**Discussion Item XI-1, 3, 4:**

The proposed project would not divide an established community and would not conflict with a land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted to avoid or mitigate an environmental effect. Residential uses are located south of the proposed project site and Gold County RV Park is north of the site; however, these two areas are not connected and the RV park is not a community of permanent residents. The proposed project is a Rezone and General Plan Amendment and no physical site development is proposed. The proposed Rezone and General Plan Amendment would be from one commercial zoning and land use designation to a similar commercial zoning and land use designation. The purpose and intent of the OP zone district is “primarily for the development and operation of professional and administrative offices and personal services, rather than retail trade. New development in such areas is intended to be planned and designed so as to be relatively compatible with residential uses.” The purpose and intent of the CPD zone district “is to designate areas appropriate for mixed-use community shopping centers, office parks, and other similar developments, where excellence in site planning and building design are important objectives.” Surrounding zoning includes CPD to the west and south, OP to the east and southeast, and INP (Industrial Park) to the north. The uses in the CPD zone district are compatible with the immediate surrounding area. The proposal to Rezone the site from one commercial use to another, within an area surrounded by similar zoning, would not result in the development of incompatible uses or create land use conflicts nor would it cause economic or social changes that would result in adverse physical changes to the environment. Therefore, there is no impact.

**Discussion Item XI-2:**

The proposed project site is made up of an approximately 1.9-acre parcel proposed to be rezoned from OP-Dc-FH-AO to CPD-Dc-FH-AO, in addition to a General Plan Amendment to change the existing land use designation from Professional Office/Riparian Drainage to General Commercial/Riparian Drainage to facilitate the proposed rezone.

No improvements are proposed or required to be constructed with this GPA and rezone. The existing parcel is undeveloped with no existing improvements. Any future access will be from KOA Road, a County maintained road, which fronts the east side of the parcel. The proposed project does not significantly conflict with General Plan/Community Plan policies related to grading, drainage, and transportation. Therefore, this is a less than significant impact. No mitigation measures are required.

## XII. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. 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? (PLN)				X
2. 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? (PLN)				X

### Discussion Items XII-1, 2:

The proposed project for a Rezone and General Plan Amendment does not propose physical site development. When site development is proposed, a future project would be reviewed to determine potential impacts to mineral resources. Therefore, there is no impact.

## XIII. NOISE – Would the project result in:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (PLN)				X
2. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? (PLN)				X
3. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (PLN)			X	

### Discussion Items XIII-1, 2:

The proposed project is a Rezone and General Plan Amendment and no physical site development is proposed. Future projects would be required to comply with the Placer County Noise Ordinance, and may be required to prepare a Noise Study/Acoustical Analysis to determine if a project would result in noise impacts and identify appropriate mitigation measures if a project would result in a noise impact. Therefore, there is no impact.

### Discussion Item XIII-3:

The Auburn Municipal Airport is located approximately 0.64 mile northeast of the project site. As noted above in the Hazards and Hazardous Materials section, the proposed Rezone and General Plan Amendment were reviewed by the Airport Land Use Commission for consistency and identified two Conditions of Approval that would ensure future projects are not exposed to excessive noise levels. Therefore, the impact is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

**XIV. POPULATION & HOUSING** – Would the project:

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

**Discussion Item XIV-1:**

The proposed Rezone and General Plan Amendment would not induce population growth either directly or indirectly as the project is proposing to change the zoning and land use designation from one commercial land use to another. The surrounding area is developed with residential and commercial uses. Future development of the site would be reviewed to determine if roads or other infrastructure, including sewer and water, would be required to be extended or upgraded to serve the site. Therefore, there is no impact.

**Discussion Item XIV-2:**

The proposed project would not displace any existing housing. The proposed Rezone to CPD would provide increased opportunity for implementation of residential uses than are currently allowed in the OP zone district, as the CPD zone district allows for multifamily uses including duplexes, triplexes, and apartments, as well as senior housing projects and emergency shelters. As the site is within an Aircraft Overflight zone, all residential proposals would be reviewed by the Placer County Transportation Authority and may limit residential densities to ensure compliance with the C1 Compatibility District. Therefore, there is no impact.

**XV. PUBLIC SERVICES** – 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 construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services?

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

**Discussion Item XV-1:**

The Placer County Fire Department provides fire protection services to the proposed project area. The servicing fire district has reviewed the proposed project. The proposed project does not generate the need for new, significant, fire protection facilities as a part of this proposed project. Therefore, this impact is less than significant. No mitigation

measures are required.

**Discussion Item XV-2, 3, 5:**

The Placer County Sheriff's Department provides police protection services to the proposed project area and the proposed project is within Placer Union High School District and Colfax Elementary School District. The proposed project would not increase the number of residents in the proposed project area. Therefore, the proposed project would not create a significant increase in the need for Sheriff protection facilities, schools, parks, or other public facilities. Therefore, these impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion Item XV- 4:**

The proposed project does not include physical site development. Future projects would be reviewed to determine if existing services are adequate, and would pay into programs regulated by ordinance (such as the countywide traffic fee program) that are integrated into the commercial Building Permit process. Therefore, there is no impact.

**Discussion Item XV-6:**

The Placer County Department of Public Works is responsible for maintaining County roads that access the parcel. The proposed rezone and GPA would result in similar impacts on the maintenance of public roads as was anticipated with the development of the original Zoning of the parcel. Therefore, this impact is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

**XVI. RECREATION:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? (PLN)				X
2. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? (PLN)				X

**Discussion Items XVI-1, 2:**

The proposed project does not include physical site development including residential development. If residential uses are proposed in the future, they would be reviewed to determine if potential impacts to recreational facilities would occur. Therefore, there is no impact.

**XVII. TRANSPORTATION – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy, except LOS (Level of Service) addressing the circulation system (i.e., transit, roadway, bicycle, pedestrian facilities, etc.)? (ESD)			X	
2. Substantially increase hazards to vehicle safety due to geometric design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (ESD)			X	
3. Result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses? (ESD)			X	

4. Result in insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site? (ESD, PLN)			X	
5. Would the project result in VMT (Vehicle Miles Traveled) which exceeds an applicable threshold of significance, except as provided in CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)? (PLN)				X

**Discussion Item XVII-1:**

The proposed project would not significantly conflict with any existing policies or preclude anticipated future policies, plans, or programs supporting the circulation system. The proposed rezone and GPA does not significantly impact the construction of bus turnouts, bicycle racks, planned roadway, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, etc.

Therefore, this impact is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion Item XVII-2:**

No new traffic will be generated as a result of the rezone or GPA, therefore, no driveway or circulation improvements are proposed. Impacts of vehicle safety is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion Item XVII-3:**

The servicing fire district has reviewed the proposed project and has not identified any significant impacts to emergency access. The proposed project does not significantly impact the access to any nearby use. Therefore, this is a less than significant impact. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion Item XVII-4:**

The proposed rezone and GPA is not proposing or required to provide any parking. Any future proposed project would provide on-site parking spaces in accordance with the Placer County Zoning Ordinance to the satisfaction of Placer County parking requirements. Therefore, this is a less than significant impact. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion Item XVII-5:**

Future site development would be required to provide adequate parking required for the land use as described in Placer County Zoning Ordinance Section 17.54.060: Parking space requirements by land use. Future site development would also be required to determine if a potential project would exceed applicable thresholds of significance for VMT. Therefore, there is no impact.

**XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES** – Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or (PLN)			X	
2. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe. (PLN)		X		

The United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC) is a federally recognized Tribe comprised of both Miwok and Maidu (Nisenan) Indians and are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the proposed project area. The Tribe possess the

expertise concerning tribal cultural resources in the area and are contemporary stewards of their culture and the landscape. The Tribal community represents a continuity and endurance of their ancestors by maintaining their connection to their history and culture. It is the Tribe's goal to ensure the preservation and continuance of their cultural heritage for current and future generations.

**Discussion Item XVIII-1, 2:**

The identification of Tribal Cultural Resources (TCR) for this proposed project by UAIC included a review of pertinent literature and historic maps, and a records search using UAIC's Tribal Historic Information System (THRIS). UAIC's THRIS database is composed of UAIC's areas of oral history, ethnographic history, and places of cultural and religious significance, including UAIC Sacred Lands that are submitted to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The THRIS resources shown in this region also include previously recorded indigenous resources identified through the CHRIS North Central Information Center (NCIC) as well as historic resources and survey data.

On February 10, 2022, the UAIC determined no TCRs were identified and the site would have a low potential for cultural sensitivity. However, as ground disturbance can result in inadvertent resource discovery, future projects would be required to comply with the standard UAIC mitigation measure for Unanticipated Discoveries.

**Mitigation Measures Item XVIII-1, 2:**

MM XVIII.1

If potential tribal cultural resources (TCRs), archaeological resources, other cultural resources, articulated, or disarticulated human remains are discovered during construction activities, all work shall cease within 100 feet of the find (based on the apparent distribution of cultural resources). Examples of potential cultural materials include midden soil, artifacts, chipped stone, exotic (non-native) rock, or unusual amounts of baked clay, shell, or bone.

A qualified cultural resources specialist and Native American Representative from the traditionally and culturally affiliated Native American Tribe(s) will assess the significance of the find and make recommendations for further evaluation and treatment as necessary. Culturally appropriate treatment that preserves or restores the cultural character and integrity of a Tribal Cultural Resource may be, but is not limited to, processing materials for reburial, minimizing handling of cultural objects, leaving objects in place within the landscape, construction monitoring of further construction activities by Tribal representatives of the traditionally and culturally affiliated Native American Tribe, and/or returning objects to a location within the project area where they will not be subject to future impacts. The United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC) does not consider curation of TCRs to be appropriate or respectful and requests that materials not be permanently curated, unless specifically requested by the Tribe.

If articulated or disarticulated human remains are discovered during construction activities, the County Coroner and Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted immediately. Upon determination by the County Coroner that the find is Native American in origin, the Native American Heritage Commission will assign the Most Likely Descendant(s) who will work with the project proponent to define appropriate treatment and disposition of the burials.

Following a review of the find and consultation with appropriate experts, the authority to proceed may be accompanied by the addition of development requirements which provide for protection of the site and/or additional measures necessary to address the unique or sensitive nature of the site. The treatment recommendations made by the cultural resource specialist and the Native American Representative will be documented in the project record. Any recommendations made by these experts that are not implemented, must be documented and explained in the project record. Work in the area(s) of the cultural resource discovery may only proceed after authorization is granted by the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency following coordination with cultural resources experts and tribal representatives as appropriate.

**XIX. UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects? (EH, ESD, PLN)			X	

2. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years? (EH)			X	
3. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which 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? (EH, ESD)			X	
4. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals? (EH)			X	
5. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (EH)			X	

**Discussion Item XIX-1:**

Storm water will continue to be conveyed through the property along the existing runoff patterns. The overall drainage patterns will not be changed.

The proposed project does not require any relocation or construction of electric, gas, or telecommunication facilities that would cause significant environmental effects.

No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion Item XIX-2, 3:**

The proposed project would not result in the construction of new treatment facilities or create an expansion of an existing facility. Typical project conditions of approval for any future proposed project will require submission of "will-serve" letters from each agency. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion Item XIX-4, 5:**

The proposed project would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the proposed project's solid waste disposal needs. No mitigation measures are required.

**XX. WILDFIRE** – If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (PLN)				X
2. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire? (PLN)				X
3. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) the construction or operation of which may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment? (PLN)				X
4. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding, mudslides, or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes? (PLN)				X



**Discussion Item XX-1, 2, 3, 4:**

The proposed project for a Rezone and General Plan Amendment does not propose physical site development. The site is within a Low Responsibility Area and future development would be reviewed by the serving fire district to determine potential requirements. The immediate surrounding area is not within a High Fire Severity zone. All future buildings would be required to comply with the California Building Code and California Fire Code for commercial development. The site is not within an area of significant inherent risk of flooding, mudslides, or landslide. Therefore, there is no impact.

**F. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:**

Environmental Issue	Yes	No
1. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**G. OTHER RESPONSIBLE AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES** whose approval is required:


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

**H. DETERMINATION** – The Environmental Review Committee finds that:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A <b>MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION</b> will be prepared.
-------------------------------------	---

**I. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE** (Persons/Departments consulted):

Planning Services Division, Kally Keding-Cecil, Chairperson  
 Planning Services Division-Air Quality, Angel Green  
 Engineering and Surveying Division, Candace Bartlett  
 Department of Public Works-Transportation, Katie Jackson  
 DPW-Environmental Engineering Division, Sarah Gillmore, P.E.  
 Flood Control and Water Conservation District, Katie Conkle  
 DPW- Parks Division, Ted Rel  
 HHS-Environmental Health Services, Danielle Pohlman  
 Placer County Fire Planning/CDF, Jeff Hoag and/or Dave Bookout

Signature  Date 04/11/22  
 Leigh Chavez, Environmental Coordinator

**J. SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:** The following public documents were utilized and site-specific studies prepared to evaluate in detail the effects or impacts associated with the project. This information is available for public review, Monday through Friday, 8am to 5pm, at the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, Environmental Coordination Services, 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603.

<b>County Documents</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Pollution Control District Rules & Regulations	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community Plan	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environmental Review Ordinance	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Plan	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grading Ordinance	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Development Manual	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Division Ordinance	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stormwater Management Manual	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tree Ordinance	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Trustee Agency Documents</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Department of Toxic Substances Control	
<b>Site-Specific Studies</b>	Planning Services Division	<input type="checkbox"/> Biological Study
		<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources Pedestrian Survey
		<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources Records Search
		<input type="checkbox"/> Lighting & Photometric Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Paleontological Survey
		<input type="checkbox"/> Tree Survey & Arborist Report
		<input type="checkbox"/> Visual Impact Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Wetland Delineation
		<input type="checkbox"/> Acoustical Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/>
	Engineering & Surveying Division, Flood Control District	<input type="checkbox"/> Phasing Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Grading Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Geotechnical Report
		<input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Drainage Report
		<input type="checkbox"/> Stormwater & Surface Water Quality BMP Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> West or East Placer Storm Water Quality Design Manual
		<input type="checkbox"/> Traffic Study
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sewer Pipeline Capacity Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Placer County Commercial/Industrial Waste Survey (where public sewer is available)
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sewer Master Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Utility Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Tentative Map
		<input type="checkbox"/>
	Environmental Health Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Contamination Report
		<input type="checkbox"/> Hydro-Geological Study
		<input type="checkbox"/> Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
		<input type="checkbox"/> Soils Screening
		<input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Endangerment Assessment

		<input type="checkbox"/>
	Planning Services Division, Air Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> CALINE4 Carbon Monoxide Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Construction Emission & Dust Control Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Geotechnical Report (for naturally occurring asbestos)
		<input type="checkbox"/> Health Risk Assessment
		<input type="checkbox"/> CalEEMod Model Output
		<input type="checkbox"/>
	Fire Department	<input type="checkbox"/> Emergency Response and/or Evacuation Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Traffic & Circulation Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/>

Exhibit A: Mitigation Monitoring Program

# EXHIBIT A

## **MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM Mitigated Negative Declaration – PLN21-00489 Auburn Equipment Company, LLC Rezone and GPA**

Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code requires all public agencies to establish monitoring or reporting procedures for mitigation measures adopted as a condition of project approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment. Monitoring of such mitigation measures may extend through project permitting, construction, and project operations, as necessary.

Said monitoring shall be accomplished by the county's standard mitigation monitoring program and/or a project specific mitigation reporting program as defined in Placer County Code Chapter 18.28, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

### **Standard Mitigation Monitoring Program (pre-project implementation):**

The following mitigation monitoring program (and following project specific reporting plan, when required) shall be utilized by Placer County to implement Public Resources Code Section 21081.6. Mitigation measures adopted for discretionary projects must be included as conditions of approval for that project. Compliance with conditions of approval is monitored by the county through a variety of permit processes as described below. The issuance of any of these permits or County actions which must be preceded by a verification that certain conditions of approval/mitigation measures have been met, shall serve as the required monitoring of those condition of approval/mitigation measures. These actions include design review approval, improvement plan approval, improvement construction inspection, encroachment permit, recordation of a final map, acceptance of subdivision improvements as complete, building permit approval, and/or certification of occupancy.

The following mitigation measures, identified in the Auburn Equipment Company, LLC Rezone and GPA Negative Declaration, have been adopted as conditions of approval on the project's discretionary permit and will be monitored according to the above Standard Mitigation Monitoring Program verification process:

<b>Mitigation #</b>	<b>Text</b>	<b>Date Satisfied</b>
<u>MM XVIII.1</u>	<p>If potential tribal cultural resources (TCRs), archaeological resources, other cultural resources, articulated, or disarticulated human remains are discovered during construction activities, all work shall cease within 100 feet of the find (based on the apparent distribution of cultural resources). Examples of potential cultural materials include midden soil, artifacts, chipped stone, exotic (non-native) rock, or unusual amounts of baked clay, shell, or bone.</p> <p>A qualified cultural resources specialist and Native American Representative from the traditionally and culturally affiliated Native American Tribe(s) will assess the significance of the find and make recommendations for further evaluation and treatment as necessary. Culturally appropriate treatment that preserves or restores the cultural character and integrity of a Tribal Cultural Resource may be, but is not limited to, processing materials for reburial, minimizing handling of cultural objects, leaving objects in place within the landscape, construction monitoring of further construction activities by Tribal representatives of the traditionally and culturally affiliated Native American Tribe, and/or returning</p>	

## EXHIBIT A

	<p>objects to a location within the project area where they will not be subject to future impacts. The United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC) does not consider curation of TCRs to be appropriate or respectful and requests that materials not be permanently curated, unless specifically requested by the Tribe.</p> <p>If articulated or disarticulated human remains are discovered during construction activities, the County Coroner and Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted immediately. Upon determination by the County Coroner that the find is Native American in origin, the Native American Heritage Commission will assign the Most Likely Descendant(s) who will work with the project proponent to define appropriate treatment and disposition of the burials.</p> <p>Following a review of the find and consultation with appropriate experts, the authority to proceed may be accompanied by the addition of development requirements which provide for protection of the site and/or additional measures necessary to address the unique or sensitive nature of the site. The treatment recommendations made by the cultural resource specialist and the Native American Representative will be documented in the project record. Any recommendations made by these experts that are not implemented, must be documented and explained in the project record. Work in the area(s) of the cultural resource discovery may only proceed after authorization is granted by the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency following coordination with cultural resources experts and tribal representatives as appropriate.</p>	
--	---	--

### **Project-Specific Reporting Plan (post-project implementation):**

The reporting plan component is intended to provide for on-going monitoring after project construction to ensure mitigation measures shall remain effective for a designated period of time. Said reporting plans shall contain all components identified in Chapter 18.28.050 of the County Code, Environmental Review Ordinance – “Contents of Project-Specific Reporting Plan.”