12. PUBLIC FACILITIES / SERVICES

Introduction

This section of the EIR evaluates the impacts that can be expected to public facility providers with implementation of the Plan.

Each of the public facilities and services which will be needed in the Plan area is discussed separately below. Impacts are evaluated using a worst case analysis at maximum densities at buildout allowed by the Plan. A second discussion is given where appropriate, utilizing the actual percentage buildout which may occur within the 20 year life of the Plan based on the economic study prepared for the Plan by Recht Hausrath & Associates.

IMPACT EVALUATION CRITERIA

The following impact evaluation criteria are used throughout this section unless otherwise noted.

Significant Cumulative Impacts

Impacts as a result of Plan buildout are cumulative in nature. An overall cumulative impact results when buildout of the Plan will seriously affect the providing agency's ability to serve the entire community. In the past, increased tax revenues and development fees which could be expected from new development have averted cumulative impacts. However, when these standard fees are not expected to provide for increased needs or when the providing agency is already operating at or above capacity, cumulative impacts can be considered significantly adverse. Buildout of the Plan area will make up part of a cumulative significant impact when it will contribute an adverse cumulative need expected in the future <u>or</u> if it will be contributing to an unmet need which <u>already</u> exists.

Effectiveness of Mitigation

The ability to mitigate an impact to a public facility or agency is largely dependent on whether or not it can be reasonably assured that the improvement to the public facility will take place. In some cases, improvements can be required of individual developers on a case-by-case basis.

However, in general, whether or not the impact can be mitigated is largely dependant on the ability to collect fees toward the eventual improvement. There are generally two options:

1. Developers can fund facility development upfront and be reimbursed by future development, or

2. A cumulative mitigation fee can be established.

In many cases, option #1 is infeasible because of high costs. Under option #2, mitigation can only be assured in the context of an EIR if:

1) The fee is already in place;

2) The fee can reasonably be assured to be adopted in the near future and in time for adequate fees to be collected before the facility is needed.

3) Another financing mechanism can reasonably be assured.

In situations where the fee cannot reasonably be expected to be adopted or the facility cannot reasonably be expected to be constructed in the near future, impacts must be considered unmitigable.

SCHOOLS

Introduction

The following section is based primarily on a report prepared by Jim Bush, Director of Facility Planning of the Placer County Office of Education for the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan.

Setting

Schools are provided in the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan area through three elementary districts, one high school district and one community college district.

The following table outlines the total number of schools in each district and the number of schools within each district that are physically located in the Plan area.

Table 104
SCHOOL FACILITIES IN AUBURN/BOWMAN COMMUNITY PLAN AREA

District	Total School Facilities	No. of School Facilities in Plan Area
Ackerman (K-8) Elementary School Dist.	1	1
Auburn (K-8) Union School Dist.	4	4
Placer Hills (K-8) Union School Dist.	2	0
Placer (9-12) Union High School Dist.	4	2
Sierra Community College Dist.	3	0

SOURCE: Placer County Office of Education

The following is a summary of each school district which serves the Auburn/ Bowman area:

Auburn Union School District

All of this district's existing four schools serve the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan area. Three of these schools are physically located within Auburn city limits. Over half of the district students are generated from housing in the city limits of Auburn. In the last six years, enrollment in the Auburn Union School District has grown from 2079 (1985) to 2486 (1991), a 27% increase.

TABLE 105
AUBURN UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT CAPACITY

School	State Capacity	District Capacity	1991 Enrollment	% State Capacity	% District Capacity
Alta Vista (K-5)	394	394	507	128	128
Skyridge (K-5)	220	195	618	280	317
Rock Creek (K-5)	789	690	864	110	125
E.V. Cain (6-8)	604	562	929	154	165
TOTAL	2,007	1,842	2,918	145%	158%

Note: Does not include non-state approved trailers

Table 106
AUBURN UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT CLASSROOMS

School	Permanent* Classrooms	Relocatable Capacity	Trailer Classrooms	State Emergency Portables	TOTAL
Alta Vista (K-5)	10	2	2	4	18
Skyridge (K-5)	0	6	25	0	21
Rock Creek (K-5)	23	0	2	11	36
E.V. Cain (6-8)	17	3	1	10	31
TOTAL	50	11	20	25	106

SOURCE: Bush, Placer County Office of Education.

Funding. The District currently collects State developer fees at $1.00/sq.ft. for new residential construction and $.16/sq.ft for commercial construction. The District has adopted a facility financing program through the creation of a Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD) that includes conditioning all future projects to join the District's CFD. The program calls for the CFD financing 70% of the facility costs for all future projects which need a subdivision map, parcel map or specific plan approval. (The remainder is expected to come from State funds.)

Ackerman Elementary School District

The District serves the Bowman area with one K-8 school. The school is located on Bowman Road next to Interstate 80. The District currently has an enrollment of 348. It is projected that the District will grow to over 500 students in the next ten years.

Table 107
ACKERMAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT CAPACITY

School	Capacity	Enrollment	% of Capacity
Ackerman (K-8)	283 (septic limit)	348	124%

Table 108
ACKERMAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT CLASSROOMS

School	Permanent Classrooms	Relocatable Classrooms	Trailers Classrooms	State Emergency Potables	Total
Ackerman	9	5*	1	0	15

* This includes one double-wide trailer owned by the County.

Funding. The District currently collects only the State allowed mitigation fee of $1.00/sq.ft. of residential development .16/sq.ft. of commercial development. No bonds or overrides are in place.

Placer Hills Union School District.

The Placer Hills Union School District occupies a portion of the Auburn/ Bowman Community Plan in the Christian Valley area. However, the district includes the communities of Applegate, Eden Valley, Heather Glen, Meadow Vista and Weimar.

There are two schools serving the K-8 needs of the District; they are Placer Hills School located on Placer Hills Road (K-4) in Meadow Vista, and Weimar Hills School (5-8), located on Weimar Crossroads in Weimar. Over the past five years enrollment in the District has increased from 1257 (1986) to 1585 (1992) and is operating at above capacity. This represents an increase of 328 students or 21% over the five year period.

Table 109
PLACER HILLS UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT CAPACITY

School	Capacity	Enrollment	% of Capacity
Placer Hills (K-5)	612	882	144%
Weimar Hills (5-8)	561	703	125%
DISTRICT	1,173	1,585	135%

Table 110
PLACER HILLS UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT CLASSROOMS

School	Permanent* Classrooms	Relocatable Classrooms	Trailer Classrooms	State Emergency Potables	TOTAL
Placer Hills (K-5)	19	12	0	7	38
Weimar Hills (5-8)	19	7	0	0	26
TOTAL	38	19	0	7	64

NOTE: All relocatable and trailer classrooms are leased and not owned by the District.
* 59% Permanent Classrooms

Funding. The District currently collects State developer fees at $1.00/sq. ft. for new residential construction and $.16/sq.ft. for commercial construction. The District has adopted an alternative financing program which will require all future residential projects to pay a $6,763 mitigation fee. It is estimated that only 50% of the projected dwelling units in the District will fall under the District's financing program; the remaining 50% will pay the standard State allowed fee.

The Placer Union High School District.

The Placer Union High School District serves a number of communities from Loomis to Colfax. In the Plan area, Placer High School provides for grade 9-12 students. In addition, Chana Continuation High School is located in the Plan area. The table below outlines each school in the District.

Table 111
PLACER UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT ENROLLMENT

School	State Capacity	Enrollment	% of Capacity
Placer High School	1380	1428	The District's overall capacity is currently about 3650 which means the District is currently operating at 97% capacity. Placer H.S. is operating near 100% capacity
Del Oro High School	1084	1308	
Colfax High School	626	769	
Chana High School	105	302	
Total	**3205**	**3807**	

Funding. In March of 1992, the Placer Union High School District implemented the district-wide use of a "Mutual Benefit School Impact Fee Agreement" to address development impacts and the need for future school facilities. This agreement between the developer and the school district, will need to be signed and recorded prior to project approval (recordation of final map).

The 1992-1993 Mutual Benefit Agreement fee structure is as follows:

Single Family Unit	$3,592.00/SF unit
Duplex Unit	$2,671.00/unit
Multi-Family Unit	$ 677.00/unit

These fees are subject to an annual inflation increase effective July 1st of each year and are based on the Consumer Price Index, three month average for March, April and May of each year.

Sierra Community College District

Sierra College moved from Auburn to Rocklin in 1961. At that time there were 1293 students, 260 of them attended in the evening. Rapid population growth and business-industrial expansion have had their impact on the college's enrollment, mission and programs. The college has grown from the 1300 students at the Rocklin campus in 1961 to 13,800 students in 1990, of which 5400 were taking evening courses. On a statewide average 5.5% of all adults attend community college. In the Auburn area there are currently 2100 students registered, representing about 13% of the total enrollment.

No formal campus sites are planned within the Auburn/Bowman Plan area. However outreach programs are intended for the area and could have some land use implications. For example, expansion of contract education with local employers is planned.

The District also plans to offer more of its courses, programs and services in designated community learning centers. The District envisions these community learning centers as joint-use facilities to be used by the college, businesses, cities and community at large for a variety of purposes. These facilities are expected to be more cost effective because of multiple use while meeting students' needs closer to their homes and work. Cable television courses and other means of instruction could be provided in these community extension centers by Sierra College, CSU Sacramento, UC Davis and other educational providers. Conceivably students could earn a variety of degrees without having to leave their community.

Projected Enrollment. According to District Facility Planner Dr. Don Brophy, the District is expected to grow at a 5% growth rate. Dr. Brophy does not expect the District to maintain its historical 6-7% growth rate due primarily to the state of the economy.

Funding. The State of California provides funding to the community college districts from the general fund. The amount of funding is based on a complex formula calculated from average daily attendance (ADA). Some local funding is also provided but this represents a minor funding source only.

District Issues. The primary district issues are related to enrollment and funding.

Impacts

INCREASED NEED FOR SCHOOL FACILITIES

Impacts and issues facing each school district as a result of growth in the Plan are described below including a discussion of how the Plan attempts to address the issues.

1. Auburn Union School District

a. **New schools needed.** Within the Auburn Union School District K-8 enrollment is expected to grow from 2846 students currently (1992) to 4871 students, 58% within the next ten years. The District estimates this growth will result in approximately 1500 new K-5 students and 525 6-8 grade students. Based on these enrollment projections, the District has estimated that three to four new elementary schools (K-5) and two new middle schools (6-8) will need to be located throughout the District within the next ten years to house these new students.

The District has indicated that two of the new school sites needed at District buildout should be located in the north Auburn area and one elementary school and one middle school needs to be located in the south area. The updated Plan identifies five potential school sites in the north Auburn area. Two school sites are shown in the southern area. According to District Facility Planner Jim Bush, these sites are adequate to meet the ultimate needs of the Plan area at buildout. Mr Bush has indicated that these locations are conceptual with their exact location to be determined later on a site-specific basis as development is proposed and as the District works on site acquisition. However, only minor adjustments are expected in their location.

Conclusion: Based on the impact evaluation criteria and analysis above adequate school sites have been identified to meet the Auburn Union School District need at the ultimate buildout of the Plan area. However, they are designated as "floating school sites" because exact locations have not been determined due in part to the need for State approval. However, Placer County Office of Education facility Planner Jim Bush feels that the fact that these schools are shown on the Land Use Map combined with the District's State site approval work and policies contained in the County-wide General Plan currently being prepared should provide adequate assurance that sites will be reserved. These policies are expected to reasonably assure that adequate school sites are available; as a result, impacts are expected to be less than significant.

b. **Southern area school needed.** The South Auburn Annexation currently being processed by the City cannot support a needed school site because of the topography in the area and the location of the railroad tracks. (The State requires a 1000 foot setback from railroad tracks.) The District will be unable to serve this area if a satisfactory K-5 school site in south Auburn is not found.

However, the Plan designates two schools in the southern Plan area (which includes the south Auburn Annexation area) which will serve County residents and newly annexed City residents. Both sites are well outside the 1000-foot railroad noise setback. Site acquisition assurance is discussed under Impact 1a. and have been approved by the Placer County Board of Education through an initial site acquisition analysis performed by Facility Planner Jim Bush.

Conclusion: Based on the impact evaluation criteria and analysis above, impacts related to availability of school sites in the southern Plan area are expected to be less than significant.

c. **Airport setback required for schools.** The airport poses serious problems to the District in locating school sites. The State has a two-mile setback requirement from the airport runway to any new school site. Finding suitable sites outside the two-mile radius is very difficult. However, all of the floating school sites shown on the Land Use Plan are at least two miles from the airport runway. A setback variance can be obtained from the State (the Ackerman District has obtained a variance for its new site based in part on size constraints of the District). Jim Bush indicated that obtaining a variance to the two mile setback is a rarity and is not expected to be obtainable for any of the other districts. This is due primarily to the availability of land outside the two-mile setback within the other districts.

Conclusion: Based on the impact evaluation criteria and analysis above, potential impacts are expected to be less than significant due to the availability of sites outside the two-mile setback.

d. **Facility financing.** The District has established a financing program to mitigate the potentially significant impacts that new growth could entail. The program consists of the following:

- Provides for the establishment of a Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD). All future projects would be conditioned to join the CFD.
- The financing plan would provide the following options:
  - a) Yearly tax only/no fees ($663/yr-no fee)
  - b) Split fee/tax ($2,334 fee - $279/year tax)
  - c) Fee only/no tax ($6,365 fee-no tax)
- Provides enough local funding (70%) for portable school costs.

- The District would vigorously pursue all possibilities from the State School Building Program. If funded, the District will reduce the tax burden in the CFD.
- The District will seek to enhance the chances of receiving State funding by taking steps to increase the priority level of funding such as implementation of year-round school.
- The plan includes an escalation of costs to meet future facility costs.

The current District financing plan requires participation from only projects which need a subdivision map, parcel map or specific plan approval. Infill projects or projects which do not require discretionary approval would only have to pay State allowed developer impact fees at the time of building permit issuance. According to Facility Planner Jim Bush, failure to require this type of development to participate in the adopted financing plan is having a substantial impact on the District due to the inadequacies of the State-imposed development fees and the relatively large number of projects exempt from the District's financing plan. However, the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan ensures that new developments regardless of their size, will participate in district funding mechanisms through Implementation of Policy #15 that requires the County to make new developments obtain will serve letters from the affected Districts. Will serve letters will only be issued if a project meets District financing provisions. In addition, school facility and financing policies contained in the County-wide General Plan currently being prepared will also ensure all projects participate in the District's funding mechanism.

Table 112
AUBURN/BOWMAN COMMUNITY PLAN
SCHOOL FUNDING RELATED POLICIES

Policy	
15.	School districts shall have primary responsibility for ensuring that school facilities exist, or will assist in a timely manner to accommodate projected student populations of new residential development projects in compliance with established service level standards. The County will assist the school districts by requiring will-serve letters from affected school districts for each new residential land use project.

Conclusion: Based on the impact evaluation criteria and analysis above, it is expected that the policies contained in the A/BCP and County-wide General Plan will ensure that financing mechanisms adopted to avoid significant impacts to school districts will be implemented. Impacts are expected to be less than significant.

2. Ackerman School District

a. **New school needed.** According to District Superintendent David Westsmith, the Bowman School's enrollment exceeds the physical capacity of the existing school site and new portable classrooms cannot be added without sacrificing a diminishing amount of playground area. In addition, Mr. Westsmith indicated that the sewage disposal capacity problems facing the District limits the number of new students the school can ultimately house. As a result, the District has obtained a lease/purchase option on a new 15-acre school site.

Previously, it was assumed that growth in the District would reach 662 students in the next 10 years (2002). However, buildout of the District based on the updated land use designations could substantially increase the potential number of residential units (400-1100) within the District resulting in approximately 500 additional students at buildout of the Plan area. The new site could accommodate these additional students according to Mr. Westsmith, though a larger facility would be needed. At this time, construction of the new school (and final purchase of the site) is not assured. The District is looking for ways of abandoning their existing school site to develop the new 15-acre site.

It should be noted the County has designated the existing school site and surrounding parcels as mixed use for the primary purpose of encouraging relocation of the Bowman School. The mixed use designations will be implemented through the preparation of a Specific Plan for this area. . According to Mr. Westsmith, implementation of the mixed use land use designations and/or the Specific Plan should be preceded by establishment of a school financing plan to allow funding of the new Bowman School. This would likely result from implementation of the following A/BCP policies and policies contained in the Draft Placer County-wide General Plan currently being prepared.

Table 113
AUBURN/BOWMAN COMMUNITY PLAN
SCHOOL FINANCING PLAN RELATED POLICIES

Policy	
(13)	The county and the school districts will work closely together to explore all possibilities for securing adequate school facilities. Local resources available to school districts may include private dedication of land for school sites, developer fees, development agreements, Mello-Roos CFDs, assessment districts, redevelopment funds, general obligation bond proceeds and special taxes, etc.

(14) The county shall support state legislative efforts to secure additional state funding for school construction and ensure maintenance of local district priorities for funds in the state school bond program.

(15) School districts shall have primary responsibility for ensuring that school facilities exist, or will exist in a timely manner, to accommodate projected student populations of new residential development projects in compliance with established service level standards. The County will assist the school districts by requiring will serve letters from affected schools for each new residential land use project.

The District expects that sale of the existing school site could provide 50% of the financing needed for purchase and construction of the new school site because of the increased value of the land under its new land use designation. However, until then, the District will be impacted. The Plan's school Policy 15 should be amended to prohibit issuance of building permits. Residential rezones, general plan and community plan amendments, specific plans, or other land use entitlement requests shall not be approved unless accompanied by a finding that school facilities to accommodate projected students consistent with service level standards will be available in a timely manner to serve the project or that the project includes phasing conditions to ensure coordination of residential construction and school construction consistent with policy.

Conclusion: Based on the impact evaluation criteria and analysis above, impacts on school facilities are expected to be significant and unmitigable in the short-term until a financing plan can be prepared and the school site can be sold.

b. **Proximity to Airport.** The State required two-mile setback from airport runways precludes much of the District from location of a school site. However, the State has granted the District a variance from this requirement and has approved the location for their new school.

Conclusion: Based upon the impact evaluation criteria and analysis above, it appears that the District will be exempt from the two-mile setback requirement and therefore impacts are expected to be less than significant.

3. **Placer Hills Union School District**

a. **One new school needed.** The Placer Hills Union School District occupies a relatively small portion of the Plan area in Christian Valley. The District's two schools are operating at 135% of capacity using State standards and 149% of capacity under District standards. The District is using nineteen portable classrooms at the two schools to alleviate the existing overcrowding conditions.

To alleviate these conditions, the District has begun construction on a new K-2 school in Meadow Vista adjacent to the community park. However, an additional new school will be needed to serve the Christian Valley area, the proposed Winchester subdivision, and ultimate buildout of the Plan area per the following projected enrollments which would result in an additional 1,100 students between 1991 and 2001.

Table 114
PLACER HILLS UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
PROJECTED ENROLLMENT

	K-4	5-8	Total
1990/91	831	684	1515
2000/2001	1438	1177	2615

SOURCE: Jim Bush, Placer County Office of Education.

Since the new Plan does not significantly change the land use density potential in this area, implementation of the Plan is not expected to result in any impacts to schools not previously envisioned. Both new school sites needed for buildout of the Plan within the District are shown on the Land Use map. Reservation/acquisition of these sites is reasonably assured because of A/BCP Plan policies and school related policies contained in the Draft County-wide Genera Plan currently being prepared (see discussion under Impact 1a).

Conclusion: Adequate school sites are shown on the Land Use plan to serve this district and acquisition can be reasonably assured. As a result, impacts are considered less than significant.

b. **Facility Funding.** The Placer Hills Union School District currently collects State allowed developer fees for new residential and commercial construction. The District has also adopted an alternative financing program which will require anticipation of all future projects. The cost to provide student facilities per single-family home built in the District, including land, buildings and buses equals $6,763. This fee will be assessed against all future residential projects requiring discretionary approval and therefore fails to address infill projects and projects that do not require discretionary approval.

The Auburn/Bowman Community Plan school Policy 15 calling for the County to require new projects regardless of their size to obtain will serve letters from School Districts will ensure that these future developments participate in a District's adopted financing plan.

Conclusion: Based on the impact evaluation criteria and discussion above facility funding impacts are expected to be less than significant.

c. **Proximity to Airport.** The State-imposed two-mile setback from the Auburn Airport does encroach into the District's boundaries. However, the proposed school site located on the Land Use Map is outside the setback.

Conclusion: Based on the impact evaluation criteria and discussion above, impacts are expected to be less than significant.

d. **Septic system problems.** The septic systems at Placer Hills K-2 and Weimar Hills have affected capacity of these schools in the past. However, septic system improvements have been made at both sites and is no longer a central issue.

Conclusion: Based on the impact evaluation criteria and discussion above septic system impacts are expected to be less than significant.

4. Placer Union High School District

a. **Two new schools needed.** Placer High School is at capacity and there is no room for expansion. The site is 19.3 acres in size. The State currently requires approximately 40 acres for similarly sized schools. The Chana High School site (which is over 40 acres in size) was intended to be the next comprehensive high school site, but due to the two-mile airport setback it will have to be abandoned.

Based on the following projected enrollment and buildout of the Plan area, a new high school and a new continuation high School are needed. These sites are designated conceptually with their exact location to be determined later on a site-specific basis. However, Mr. Bush indicated that only minor adjustments to their exact location are anticipated. Implementation of policies contained in the A/BCP and the Draft County-wide General Plan (currently being prepared) should reasonably assure that these school sites will be reserved. (See discussion under Impact 1a).

Table 115
PLACER UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT PROJECTED ENROLLMENT

Year	Enrollment
1996/1997	4084
2001/2002	5559
2006/2007	7375

It is projected that the District will grow at about 3% per year. This would result in an enrollment of 5559 by the Year 2002, a 58% increase over 10 years.

Conclusion: Based on the impact evaluation criteria and discussion above, impacts resulting from the need for two new schools are expected to be less than significant.

b. **Facility Funding.** In March of 1992, the Placer Union High School District implemented the district-wide use of a "Mutual Benefit School Impact Fee Agreement" to address development impacts and the need for future school facilities. This agreement between the developer and the school district, will need to be signed and recorded prior to project approval (recordation of final map).

The 1992-1993 Mutual Benefit Agreement fee structure is as follows:

Single Family Unit	$3,592.00/SF unit
Duplex Unit	$2,671.00/unit
Multi-Family Unit	$ 677.00/unit

These fees are subject to an annual inflation increase effective July 1st of each year and are based on the Consumer Price Index, three month average for March, April and May of each year.

Based on the proposed financing plan it is estimated that only 30% of all projected housing units will pay the financing program fee with the remaining paying the State allowed development fee. However, Policy 15 of the A/BCP Plan will ensure that all future developments will be required to participate in the financing program in order to obtain a will serve letter regardless of size and type of approval needed for the project.

Conclusion: Based on the impact evaluation criteria and discussion above facility funding impacts are expected to be less than significant.

c. **Proximity to Airport.** A small portion of the District is within the State required two-mile setback zone. However, the District has located a new school site in the Christian Valley area that is outside this setback area.

Conclusion: Based on the impact evaluation criteria and discussion above, impacts are expected to be less than significant.

5. **Sierra College.** The direct impacts to the Sierra College District from buildout of the Plan area are difficult to quantify. In the past the demand residential and commercial/industrial growth has created for the District's programs, services and facilities has been relatively high. The District does not receive impact mitigation fees from new developments and must rely on funding from the State. In recent years funding has not kept pace with new enrollment.

The updated Plan does not increase the holding capacity of the Plan area and therefore should not increase demand on the District above what could have been expected from the previous Plan. However, projected growth per the previous and updated plans could negatively impact the College because of State funding shortfalls (Dr. Brophy, personal communication 5/92).

Conclusion: Based on the impact evaluation criteria and analysis above funding impacts are expected to be potentially significant. Mitigation measures are recommended which would partially offset impacts. However, they are not expected to reduce impacts below the significant levels.

Additional Discussion

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

Summary - Previous Plan vs Updated Plan. The updated Plan overall would result in a lower population holding capacity than the previous Plan. However, greater densities would occur within the Ackerman School District and due primarily to the mixed use land use designations within the District. Only the Ackerman School District would experience significant, unmitigable impacts (under both the existing and adopted plans).

Mitigation Measures

1. **Increased need for school facilities - Auburn Union School District**

   a. **Site availability - None recommended for this less than significant impact.**

   b. **Southern Area school site - None recommended for this less than significant impact.**

   c. **Airport Setback - None recommended for this less than significant impact.**

   d. **Facility Financing - None recommended for this less than significant impact.**

Effectiveness of Measures/Relevant Plan Provisions: This impact is expected to be less than significant. Public Education Goals 4, 5 and Policies 10,11,13,14 and 15 should ensure impacts remain below the significant level.

Implementation: N/A

2. **Increased need for school facilities - Ackerman School District**

   a. **New school needed - Encouragement via revised policies needed.** Policy 15 should be revised to read:

      (15) School districts shall have primary responsibility for ensuring that school facilities exist, or will exist in a timely manner, to accommodate projected student populations of new residential development projects in compliance with established service level

standards. The County will assist the school districts by requiring will serve letters from affected schools for each new residential land use project.

Residential rezones, general plan and community plan amendments, specific plans, or other land use entitlement requests shall not be approved unless accompanied by a finding that school facilities to accommodate projected students consistent with service level standards will be available in a timely manner to serve the project or that the project includes phasing conditions to ensure coordination of residential construction and school construction consistent with policy.

Effectiveness of Measures/Relevant Plan Provisions: This measure is expected to ensure that significant long-term impacts of Plan buildout will be avoided. However, short-term impacts (1-5 years) are considered significant and unmitigable. Relevant Plan provisions include Public Education Goals 3,4, and 5 and Policies 10,11,13-15.

Implementation: The County finds that Mitigation Measure 2a is infeasible and therefore has not been included in the updated Plan. The County has indicated that its ability to assist school districts is limited to requiring new developments to obtain "Will Serve" letters from districts. The A/BCP Public Education Goals 3-5 and Policies 10, 13, 14, and 15, the updated County-wide General Plan Policies and Plan Implementation programs for schools will partially mitigate this impact.

b. Proximity to airport - No measures required beyond those contained in the ABCP

Effectiveness of Measures/Relevant Plan Provisions: Less than significant impact. Public Education Goals 4, 5 and Policies 10,11,13,14 and 15.
Implementation: N/A

3. Increased need for school facilities - Placer Hills Union School District

a. One new school needed - No measures required beyond those contained in the ABCP.

b. Facility funding - No measures required beyond those contained in the ABCP.

c. Proximity to Airport - No measures required beyond those contained in the ABCP.

d. Septic system constraints at existing schools - No measures required beyond those contained in the ABCP.

Effectiveness of Measures/Relevant Plan Provisions: Less than significant impact. Public Education Goals 4, 5 and Policies 10,11,13,14 and 15 should ensure impacts remain below the significant level.

Implementation: N/A

4. **Placer Union High School District**

   a. **Two new schools needed - No additional measures necessary for this less than significant impact.**

   b. **Facility funding - No additional measures necessary for this less than significant impact.**

   c. **Proximity to Airport - None additional measures necessary for this less than significant impact.**

Effectiveness of Measures/Relevant Plan Provisions: Less than significant impact. Relevant Plan provisions include Public Education Goals 4, 5 and Policies 10,11,13,14 and 15.

Implementation: N/A

5. **Sierra College. Add policy: assist Sierra College in meeting its goals.** The County should assist the College in meeting its goals by adding land use policies to the Plan which:

   - Allow for shared parking facilities when Community Learning Centers are proposed within existing or future shared facilities (such as shopping centers).

   - Allow educational facilities within a variety of land use designations.

Effectiveness of Measures/Relevant Plan Provisions: Significant unmitigable impact. These measures are not expected to reduce impacts to the College below the significant level but would assist the College in meeting its goals. Relevant Plan provisions include Public Education Goal 6 and Policy 16.

Implementation: This measure has not been included in the Plan. Implementation of this measure is considered infeasible by the County but will be addressed in the new Zoning Ordinance, currently being updated.

PARKS AND RECREATION

Setting

Recreation services in the Plan area are presently provided by the Auburn Area Recreation and Park District (ARD) and by the Placer County Parks Division. The ARD boundaries are fairly consistent with the area of the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan. The County provides park facilities for public use within the Plan area, but does not operate any recreation programs. ARD provides recreation programs and facilities. The ARD has expressed an interest in analyzing the possibility of taking over the County's parks which are within the ARD boundaries in order to consolidate administrative and maintenance services.

The current inventory of parks and recreation facilities totals 3.2 acres per 1000 residents in the ARD which includes the Plan area and are listed below:

Table 116
EXISTING RECREATION FACILITY INVENTORY 1991

Park Name	Park Acres	# Play Lots	Tennis Courts	League/ Sftbll	Bsktball Courts	Trails (miles)	Soccer Fields (youth)	Soccer Fields (adult)
Christian Valley	7	1		1			1	
Regional	62	1	4	3			1	1
Placer Hills	2	1					1	
Meadow Vista	22	1	2	2			1	1
W.C. Field	1			1				
North Park	2.7	1			1			
Totals	**96.7**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**1**	**0**	**4**	**2**

Note: Existing standards do not address needs for soccer field, specifically. This will be included in ARD's master plan.

SOURCE: Auburn/Bowman Community Plan

Park land acquisition and development are funded by Quimby Act fees and assessed property value yearly. The current Quimby Act fee is $1,080/new housing unit. According to Placer County Park District Administrator John Ramirez, this fee covers less than 50% of the cost of providing active park facilities.

Impacts

1. **Increased demand on public parks with buildout of Plan area.** The Plan estimates that buildout of the new Plan would result in a need for approximately 394 acres of park land in the Plan area based on a 10-acres/1000 population standard for passive and active park sites. The park locations shown on the Land Use Map total approximately 568 acres; thus providing for the projected need.

   It should be noted that the locations shown on the Land Use Map are conceptual and not all sites shown will be pursued beyond initial review; other sites not shown could become available and pursued by the County if they meet the land needs identified for park development. Whether or not the total acreage needed will actually be acquired is a critical issue. The Plan discusses the lack of availability of flat lands for active recreation sites as well as the inadequacy of the existing funding structure as constraints to park acquisition and development.

   Currently, the Quimby Act fee of $1,150 per new dwelling unit covers less than one-half the cost of actual park acquisition and development costs. Actual costs are estimated at $2,662/new housing unit (and much higher in certain areas) as shown on Table 117.

   In addition, the Plan identifies a need for an additional 5 acres/1000 residents of passive park land which, though less costly to provide per acre, would increase funding needs beyond the $2,662 base cost per residence. However, it should be noted that the park sites shown on the Land Use Map include appropriate passive park acreages which equal approximately 220 acres in addition to active parkland.

Table 117
PARK DEVELOPMENT COSTS
UPDATE OF INFORMATION USED BY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Park Improvement	Standard	Development Cost	Cost per 1000 persons	Cost per Household
Parkland	1 acre per 500 persons	$60,000/acre	$120,000	$ 360
Play Lot	25,000 sq ft/ 1000 persons 75 sq ft/child (1 child/hshld)	$51,000/ 3,000 sq ft	$212,500	$ 638*
Playground	5 acre per 2000 persons	$60,000/acre	$150,000	$ 450
Play Fields	1.5 acre per 1000 persons	$60,000/acre	$ 90,000	$ 270
Court	1 court per 3000 persons	$50,000/court	$ 16,667	$ 50
Trails	1 mile per 1000 persons	$48,000/mile (asphalt approx $80,000/mi)	$ 48,000	$ 144
			$637,167	$ 1,912
Add Land Costs as Variable - 5 ac/1000 persons		**Land Cost/Acre**		
Granite Bay		$100,000	$1,137,167	$ 3,142
Dry Creek-West		$ 75,000	$1,012,167	$ 3,037
Auburn-Bowman		**$ 50,000**	**$ 887,167**	**$ 2,662**
Balance of County		$ 30,000	$ 787,167	$ 2,362

NOTES:

1. Cost per home to provide recreation facilities to meet 100% of demand created. Past policy has been to recover costs to meet one-half of demand created only.
2. Assumes 3.0 persons per household and will vary with cost of land.

* Reduced by one-half.

SOURCE: John Ramirez, Placer County Park Dist. Admin.

Table 118
RECREATION FACILITY DEMAND

ITEM	UNIT	STANDARD NEEDED	EXISTING UNITS	UNMET DEMAND	ESTIMATED COST	NOTES
1. PARK ACREAGE						
Passive Park Land 5 ac/1000	Acres	210	0	210	6,294,150	Land costs @ $30,000 per acre
Active Parks 5 ac/1000	Acres	210	0	210	6,294,150	Land Costs @ $30,000 per acre. Development costs are an additional $100,000 per acre.
TOTAL ACRES		420	0	420	12,588,300	
2. FACILITIES						
Play Lots 75 SF/Child 1 Child/House	Acres	27	0.6	26	$10 per S. F.	Tot Lots @ 1 Child Per Dwelling Unit
Courts Tennis/Basketball 1 Per 3000	Courts	14	7	7	349,350	
Hardball 1 Per 6000	Diamonds	7	0	7	N/A	
Softball 1 Per 6000	Diamonds	14	7	7	419,220	
Trails 1 Mile/1000	Miles	42	0	42	1,329,324	Hiking, Riding, Bike. Costs are for D.G. Trails Only. Other costs are in A/BCP Conservation & Open Space Component

SOURCE: Auburn/Bowman Community Plan Background Report.

Park site acquisition assurance is a matter of adequate funding as well as priorities. Often, development of facilities takes priority over acquisition. As land costs rise, it becomes more difficult to meet the needs of new residents. The Plan does include Parks and Recreation Policy f which calls for prioritization of parkland acquisition and acceptance (in-lieu fees have been preferred over developer land donation in the past). Implementation will be via yearly monitoring of acquisition progress against population increases called for in the Plan as a part of yearly Plan progress reports.

These measures offer reasonable assurance that park land acquisition will become priority. However, the policies and measures as written do not offer reasonable assurance that park needs of the future population will actually be developed and met. While the Auburn Recreation District Master Plan called for will assist with implementation, it would be appropriate for the basic park standards and funding mechanisms to be required within this Plan (See Mitigation Measures). Without such assurances, potential impacts from buildout of the Plan area may not be adequately mitigated.

Conclusion: Based on the impact evaluation criteria and discussion above, impacts are expected to be significant and unmitigable.

2. **Cumulative impacts — City plus County buildout.** Buildout of the City and the unincorporated areas per the two plans combined will intensify the impacts discussed under #1 above.

Conclusion: Based on the impact evaluation criteria and discussion above impacts are expected to be significant and unmitigable.

Additional Discussion

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

Summary - Previous Plan vs Updated Plan Impacts. This Plan goes further toward providing for the park and recreation needs of Plan area residents than the previous Plan. The previous Plan designated 5 acres of park land per 1000 residents; the updated Plan designates 10 park acres per 1000 residents and designates 3909 acres of Open Space. (The previous Plan does not include an Open Space designation.) In addition, the updated Plan includes policies which prioritize land acquisition and call for an ARD Master Plan. However, the updated Plan could still result in significant impacts related to an unmet need for recreational facilities because of potential funding and acreage shortfalls as discussed in the sections above.

Mitigation Measures

1. **Increased demand for park facilities - Add a policy related to site acquisition and full fee charges. The following policy should be added to the Plan:**

   — **Require full mitigation of park and recreation impacts of new development (implementation could be via a fee which represents actual park and recreation development costs, developer construction of sites, or other measures which could be identified in the ARD Master Plan).**

Effectiveness of Measure/Relevant Plan Provisions: This measure is expected to reduce impacts below the significant level. Relevant Plan provisions include Parks and Recreation Policies a,f, and j which will provide partial mitigation.

Implementation: The County finds that implementation of this measure is infeasible and therefore has not been included in the Plan. The County has indicated that requiring increases in dedication fees to be counter-productive to other goals of the Plan; principally providing affordable housing to all economic segments of the Plan area's population.

2. **Cumulative impacts — City plus County buildout.** See measures described under 1, above.

Effectiveness of Measure/Relevant Plan Provisions: See discussion under 1, above.

Implementation: N/A

TELEPHONE

Setting

Pacific Bell currently provides telephone service throughout the Plan area in accordance with current rates and rules approved by the California Public Utilities Commission. According to Pacific Bell Engineer Rich Bememer the Company's major infrastructure is in place to serve new developments as they occur.

Impacts

1. **Buildout of the Plan area (based on the County's and/or the City's land use designations as well as combined development).** Mr. Rich Bememer indicated that Pacific Bell can provide service to new development within the Plan area regardless of which jurisdictions land use designations are implemented. In the past Pacific Bell has been able to provide service to new development with little or no impact to their existing operation. Line extension into new development would need to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

   Mr. Bememer indicated that Pacific Bell has the necessary equipment, personnel and facilities to serve new development throughout the Plan area as well as the City.

   Conclusion: Based on the impact evaluation criteria and discussion above, impacts resulting from implementation of the County's or City's land use designation on Pacific Bell's operations is expected to be less than significant.

2. **Installation of new telephone lines.** New phone lines will be necessary to provide for growth per the new Plan. Though in general, phone lines are located within street and PG&E rights-of-way, alignments can be located in unimproved areas. Potential indirect impacts of line construction can occur including tree and vegetation loss, grading, and associated visual and erosion impacts. However, installation of telephone lines generally does not involve a wide swath of disturbance. The Plan includes Community Design Policy 12 requiring undergrounding of utility lines as part of all new subdivisions and major projects, reducing the potential for visual impacts. Undergrounding of existing overhead lines is also occurring incrementally using set aside funds which will reduce overall cumulative impacts.

   Impacts will need to be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. It is anticipated that impacts can be minimized through existing environmental review and permitting process.

Conclusion: Based on the impact evaluation criteria and discussion above, indirect impacts due to extension of new telephone lines are considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

1. **Increased needs per buildout of the Plan area. None recommended for this less than significant impact.**

Effectiveness of Measures: N/A

Implementation: N/A

2. **Installation of new telephone lines. None recommended for this less than significant impact.**

Effectiveness of Measures/Relevant Plan Provisions: Relevant Plan provisions include Community Design Policy 12.

Implementation: N/A

GAS AND ELECTRIC

Setting/Impact

Gas and electric service is provided in the Plan area by the Pacific Gas and Electric Company in accordance with current rates and rules approved by the California Public Utilities Commission. According to PG&E Supervisor of Land Planning Greg Johnston, the company's electrical distribution network is currently in place to serve all portions of the Plan area. Gas distribution lines are limited to the City and higher density areas of the Plan area.

Electric and magnetic radiation. Throughout the Plan area there are many sources of electric and magnetic fields (EMFs) due to the movement and consumption of electric power. High voltage transmission lines, low voltage distribution lines, substations, electrical service vaults, office equipment, and household appliances all generate EMFs. Epidemiological studies suggest there may be health risks associated with low level chronic exposure to EMFs. We consulted the following publications regarding this potential risk.

"Biological Effects of Power Frequency Electric and Magnetic Fields - Background Paper", May 1989. U.S. Congress, Office of Technology Assessment. U.S. Government Printing Office, OTA-BP-E-53.

"Potential Health Effects of Electric and Magnetic Fields from Electric Power Facilities", September 1989. California Public Utilities Commission/California Department of Health Services.

"Electric and Magnetic Fields from 60 Hertz Electric Power: What do we know about possible health risks?" 1989. Department of Engineering and Public Policy Carnegie Mellon University.

"Electromagnetic Waives: How Real a Hazard?" March 1990. Harvard Medical School Health Letter.

Correspondence from ETC (Enertech Consultants) to ERI (Environmental Research Information, Inc.) reporting the results of field measurements of electric and magnetic fields near a 115KV transmission line in Nevada County.

Correspondence from ERI to a prospective subdivider interpreting the data taken from ETC.

"Electromagnetic Fields and Land Use Controls", December 1991. Louis Slesin, Matthew Connelly, David Bergman.

These publications contain an abundance of information on EMF; relevant conclusions are presented below:

> Taken together, the body of scientific evidence for electric and magnetic fields posing a significant health risk is not yet compelling, but it is worrisome. On one hand, the epidemiological studies in Denver do not establish a causal connection between power-frequency magnetic fields and childhood cancer. On the other hand, however, scientists have not yet been able to propose a credible candidate other than magnetic fields that explain the Denver study results. In the case of the laboratory evidence to date, the variety of biological effects observed and the possible linkages of many of them with serious adverse health effects only heightens the concern that exposure to electric and magnetic fields may pose significant health risks. (California PUC/DHS)

In addition, the U.S. Office of Technology Assessment contends:

> As recently as a few years ago, scientists were making categorical statements that on the basis of all available evidence there are no health risks from human exposure to power-frequency fields. In our view, the emerging evidence no longer allows one to categorically assert that there are no risks. But it does not provide a basis for asserting that there is a significant risk...
>
> **7. General Conclusions About Biological Effects of ELF Fields and Their Implication**. As the preceding discussions have indicated, there is now a very large volume of scientific findings based on experiments at the cellular level and from studies with animals and people which clearly establish that low frequency magnetic fields can interact with, and produce changes in, biological systems. While most of this work is of very high quality, the results are complex. Current scientific understanding does not yet allow us to interpret the evidence in a single coherent framework. Even more frustrating, it does not yet allow us to draw definite conclusions about questions of possible risk or to offer clear science-based advice on strategies to minimize or avoid potential risks.
>
> Of the effects discussed, the central nervous system effects including circadian effects in animals and the possibility of cancer promotion appear most worthy of concern with respect to public health effects. These are now summarized.
>
> **7.1. Central Nervous System Effects**. As a system that uses low frequency fields for its intracellular communication and function, the brain and central nervous system are natural candidates for interaction with fields. The implications of tissue or cellular level in vitro experiments for the whole organism are not clear. But the animal studies, including the circadian variations introduced by fields, indicate that:

1. Field-CNS interactions may have dependencies which are at very specific frequencies and intensities, and may vary with the background static fields present, the time of day and the duration of exposure.

2. Developing nervous systems may be particularly susceptible and effects may be latent, manifested only in specific situations or later in time.

3. More than any other agent known, except perhaps some psychotropic drugs, ELF fields are specific: with respect to the regions of the brain tissue affected and the point of administration in the circadian rhythm.

How and whether these findings have public health implications remains unclear. What is clear is that these findings about subtle and complex effects demand a carefully planned research agenda in this area.

7.2 Cancer Promotion. The following points summarize the key experimental results that are consistent with a possible association between exposure to ELF fields and the occurrence of cancer:

1. ELF fields are not known to cause any chromosomal damage, and, hence, are not likely initiators of cancer.
2. Some cellular level experiments indicate that the cell membrane is the site of the interaction between ELF fields and the cell. The membrane site responsible for this action has also been shown to be a receptor for chemical cancer promoters.
3. ELF fields have shown to increase ornithine decarboxylase (ODC) activity. All known cancer *promoters* stimulate ODC. However, the converse is not true. Many agents that promote ODC activity are not cancer promoters.
4. Alterations in protein synthesis, in immunological and hormone status, and in metabolic competence via circadian shifts can all contribute to the progress of initiated cancer. To the extent that ELF fields play a role in those, they might have an effect on tumor growth or indeed tumor inhibition. The increase in ODC activity noted above is indicative of growth enhancement rather than inhibition.
5. Pineal melatonin depression has been associated with cancer growth, and administration of melatonin has been found to slow the growth of cancer. ELF fields depress pineal melatonin levels in animals.
6. Functions of gap junctions are disrupted by ELF fields. Similar disruptions are produced by other known chemical promoters.
7. Epidemiologic studies of ELF exposures and cancer show a weak association between ELF field exposure and nervous system cancer and leukemia.

While the above arguments are consistent with the hypothesis that ELF fields may play a role in cancer or tumor development, none of these constitutes proof or even necessarily a strong indication that it does. (U.S. Office of Technology Assessment)

Based upon these concerns, coupled with the lack of certainty about the risk, the Office of Technology Assessment publication evaluates five policy alternatives:

1. Do nothing until the science becomes better.
2. Make public information available but take no additional actions.
3. Adopt a field strength safety standard approach to transmission line fields based on the fiction that the numbers are supported by a review of the science. Ignore fields from all other sources.
4. Adopt a "similarity" based approach to transmission line fields which makes the exposures that people receive to these fields "similar" to those they receive from other sources in modern life. Ignore fields from all other sources.
5. Adopt a "prudent avoidance" strategy. That is, look systematically for strategies which can keep people out of 60 Hz fields arising from all sources but only adopt those which look to be "prudent" investments given their cost and our current level of scientific understanding about possible risks. (U.S. Office of Technology Assessment)

The publication finds pitfalls with each alternative, but primarily with 1-4. Policy Alternative 5, prudent avoidance, could involve a number of actions such as redesigning appliances, home wiring, and electrical delivery systems. It might also involve avoidance of building new lines very close to people or widening transmission line rights-of-way.

For the same reasons set forth in the Office of Technology Assessment publication, prudent avoidance seems to be the most appropriate strategy in providing for mitigation throughout the Plan area. Unfortunately, however, we have not been able to find any formal guidance in how this strategy should be manifested in site design. Except for the City of Irvine, no publications, officials, or California jurisdictions have been able or willing to make specific recommendations on setbacks for health risk reductions. The PG&E position is that the evidence it has gathered to date does not show that power lines have adverse effects on public health (PG&E Public Issue Policy Statement 8/87).

Most local jurisdictions have not taken any action related to the issue or, if they have taken action, it has been minimal. We know of the following cases:

Table 119
EMF RELATED REQUIREMENTS

Jurisdiction	Requirement
City of Irvine	Condition of approval requiring setback from power lines based on the 4 mG magnetic field strength (Irvine is the first jurisdiction in California to establish a setback based on health risk).
City of Fremont	Standard condition of approval requiring notification of buyers through final Subdivision Public Report that there are nearby power lines and that there is on-going research on potential health effects of associated magnetic fields.
County of San Luis Obispo	Ordinance requiring measurements of EMF near any proposed facilities which may generate electromagnetic radiation.
Placer County	One project approval ("Los Lagos") conditioned on a 50-foot setback from a transmission line.
Nevada County	One project approval was conditioned on provision of a note on Final Maps, CC&Rs, and State Subdivision Report indicating a potential health risk as well as the distribution of the Carnegie Mellon publication cited above to any interested person upon request. The conditions also required modelling data of field strength for the subdivision file. Additionally, the subdivider proposed a 25-foot setback from each side of the power line easement for a total setback of 65-feet from the power line centerline.
Sacramento County	The County considers the health risk from power lines to be an unresolved issue in its EIRs and recommends parks/greenbelts in power line easements, but does not recommend greater setbacks (Joyce Horizumi, Sacramento County, personal communication 1990).

We have not been able to find anything in the literature that indicates what prudent avoidance means with regard to setbacks from power lines. However, the City of Irvine has decided upon a level of 4 mG to determine setback. Measurements were taken for a 115kV line in Nevada County by ENERTECH Consultants. The field strengths indicated by these measurements are not directly applicable to transmission lines throughout the Plan area because of differing line geometries. However, they may provide a rough idea of the general magnitude of the fields associated with transmission lines within the Plan area because of roughly similar line geometrics and because of similar power loading (we known of one line in the Plan area which averages 110 amps, and the Nevada County line loads ranged from 70 to 120 amps during the measurements).

Table 120
Magnetic Field (mG)

	Vertical	Horizontal	Maximum
0'	1.3	4.7	4.8
10'			4.4
20'			3.8
30'			3.0
40'	2.6	0.2	2.6
50'			2.0
60'			1.7
65'	1.5	0.7	1.6
70'			1.4
80'			1.2
90'			1.0
100'			0.9
120'			0.7
140'			0.5
160'			0.4
180'			0.3
200'			0.2
215'	0.1	0.2	0.2

Impacts

1. **Impacts to PG&E as a result of increased power demand per buildout of the Plan area.** PG&E Supervisor of Land Planning Greg Johnston indicated that PG&E currently has the electrical supply necessary and a comprehensive electrical distribution network in place throughout the Plan area to serve existing and future demand (Greg Johnston, PG&E Supervisor of Land Planning, personal communication, 5/12/92). PG&E also intends to continue expanding natural gas distribution piping as urban densities make it economically feasible to do so.

   New development may require installation of additional distribution lines and substations but this needs to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis as to their location and size. The expense of these facilities precludes PG&E from installing them prior to demand. Therefore, according to Mr .Johnston, PG&E must react to new development proposals rather than take a pro-active approach. Mr. Johnston indicated that PG&E has the ability to respond to most development proposals without being significantly impacted as long as development meets PG&E's requirements for right-of-way dedication.

   Conclusion: Based on the impact evaluation criteria and discussion above, impacts to PG&E's ability to supply power to serve buildout of the Plan area are expected to be less than significant.

2. **Impacts from installation of new distribution and transmission lines.** New distribution lines will be necessary to provide for growth per the new Plan. Though in general distribution lines are located within street rights-of-way, alignments can be located in unpaved areas. Potential indirect impacts of line construction can occur including tree and vegetation loss, grading, and associated visual and erosion impacts. However, distribution lines generally

do not involve a wide swath of disturbance. In addition, the Plan includes Community Design Policy 12 requiring undergrounding of utility lines as part of all new subdivisions and major projects, reducing the potential for visual impacts. Undergrounding of existing overhead lines is also occurring incrementally using PG&E set aside funds which will reduce overall cumulative impacts. However, impacts will need to be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. It would be appropriate for the Plan to include a policy calling for mitigation attention to this issue by individual developments and prioritization of undergrounding of existing lines.

In addition to distribution lines, PG&E may need to install high voltage transmission lines in the Plan area depending on ultimate demand within the Plan area. According to Greg Johnston with PG&E there are no new transmission lines currently planned for in the Plan area and the existing lines should be adequate to meet future demand (Johnston, personal communication 5/23/92). Mr. Johnston could not provide the specific locations of existing transmission lines and could not give the potential location for new lines due to national security safeguards implemented following the Persian Gulf War. These provisions prohibit utility companies from revealing this type of information.

However, in general, high voltage transmission lines involve greater impacts than the installation of distribution lines. They often do not follow existing road alignments and can involved disturbance of a swath 60- to 100-feet in width. In addition, transmission lines generally cannot feasibly be undergrounded, resulting in visual impacts.

The County has little jurisdiction over the location of transmission lines. State law does not allow County regulation of lines carrying 120 KV or greater, passing this responsibility to the Public Utilities Commission. Regardless, the County does require alignment review within the Zoning Ordinances. However, it is not clear whether or not this practice can be anything other than advisory.

Conclusion: Based on the impact evaluation criteria and discussion above, because of lack a of County control, impacts related to potential new above ground high voltage transmission line construction can be expected to be significant and unmitigable. Impacts related to distribution line installation are expected to be less than significant.

3. **Health risk from electric and magnetic radiation (EMF).** The scientific and medical communities are still uncertain as to the risk the public faces from low level chronic exposure to EMFs. The research compiled to date indicates the controversy surrounding EMF health effects is potentially too serious to ignore. It is possible to say that some health risk of undetermined proportion and character may be present adjacent to electric transmission lines and other EMF sources.

Pubic concern regarding the health effects from EMF exposure is expected to increase in the future as the population in the Plan area grows and the

siting of new transmission lines and substations becomes necessary. Several communities throughout the nation have established performance controls for transmission lines and other sources of EMFs. These controls are based primarily on the doctrine of prudent avoidance in light of evolving scientific knowledge. However, the scientific evidence available today is not able to establish what would be a "safe" level of exposure.

Conclusion: The California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines, Section 15145, allows for a finding that an impact is too speculative if thorough investigation indicates that its significance cannot be foreseen. This is the case with health effects from EMF. However, the Utilities section of the Plan includes Policies a-i that are based on prudent avoidance.

4. **Cumulative impacts - City plus County buildout.** Cumulative impacts of combined City and County buildout are expected to be less than significant due to PG&E's stated ability to meet existing and future gas and electric demand throughout the Plan area (as discussed above under the individual impact areas).

Conclusion: Based on the impact evaluation criteria and discussion above, cumulative impacts are not expected to be significant.

Mitigation Measures

1. **Increased demand for power per buildout of the Plan area - None recommended for this less than significant impact.**

Effectiveness of Measures/Relevant Plan Provisions: Less than significant impact. Relevant Plan provisions include Community Design Policy 12.

Implementation: N/A

2. **Impacts from installation of new distribution and transmission lines - No mitigation is available for installation of new transmission lines.**

Effectiveness of Measures/Relevant Plan Provisions: Significant, unmitigable impact. Relevant Plan provisions include Community Design Policy 12.

Implementation: N/A

3. **Health risk from electromagnetic radiation. No additional mitigation measures needed beyond those contained in the Plan.**

~~Table 121~~

~~{D E L E T E D}~~

Effectiveness of Measure/Relevant Plan Provisions: This remains an unresolved issue. Relevant Plan provisions include Utilities Policies a-i.

Implementation: N/A

4. **Cumulative impacts. None recommended for this less than significant impact.**

Effectiveness of Measures/Relevant Plan Provisions: See discussion under 1-3 above.

Implementation: N/A

SOLID WASTE

Setting

Solid waste generated in the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan area is collected by the Auburn Placer Disposal Service (APDS), a licensed private disposal company. Solid waste from the Plan area is transported to the company's transfer station located on Shale Ridge Road and then long-hauled to the Western Regional Landfill located near Highway 65 at Industrial Boulevard and Athens Road.

The Western Regional Landfill is a 320 acre Class III facility owned by Placer County and operated by the Western Placer Recovery Company, a licensed private landfill operator, under a contract with the Western Regional Landfill Authority (a joint powers authority consisting of Placer County, Lincoln, Roseville, and Rocklin). The estimated life expectancy of the landfill is approximately 25 years. Negotiations are currently underway to expand the site by an additional 480 acres extending the landfill life expectancy an additional 50 years.

Impacts

1. **Increased and cumulative demand on the Western Regional Landfill.** Implementation of the new Plan will result in a lower holding capacity than the previous Plan. Based on an overall solid waste generation factor of 6.8 lbs/capita/day (SWMP, p. 35), total waste generation including residential, industrial, institutional, construction, demolition and wastewater treatment sludge/septage is expected to be 43,300 tons per year (based on 34,917 population at 6.8 lbs/day/person) at buildout under the new Plan compared to 51,900 tons/year under the previous Plan (based on 41,851 population at 6.8 lbs/day/person).

   It should be noted that the Implementation section of the Plan (p. 150) indicates that the new Plan is consistent with the projections contained in the 1989 Placer County Solid Waste Management Plan in that it does not provide for residential, commercial or industrial growth beyond that anticipated by the Solid Waste Plan. Projections regarding the life span of the County's waste disposal facilities as discussed in the 1989 Solid Waste Plan remain unchanged with the adoption of the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan.

   Residential buildout of the Plan area is expected in 2041 and the expanded landfill life expectancy will run to approximately 2050 (Placer County Solid Waste Management Plan, p. 130). Commercial and industrial buildout is not

expected for 72 and 251 years respectively (Recht Hausrath Study, January 1993). Though the ultimate buildout of the Plan area is not necessarily provided for, there is adequate capacity for the 20 year growth expected during the life of the Plan and ultimate residential buildout. In addition, unlike schools which will require a set number of sites to serve ultimate Plan area buildout, landfill technology is an evolving science and State-mandated recycling is expected to reduce landfill input in the future. As a result, it is reasonably assured that waste disposal means will eventually be provided to serve full buildout of the Plan area. In addition, the annual implementation progress report called for in the Plan will serve to monitor changes in growth rates and related impacts to public facilities including the landfill.

Conclusion: Based on the impact evaluation criteria and discussion above, impacts resulting from an increased demand on solid waste disposal facilities are expected to be less than significant.

2. **Increased demand on the Auburn Transfer Station.** The Auburn Transfer Station is located on a five acre site on Shale Ridge Road adjacent to the Auburn Municipal Industrial Park in the north Auburn Area, and owned and operated by the Auburn Placer Disposal Company. Shale Ridge Road is designated Industrial on the Land Use Map. Surrounding lands are designated Industrial. Existing land uses surrounding the facility include the City of Auburn's airport and other commercial uses. County zoning districts to the west, north and south are C-2,C-3 and Industrial, respectively. The site is on a hillside and hilltop overlooking low, seasonally wet ground and a wrecking yard to the south. To the immediate west lies a large convalescent hospital (Solid Waste Management Plan, p. 105). The new Plan designates the surrounding lands Industrial.

   The site is permitted to handle 350 tons per day due to installation of a new compactor. According to the adopted 1989 Solid Waste Management Plan, the transfer station has the capacity to meet the refuse disposal needs of the Auburn area for at least twenty years. Twenty years is the life of the Plan, though commercial, industrial, and multi-family residential buildout may not occur until after the 20-year period. However, it is reasonable to assume that new transfer facilities can be located after that time due to the abundance of Industrial land use designations.

Conclusion: Based on the impact evaluation criteria and discussion above, impacts resulting from an increased demand on the Auburn Transfer Station are expected to be less than significant.

3. **Cumulative impacts — City plus County Plan buildout.** The City and the County both utilize the Western Regional Landfill. Buildout of the two Plan areas at growth rates greater than assumed in the City and County Plans is assumed in the 25 year landfill capacity projections for the entire service area (a 3% growth rate was used to determine the landfill life expectancy). As a result, unless projected growth rates in the Plan areas or in the landfill service as a whole increase substantially over projections, impacts are not expected

to be significant. The yearly Plan progress report will serve to monitor growth rate changes which could affect these conclusions.

Conclusion: Based on the impact evaluation criteria and the discussion above, cumulative impacts are expected to be less than significant.

Additional Discussion

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

Summary - Previous Plan vs Updated Plan Impacts. As discussed above, the updated Plan has a lower residential holding capacity than the previous Plan. Commercial and Industrial acreage is similar. As a result, waste generation is expected to be reduced under buildout per the updated Plan.

Mitigation Measures

1. **Increased demand on Western Regional landfill — No additional mitigation measures needed beyond those contained in the Plan.**

Effectiveness of Measures/Relevant Plan Provisions: Less than significant impact. Relevant Plan provisions include goals and policies contained in the County's Solid Waste Management Plan incorporated into the Plan by reference.

Implementation: N/A

2. **Increased demand on the Shale Ridge Road Transfer Station — None recommended beyond those contained in the Plan.**

Effectiveness of Measures/Relevant Plan Provisions: See discussion under #1 above.

Implementation: N/A

3. **Cumulative Impacts, City plus County Plan buildout. None recommended for this less than significant impact.**

Effectiveness of Measures/Relevant Plan Provisions: See discussion under #1 above.

Implementation: N/A

WASTEWATER

This section is based in part on background material in the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan Public Services/Public Facilities Study (Quad, September 1991) and the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan.

Setting

The County provides portions of the Plan area with wastewater collection, treatment

and disposal facilities through a sewer maintenance district. The remaining portions of the Plan area outside of the County's collection system utilize on-site septic tank/leachfield wastewater disposal systems.

The County's Sewer Maintenance District #1 (SMD) serves the Bowman area and developed areas generally north of Auburn, including the incorporated industrial park area around the Auburn Airport. (See Figure 39 for current district boundaries). The City of Auburn owns and operates the sewer collection system in the Airport Industrial Park. SMD #1 has an outside user agreement with the City and the district is paid to treat and dispose wastewater from the park once their system discharges into the SMD #1 system. The SMD does not currently serve any areas outside the Plan area. Existing residential and commercial average dry weather flows to the District's treatment plant on Joeger Road are approximately 1.45 million gallons per day (MGD). This equates to approximately 4262 residential units and 1000 commercial establishments, the estimated current users.

A portion of the SMD is served by septic tank effluent pumping (STEP) systems. These systems are used in areas with failing septic systems, but which are too remote from the basic large diameter line gravity collection system. The County's criteria for permitting this type of small diameter piping which cannot handle solids is a minimum lot size of 2.3 acres. The County is responsible for the STEP system on private properties: pumping, pump maintenance, and piping system maintenance.

Properties in the Plan area which are not served by the SMD utilize septic tanks under a County permit system. Building permits are issued only upon demonstration that there is sufficient area on the property for 100% leachfield replacement with satisfactory percolation testing and demonstration of an adequate depth of unsaturated soil mantle.

The geology and soil conditions in some portions of the Plan area make it difficult to demonstrate adequate soil conditions for the development of some parcels with on-site wastewater disposal systems. The County Health Department has identified the following locations within the Plan area as needing community sewer facilities in lieu of existing on-site wastewater treatment/disposal facilities (also see Figure 40).

Sylvan Vista Subdivision Area. This area, located north of Foresthill Road and east of I-80 in the Bowman area previously had a sewer system under design to be financed by an assessment district. However, special District Engineer Warren Tellefson indicated that the proposed assessment District has failed and is non-existent. The County does not expect that it (the assessment district) will come back; however, there are some property owners that might possibly build some of the project on their own. The system will be connected to the County's Bowman area collection system to the Joeger Road plant.

Bean Road/Kemper Road Neighborhood. Bean Road and Kemper Road, located in northwestern Auburn, are situated in an area topographically tributary to the City of Auburn's wastewater treatment plant. The City of Auburn is proposing an expansion of its Sphere of Influence to include this area, with the expectation that sewage collection and treatment will be provided by the City in the future.

Keena Drive/Bowman Way Neighborhood. This development, located in the Bowman area along Old Airport Road, is not currently in the County's service area. Service by the County would require major pump station installations.

Merry Knoll Road Area. The Merry Knoll Road area is northwest of the present city limits of Auburn, adjacent to Wise Forebay. This area will be difficult for the County to serve, probably requiring a STEP system. The topography appears to more readily lend itself to service by the City's wastewater treatment facility.

Ladd Lane/Nelson Drive Area. This development, in the vicinity of New Airport Road and south of Bell Road, can fairly easily be sewered by the County. However, it is not in the County's present service area.

Shirland Tract/Crockett Road Area. This area is south of the City of Auburn, adjacent to the city limits, and can be served by the City of Auburn.

Christian Valley. The Christian Valley area is too remote to be feasibly served at this time. Gravity, or more likely STEP systems, will likely await the time when adjacent and more distant development permit joint pipeline construction and cooperative financing.

Area East of Highway 49 and North of Dry Creek Road. This area, northwest of Auburn Airport, is tributary to the County's wastewater treatment facility and logically should be served by that facility.

Impacts

1. **Increased demand on the Sewer Maintenance District's wastewater treatment plant due to buildout of the Plan area.** The development of the Plan area to full buildout will involve significant additional urbanization compared to existing development. In addition, the updated land use designations for the Plan area would locate a majority of this additional urbanization within the SMD's present service area based on the County's "urban core" concept. It is difficult to accurately predict what the ultimate flow to the plant will be because the boundaries of the District's service area may change somewhat (through annexations) and because the density of actual development may vary from Plan projections. For planning purposes, County Special Districts Engineer Warren Tellefson and Assistant District Sanitary Engineer Richard Kai estimated the ultimate future flows to the Joeger Road Treatment Plant that could be expected from buildout of the SMD's existing boundaries and from potential annexations to the SMD (Ultimate Flow & Future Capacity Study, January 7, 1991). Based on previous land use designations within the SMD, Tellefson and Kai estimated an ultimate flow from the existing SMD to be 2.58 MGD (1.45 MGD existing + 1.13 MGD potential). In addition, they estimated an additional 1994 acres and two schools could be annexed to the District which would add another 0.89 MGD of wastewater flow to the treatment plant. Combined, the ultimate flow to the SMD's treatment plant is expected to be approximately 3.5 MGD.

   The 3.5 MGD ultimate flow estimate was then used by Harris and Associates to prepare a Capacity Expansion Study for the SMD's Wastewater Treatment Plant. In that study, a program for the phased development of the treatment

plant to increase the plant's present capacity of 1.62 MGD to meet the ultimate flow projection of 3.5 MGD is presented. The Harris and Associate study used a 5% district growth rate to determine the staging of plant improvements and the year in which the improvements would be needed. This is a higher growth rate than the 2.1% assumed in the Plan and in the economic study prepared for the Plan. The study predicted additional capacity would be needed by 1993, 1996, 2001, 2004, and 2006 to meet the ultimate flow estimate of 3.5 MGD. According to District Engineer Warren Tellefson, the District's annexation fee of $2,700 per acre and connection fee of $2,800 per unit were developed to finance the improvements needed to expand the plant to an ultimate capacity of 3.5 MGD.

However, the County's land use designations in the SMD could substantially increase the volume of wastewater flows over those estimated based on the land use designations. This is because the urban core concept focuses development in the SMD even though over the entire Plan area the land use designations would result in a lesser population than under the previous Plan. The ability of the SMD to expand its plant's capacity beyond the 3.5 MGD is unknown at this time. Mr. Tellefson indicated that an analysis would need to be conducted to determine if physical or environmental constraints would prevent expansion beyond the 3.5 MGD and to determine the ultimate wastewater flows that could be expected within the SMD based on the County's updated land use designations. It should be noted that if the County prohibited future annexations to the SMD, the 3.5 MGD ultimate plant capacity that is currently planned for could possibly handle future flows from the County land use designations in the SMD. The buildout of the Plan area expected within 20 years could be handled by the 3.5 mgd capacity if growth is assumed to be spread evenly throughout the Plan area.

Wastewater Goal 2, Policy 1 and Implementation Measures 2,5 and 6 in the Plan are designed to permit orderly planning and financing of wastewater system improvements to serve Plan area development. Further analysis will be needed to determine the ultimate wastewater flows that can be expected from Plan area buildout and the ultimate capacity of the treatment plant. The projected development rate under the Plan should permit sufficient time between system planning and financing of wastewater system improvements. The Plan includes a policy which calls for annual Plan progress reports which will serve to monitor actual growth rates to determine if action needs to be taken to avert public facility impacts. This procedure should serve to avoid significant impacts as a result of inadequate sewer facilities.

Conclusion: Based on the discussion above and impact evaluation criteria, buildout of the Plan could have significant impacts to the SMD. However, the policies and implementation measures listed above are expected to ensure that impacts are less than significant.

2. **Impacts due to expansion of the Joeger Road plant.** The Joeger Road plant and adjacent parcels south, east, and west of the plant are designated Rural Residential on the Land Use Map. Lands north of the plant are designated Rural Low-Density Residential. Existing surrounding land uses include single-family homes on .9 acre parcels and larger.

The November 7, 1991 SMD #1 Capacity Expansion Study Report prepared by Harris & Associates presents a site plan (Figure 4-1, p. 4-28) which shows all the necessary facilities needed to meet the 3.5 mgd estimated demand within the plant's present boundaries. Therefore, expansion of the plant onto adjacent parcels is not anticipated at this time. However, the Harris report also indicated that the existing plant has had some problems with odor complaints and that regulations governing odor emissions are becoming increasingly strict. In addition, the concentrations of toxic air emissions from wastewater treatment plants have been known to exceed the allowable levels in other air quality management districts. However, no testing has been conducted at the plant. The facilities required for control of odors and of toxic emissions are similar, consisting of covers, ventilation ducts and fans to collect air from the units and a treatment system such as a carbon filter or a wet scrubber. Chemical feed facilities are also usually a part of these systems. (SMD #1 Capacity Expansion Report, Harris & Assoc., p. 5-4.) The systems can be costly.

According to Warren Tellefson, Placer County Department of Public Works, Assembly Bill 2588 of the State of California requires that all wastewater treatment plants measure and report what the volatile organic emissions are from the plants. The bill requires the local air pollution districts to enforce the requirements and then gives a time schedule for its completion. The Placer County Air Pollution Control District reports that plants the size of Plant #1 are not yet required to do the work, however they will within the next year. The Placer County Air Pollution Control District will be the lead agency in requiring the work. As a result, it is assumed that plant emissions will be tested and that future problems will be mitigated consistent with State law.

Water quality impacts could also result from expansion of the plant. The plant discharges into Rock Creek just upstream of Dry Creek. Additional impact studies will need to be completed before expansion is actually undertaken. Whether or not these impacts can be mitigated is unknown at this time. However, Plan buildout could not proceed if environmental clearance was not received on plant expansion. This will be assured by the Plan policy which calls for yearly Plan progress reports which will serve to monitor growth relative to public facility capacities and levels of service.

Conclusion: Based on the discussion above and impact evaluation criteria land use impacts related to expansion of the Joeger Road plant are considered potentially significant but mitigable. Water quality impacts will be avoided by implementation of Wastewater Policiy 1 and Implementation Measures 1,2,4 and 7, and therefore are considered less than significant.

3. **Impacts related to collection line adequacy/construction.** The SMD operates a gravity flow collection system to its treatment and disposal facility on Joeger Road. The capacity of gravity sewer lines can vary between manholes due to the diameter of the pipe and its slope. The District has identified areas of the system where sewer pipes will need to be enlarged because they will reach capacity at 100% buildout of the District (based on

current land use designations); and pipes that will either reach capacity or need to be replaced due to annexations to the District. Since urbanization patterns will not differ greatly under updated land use designations, this analysis is considered adequate for advance planning purposes at this time by the County.

It is reasonably assured that the collection system will be upgraded as growth occurs. According to Placer County District Sanitary Engineer Warren Tellefson, SMD #1 "has an adequate monetary policy of collecting sufficient funds from new development to pay for collection line improvements and expansion and it should have no problem in the future." (Warren Tellefson letter dated March 9, 1992, found in Appendix to this EIR)

Physical impacts can also result from new sewer line installation. Though, in general, sewer lines are located within street rights-of-way, alignments can be located in unpaved areas. Indirect impacts of line construction can include tree and vegetation loss, grading, and associated visual and erosion impacts. The County's existing environmental review and permitting requirements should ensure that these potential impacts will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis and at least partially mitigated.

Conclusion: Based on the impact evaluation criteria and discussion above, indirect impacts due to expansion of the sewer line system are considered potentially significant and unmitigable.

4. **Health/water quality impacts in areas not suitable for septic systems.** The areas identified in the Setting section as having existing and potential septic system problems have the potential for significant health and water quality impacts as buildout occurs under Plan direction. Some of these areas could be sewered by the City or the County, but there is no assurance at this time that connection will result.

To limit further impacts on groundwater quality, new development must conform to Section 4.45 of the Placer County Land Development Manual which sets forth specific criteria for the use of on-site septic tank disposal systems. Failed systems must be replaced by engineered systems. As a result, Policy #2, p. 67 of the Plan which calls for continued use of present technically-based criteria for approval of rural development with septic tank/leachfield systems is expected to be adequate to ensure that health and water quality impacts are mitigated.

The Plan does include a policy (Wastewater Policy 3) calling for the Environmental Health Division and the County Sewer District to work together to identify and strive to provide sewer service to those areas currently using septic systems but are in need of sewer service to protect the health of the community.

Conclusion: Based on the discussion above and the impact evaluation criteria, health and water quality impacts resulting from Plan implementation are expected to be less than significant.

5. **Cumulative City plus County Buildout.** Since the City and County operate separate sewer systems, the combined impacts of development of the two Plan areas is limited. As discussed under Impact 1 above, and the discussion of potential annexations below, there are jurisdictional inefficiencies in potential service areas. Potential changes in the service areas of each entity and the greater residential density allowed under City designations have not been fully taken into account in sewer master planning by the County. The City's sewer master plan (Cranmer Engineering, March 1985) assumes that natural drainage basin limits will determine the ultimate service districts of the County Sanitation District #1 and the City system and plans for an appropriate plant capacity.

   However, despite these problems, adequate fee structures, funding mechanisms, and planning time appear to be available to ensure that significant impacts are avoided.

Conclusion: Based on the impact evaluation criteria and discussion above, cumulative impacts are expected to be less than significant.

Additional Discussion

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

Summary - Previous Plan vs Updated Plan. As described under Impact #1, the updated Plan has a lower overall population holding capacity than the previous Plan but focuses greater density within the SMD service area. These potential impacts are expected to be mitigated by planned expansions which are reasonably assured due to the existing fee structure and funding mechanisms. In addition, annual plan progress reports will serve to monitor growth relative to public facility capacities. Plan buildout would need to be halted if adequate sewer capacity could not be achieved.

Mitigation Measures

1. **Increased demand on SMD #1 - No additional measures needed beyond those included in the ABCP.**

Effectiveness of Measure/Relevant Plan Provisions: Significant, mitigable impacts. Relevant Plan provisions include Wastewater Policy 1 and Implementation Measures 1,2 and 4.

Implementation: N/A

2. **Expansion of Joeger Road plant. No additional measures needed beyond those contained in the ABCP.**

Effectiveness of Measure/Relevant Plan Provisions: Significant, mitigable impacts. Relevant Plan provisions include Wastewater Policy 1 and Implementation Measures 1,2,4 and 7. In addition, compliance with State law should ensure that impacts remain below the significant level.

Implementation: N/A

3. Impacts related to collection line adequacy and construction — No mitigation available.

Effectiveness of Measure/Relevant Plan Provisions: Potentially significant, unmitigable impacts. Relevant Plan provisions include Wastewater Policy 1 and Implementation Measures 1,2,4 and 7.

Implementation: N/A

4. Health/water quality impacts in areas not suitable for septic systems — No additional measures needed beyond those included in the Plan.

Effectiveness of Measure/Relevant Plan Provisions: Less than significant impact. Relevant Plan provisions include Wastewater Goal 2 and Policies 2-4.

Implementation: N/A

5. Cumulative City plus County Buildout — No additional measures needed beyond those included in the Plan.

Effectiveness of Measure/Relevant Plan Provisions: See discussion under 1-4 above.

Implementation: N/A

POLICE PROTECTION

Additional Impact Criteria

The methodology used by the Department to determine staffing levels is a 1:1000 ratio of officers to population which is an accepted national standard used by many law enforcement agencies. The County uses a 12 minute appropriate response time.

Setting

The law enforcement needs of the unincorporated Auburn/Bowman Plan area are served by the Placer County Sheriff's Department. In addition, traffic enforcement and accident investigations in the unincorporated area are provided by the California Highway Patrol. The Auburn Police Department is responsible for law enforcement within the city limits and maintains informal cooperative service agreements with the Sheriff's Department. There is also a formal mutual aid agreement in effect.

The Placer County Sheriff's Department has headquarters in the DeWitt Center at 11500 A Avenue in north Auburn. The Department has a staff of 275 permanent

employees; 170 of those are sworn positions and assigned to enforcement and custodial duties. The remaining 105 employees are civilians performing various administrative, communications and clerical duties. The full-time staff is augmented by 35 reserve officers. The Department is organized in a traditional manner consisting of five divisions: patrol services, investigations/coroner, corrections, marshals and a Tahoe substation. With the exception of the captain in charge of the Tahoe substation who reports directly to the Sheriff, all division commanders report to the chief deputy. The Department provides service to residents of Placer County which encompasses some 1400 square miles and serves a population of 90,000 in the unincorporated area. Presently, six deputies are assigned to the Auburn/Bowman Plan area, providing service on a 24-hour, 7 day a week basis.

During calendar year 1990, the Department responded to an estimated 35,000 calls for service in the entire county. It is estimated that 2450 or 7% of all calls for service were in the Plan area. Although exact figures are not available, a major portion of these calls were of a minor nature such as shoplifting, service station drive-outs, thefts, and aid to motorists. Due to a lack of data, an analysis of percentage of calls for service to the population in the Auburn/Bowman Plan area was not made. However, it is assumed that the calls for service are about average in relationship to the population of the area.

Average response time to calls in the project area is slightly less than the accepted 12 minute response time in most other areas of the county. Given the staffing patterns in most Sheriff's departments, greater distances to travel to calls, and expanded patrol areas compared to cities, the 8 to 12 minute response time is considered well within acceptable limits.

The Placer County Sheriff's headquarters is a converted military facility constructed in the 1940s which houses the administrative, patrol and investigative units of the department. The facility is considered obsolete and a new facility is needed. A County Criminal Justice Master Plan is in progress. It will identify the need for new facilities as well as methods of providing such facilities.

The present jail facility located at 2775 Richardson Drive at the DeWitt Center has recently been expanded from 140 beds to a 230-bed facility. Although the jail is separated from the Sheriff's headquarters, it is within the DeWitt Center complex. Due to present jail overcrowding and an increasing number of arrests, the Department estimates that the new jail facility will be at maximum capacity shortly after opening. There are no plans under consideration to expand the current jail facility or build another jail at this time. It should be noted that jail needs reflect the growth of the entire County, not just that of the Auburn/Bowman area.

Impacts

1. **Increased demand on Sheriff's Department with buildout of Plan area**
   Given the total population for the Plan area, and applying the ratio of officers to population of 1:1000, a total of approximately 20 additional positions would ultimately be required to provide the current level of service to the Plan area at ultimate buildout by the Sheriff's Department. Assuming development would occur in an orderly manner over the next twenty years (the life of the Plan), officers would need to be added at the rate of 1 to 3 officers annually.

   In addition, much of the planned development in the Plan area is urban in nature, and therefore involves a higher level of service expectation on the

part of residents: shorter response times of 3 to 5 minutes for emergency calls as compared to the present 8 minute response by the Sheriff's Department. The additional staff discussed above will be necessary to ensure this response time.

Associated with the addition of sworn officers to staff the Plan area by the Sheriff's Department, additional support personnel will be required. Likewise, equipment needs (vehicles and safety equipment) increase as personnel are added. The Quad report estimated support personnel needs at 25% of sworn officer needs and vehicle needs at one vehicle per five sworn officers. New structures which are currently needed include expanded jail facilities (beyond the 240 bed current capacity) and a new sheriff's headquarters building.

The economic and fiscal analysis prepared for the Plan (Recht Hausrath & Assoc., January 1993) projects a small annual cost/revenue shortfall through the Year 2000 ($65,000-$66,000/yr) and a positive balance by the Year 2005. As a result, it may be difficult to provide additional needed Sheriff personnel equipment, and facilities in the short-term. However, the Plan includes Implementation Measure 3 (p. 78) which calls for creation of an impact mitigation fee or use of Mello/Roos financing district in newly developing areas to meet law enforcement needs. Implementation of this program will serve to avoid significant, unmitigable impacts to law enforcement services.

However, in the short-term — until a fee is established or the jail is expanded, impacts are expected to be significant and unmitigable.

Conclusion: Based on the discussion above and the impact evaluation criteria, impacts are expected to be less than significant in the long-term but significant and unmitigable in the short term.

2. **Cumulative City plus County buildout.** Because the two entities have their own law enforcement agencies impacts combined are not cumulative in nature with the exception of County jail facilities. Jail fees charged via the mitigation fees called for in the Plan are expected to avoid significant adverse impacts in the long-term. As described under Impact #1, short-term impacts are expected to be significant and unmitigable.

Conclusion: Based on the impact evaluation criteria and discussion above, impacts are expected to be less than significant in the long-term, but significant and unmitigable in the short-term.

Additional Discussion

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

Summary - Previous Plan vs Updated Plan Impacts. The economic/fiscal analysis prepared for the Plan (Recht Hausrath & Assoc., January 1993) concluded that the updated Plan would have greater negative fiscal impacts than the previous Plan in the short-term. (Both plans are fiscally positive after the Year 2005.) However, law

enforcement needs will be somewhat less under the updated Plan because of the lesser residential holding capacity. Plan policies discussed in the sections above are expected to assist in avoidance of related significant impacts in the long-term, but until these measures are implemented impacts are expected to be significant and unmitigable in the short-term.

Mitigation Measures

1. Increased demand on Sheriff's Department with buildout of Plan area — No mitigation available for short-term impacts.

Effectiveness of Measure/Relevant Plan Provisions: Short-term unmitigable impacts; long-term less than significant impacts. Relevant Plan provisions include Public Protection Policy 2 and Implementation Measures 1-4 which should ensure impacts remain below the significant level in the long-term. However, impacts are expected to be significant and unmitigable in the short-term. Though annexation to the City is always an option, it is not considered a mitigation here because its implementation cannot be assured due to the need for LAFCO approval, an independent agency.

Implementation: N/A

2. Cumulative City plus County buildout — See #1.

Effectiveness of Measure/Relevant Plan Provisions: See discussion under 1 above.

Implementation: N/A

WATER SUPPLY

Setting

Domestic water in the Plan area is principally supplied by three agencies: Nevada Irrigation District (NID), Placer County Water Agency (PCWA) and the Christian Valley Community Services District. Figure 41 shows the water service area boundaries of these agencies. Many individual parcels within the Plan area are supplied with pumped groundwater by individual wells. A number of residences still utilize direct connections to irrigation ditches as a water supply.

The Nevada Irrigation District (NID) serves approximately 1800 customers in the North Auburn area, both east and west of Highway 49. The District itself covers portions of three counties and provides both agricultural and domestic water service. The District's Locksley Lane treatment plant has a current capacity of treating 4.0 million gallons per day and estimates a maximum daily flow of 1.20 gallons per minute per service. The expansion of the plant to 6 MGD is being designed and should be complete in 1994 (Vern Smith, personal communication 5/4/92). The District system is intertied at two locations with the PCWA system.

The Placer County Water Agency serves the City of Auburn and the adjacent urban portions of the Auburn/Bowman area. Under the Agency's contract with PG&E, the District can purchase up to 55,000 acre feet of water annually to supply the Auburn/

Bowman area. (This could serve a population of approximately 72,000 at 4 du/acre.)

The District has two water treatment plants serving the Plan area, one located north of Bowman and the other at the intersection of I-80 and the Auburn-Foresthill Road; each has a 5 MGD capacity. A 10 million gallon storage tank is currently under construction at the Bowman plant, and the expansion of that plant to 20 MGD capacity is being designed and should be completed in 1994. In the interim, the Bowman Plant is presently being expanded to provide an additional 2 MGD until the 20 MGD expansion is complete.

The Christian Valley Community Services District serves about 480 residential customers in the northern portion of the Auburn/Bowman area, north of Dry Creek Road. CVCSD purchases its water supply from the Placer County Water Agency and treats that supply at its water treatment plant near the intersection of Westridge Circle and Pondorex Road. After the water is treated, it is pumped approximately two miles to a 1.5 million gallon covered reservoir where it is stored and subsequently distributed to its service area.

In 1990, total water usage was 128 million gallons (mg), an average demand of approximately 0.36 mgd. During peak summer months, the average daily water flow is approximately .7 mgd and winter months average .15 mgd. The maximum daily flow is estimated at 1 mgd (Ed Bailey, Operations Manager, personal communication 5/92).

CVCSD treatment facilities are currently reported to be near capacity during peak periods. There are no immediate expansion plans for either the water treatment plant or storage reservoir. Further development in the CVCSD service area must be preceded by water treatment plant expansion or by service from PCWA.

Table 122
SUMMARY OF DISTRICT WATER TREATMENT PLANT CAPACITY

District	Current Demand (mgd)	Existing Capacity (mgd)
Placer County Water Agency	9.8[1]	10.0
Nevada Irrigation District	3.14[2]	4.0
Christian Valley Com.Serv.	.50[3]	1.0

[1] Combined Auburn and Bowman water treatment plants
[2] Vern Smith, NID Engineer
[3] Ed Bailey, Operations Manager CVCSD

Impacts

1. **Increased demand on surface water supplies and facilities.** The Quad report (Auburn/Bowman Community Plan Public Services/ Public Facilities Study, September 1991) estimated that Plan area buildout under Alternative 2 would create an ultimate total domestic water supply demand for 34 million gallons/day (mgd). The updated Plan is a variation on the original Alternative 2 with reduced residential holding capacity, thus reduced associated total water need. Over the entire planning area, water rights appear to be available to serve ultimate Plan area buildout:

- PCWA is currently planning for 25 mgd at their two treatment plants that serve the Plan area
- Christian Valley has a capacity of approximately 1 mgd;
- NID's planned program is to serve 4148 customers (8 mgd at 1886 gpd/connection)

These programs together total the needed 34 mgd. In addition, PCWA has the ability to purchase 55,000 acre feet/year (1127 mgd).

However, the Quad report did not provide a spatial analysis of the demand that will be created specifically within each water district. This is of particular concern in the NID North Auburn service area where the updated Plan includes a greater intensity of commercial and industrial land uses than under the evaluated Alternative 2. In addition, the Christian Valley system is near capacity. Since both of these systems are tied into the PCWA system, there is little concern as to future water supply. However, water treatment and distribution line systems may need to be upgraded.

To address overall expansion needs as growth occurs the three agencies have varying capital improvement programs:

- **PCWA** is currently preparing treatment plant expansion alternatives to provide adequate capacity at the two treatment plants that serve the Plan area to be able to meet projected demand. At this time the draft report appears to favor "constructing all of the needed Auburn/Bowman plant capacity at the Bowman site in a single phase" (pp. 4-6 PCWA Draft Master Plan). The Quad Public Facilities report indicated that a 10 million gallon storage tank is currently under construction at the Bowman plant, and the expansion of that plant to 20 MGD capacity is being designed and should be completed in 1994. PCWA proposes to finance the planned Bowman treatment plant expansion from current cash reserves and from loan instruments based on developer fees and rates. Current connection fees are $3,670 for a 5/8-inch metered residential unit. According to PCWA Engineer Brent Smith, impact mitigation fees are set based on future expansion expected, and the projected volume of new customers. These fees have been adequate to finance capital improvements needed to handle new growth.

- **NID**'s fee program is also adjusted as needed to meet projected needs. (Current residential hookup fees are $2,170 per 5/8-inch meter). At this time, expansion of the District's Locksley Lane treatment plant from its current 4.0 MGD capacity to at least 6.0 MGD capacity is anticipated during the summer of 1993. The District's Water Supply Master Plan for North Auburn prepared in 1987 is proposed to be updated again after the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan is adopted and fees will be adjusted.

  NID's current planning program anticipates serving 4148 customers at buildout of the current General Plan land use designations. With 1800 existing connections, the NID North Auburn service area is currently being planned to provide service to an additional 2348 customers based on their previous Master Plan. Based on existing connection rates in

their service area the 2348 available connections represents approximately 28 years of capacity (based on 84.2 connections per year averaged from 1986-1991). However, since the Quad report did not specifically outline NID system expansion needs under the Plan, it is not known whether or not ultimate Plan buildout is provided for. NID's system of hook-up fee adjustment as needed to provide for new capital facility needs offers reasonable assurance that facilities will be constructed.

— **CVSD**'s fee structure of 1,006 per 5/8-inch meter connection and monthly rate of approximately $14 is adequate to meet the needs the District (Ed Bailey, personal communication 4/92). No expansion plans are underway and as a result service to meet Plan buildout needs is not assured at this time.

Summary. To summarize:

— It appears that adequate water supplies are available to serve the Plan area.

— It appears that adequate facilities are planned to serve Plan area growth by PCWA;
— It is unknown whether or not planned facilities will be adequate to serve Plan area growth in the NID service area.
— No expansion plans have been made in the Christian Valley District service area.

To address these concerns, the Plan includes Water Supply Implementation Measures 1-2 calling for exploration of transfer of the Christian Valley system to a major agency and to monitor growth in the area until treatment plant capacity is expanded (Plan, pp. 71 and 73). In addition, the Plan includes a policy calling for annual Plan progress reports which will monitor growth relative to public facility impacts and ensure that action will be taken if impacts are anticipated. Water Supply Implementation Measure 6 calling for will-serve letters prior to development approval is also within the Plan. Thus, it is reasonably assured that water supplies and facilities will be available to serve growth as it occurs. The actual costs to provide these facilities are unknown since facility plans are not complete; but the financing structure exists to pay for the facilities regardless of the costs. It should be noted that these costs could rise considerably given past trends:

Table 123
HOOK-UP CHARGE AND WATER USE RATE TREND

	PCWA[1]		NID[2]		CVC0[3]	
Year	**Hookup**	**Mo. Use Rate**	**Hookup**	**Mo. Use Rate**	**Hookup**	**Mo. Use Rate**
1992	$3,670	$15.94	$2,120	$20.20	$1,006	$14+25¢
1991	$3,418	$14.61	$2,120	$20.20	$ 987	$12+22¢
1990	$3,418	$14.61	$2,020	$20.00	$ 957	$11+22¢
1989	$3,250	$14.12	$1,980	$19.85	$ 943	$10+20¢
1988	$2,500	$13.51	$1,930	$19.40	$ 943	$10+20¢

SOURCES: [1] PCWA [2] NID [3] CVCS

Conclusion: Based on the impact evaluation criteria and the analysis above, impacts are expected to be less than significant.

2. **Impacts related to new water system facilities.** New water lines and treatment facilities will be necessary to provide for growth per the Plan. Though, in general, water lines are located within street rights-of-way, alignments can be located in unpaved and undisturbed areas. Potential indirect impacts of line construction can occur including tree and vegetation loss, grading, and associated visual and erosion impacts. Water treatment plants can also include visual and noise impacts. Water Supply Policy 5, Implementation Measure 7, and the County's existing environmental review and permitting requirements should ensure that these impacts will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis and at least partially mitigated.

Conclusion: Based on the impact evaluation criteria and discussion above, indirect impacts due to expansion of water transmission lines and treatment plants are considered potentially significant and unmitigable.

3. **Groundwater supplies.** Rural residential uses in the northern, western, and southern portions of the Plan area generally depend on groundwater supplies for domestic needs and are anticipated to continue to be served by wells in the future. The adequacy of groundwater supplies varies greatly throughout the Plan area and is dependent on the geology of the area. Parcels and developments in the Plan area and adjacent to the Plan area (i.e., the Auburn Valley Country Club development) have experienced difficulties in maintaining adequate groundwater supplied quantities during recent drought years.

The Quad report indicated that in general, groundwater in the Auburn/ Bowman area is of moderate to high quality. In the past the only water quality problems encountered have been from wells located in serpentine rock where groundwater can be salty and brackish. However, Lynn Johnson of Placer County Environmental Health Division indicated in his response to the Notice of Preparation for this EIR that elevated nitrate concentrations have been discovered recently in the shallower groundwaters encountered in the southeast portion of the Plan area. This could be due to past fertilization of fruit tree orchards or on-site sewage disposal systems. Mr. Johnson also indicated that since excessive nitrate concentrations can cause health problems and since the extent and source of the problem is not fully known at this time, caution should be used in both the location of and in the sealing of water wells for domestic use in the Plan area. Groundwater problems similar to those encountered in the southeast corner of the Plan area may exist elsewhere. Permanent groundwater monitoring wells may be needed in areas where lands were historically used for agriculture and those areas heavily dependent on on-site septic tank systems. However, the Plan's Hydrology Policy 8 and the County's existing environmental review and new well and septic system permitting process should ensure that these potential impacts do not become significant.

Conclusion: Based on the impact evaluation criteria and discussion above, impacts resulting from groundwater use as buildout occurs in the Plan area are considered less than significant.

4. **Cumulative City plus County Buildout.** Since PCWA serves both the incorporated and unincorporated areas cumulative impacts are a particular concern. PCWA owns water rights for a combined population of up to 72,000 in the City/County plan areas. Ultimate buildout under the two plans could result in a population of 57,437 (assuming 22,520 in City limits, not including their Sphere of Influence).

   (Expansion of the water treatment and distribution system within the County areas is discussed in Impact 1. Within the City, connection fees and monthly service fees are the same charged County residents and are intended to mitigate cumulative impacts from growth in the PCWA service area. Thus, it is reasonably assured that adequate facilities will be funded.

Conclusion: Based on the impact evaluation criteria and analysis above, impacts are expected to be less than significant.

Additional Discussion

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

Buildout of the Sphere of Influence per the City land use designations. See #4, above.

Summary - Previous Plan vs Updated Plan Impacts. The updated Plan has a lower holding capacity than the previous Plan and, as a result, water supply needs would not be as great. However, urban densities are somewhat redirected to the north Auburn area including the DeWitt Center Area and the Bowman Mixed Use Area, redistributing water supply facility and treatment needs as discussed under Impact #1.

Mitigation Measures

1. **Increased demand on water system supplies/facilities- No additional measures are needed beyond those contained in the ABCP.**

Effectiveness of Measure/Relevant Plan Provisions: Less than significant impact. Relevant Plan provisions include Water Supply Goal 1, Policy 1, and Implementation Measure 6.

Implementation: N/A

2. **Impacts related to construction of new water system facilities. No additional mitigation available beyond those contained in the ABCP.**

Effectiveness of Measure/Relevant Plan Provisions: Potentially significant, unmitigable impacts. Relevant Plan provisions include Water Supply Policy 5 and Implementation Measure 7. In addition, existing environmental review and permitting process should partially mitigate these impacts, though not below the significant level.

Implementation: N/A

3. Groundwater supplies. None recommended for this less than significant impact.

Effectiveness of Measure/Relevant Plan Provisions: See discussion under 1-2 above.

Implementation: N/A

4. City plus County buildout - None recommended for this less than significant impact.

Effectiveness of Measure/Relevant Plan Provisions: See discussion under 1-2 above.

Implementation: N/A

FIRE PROTECTION

Setting

Fire protection services are currently provided to the Plan area by the Placer Foothills Consolidated Fire Protection District, the California Department of Forestry and the Newcastle Fire District. Figure 42 shows the present service areas of the fire protection agencies and existing and proposed station locations.

Placer Foothills Consolidated Fire Protection District. The Placer Foothills Consolidated Fire Protection District boundary includes an area generally west and north of the City of Auburn. Fire stations serving the Plan area are:

Table 124
PLACER FOOTHILLS CONSOLIDATED FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT STATIONS AND LOCATIONS

- Station #1: 11645 Atwood Road - North Auburn
- Station #2: 9305 Crater Hill Road - Ophir
- Station #3: 12990 Luther Road - Bowman
- Station #4: 6150 Grass Valley Highway - North Auburn

The four fire stations have been situated throughout the District's service area to allow the primary response station to be within a five-mile driving distance. This travel distance standard has allowed the District to maintain an Insurance Service Organization (ISO) rating of 4 (on a scale of 1 through 10, with 1 being the best rating) for all urban areas served by community water systems.

The District owns and operates six fire engines, four specialized wildland/grassland trucks, three water tankers, one rescue unit and one 100' aerial trucks, and employs 55 firefighters. In addition to the Fire Chief and administrative assistant, there are 7 full-time and 13 part-time firefighters together with 35 paid volunteers.

California Department of Forestry. The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF) has primary responsibility for fire suppression and fire prevention services throughout the mountainous regions of California. While the CDF is basically devoted to providing state-mandated wildland fire protection, it also provides contract fire service protection to individual counties.

With one fire truck assigned from the Placer Ranger Unit Headquarters located in the Bowman area at Lincoln Way and Rhodes Krueger Drive, the CDF serves the Bowman and Christian Valley area northeast of Auburn and the southern portion of the Plan area. Under contract with Placer County to provide urban fire services to these areas, the CDF relies on automatic aid from the Auburn Fire Department, the Placer Foothills Consolidated Fire Protection District, and the Newcastle Fire Protection District.

With the automatic aid agreements and available water, the Bowman area has an ISO rating of 4. The Christian Valley and Southern Plan area, which is outside the five mile driving distance from the CDF station at Bowman, is not rated by the ISO. In rural areas, fire stations are generally located within a five-mile driving distance from developed areas. However, there are no specific standards set forth by State or federal agencies for such areas.

Newcastle Fire Protection District. A small portion of the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan area is within the Newcastle Fire Protection District. This area includes the Auburn Indian Rancheria, an unincorporated island situated in the southwestern portion of the City of Auburn, and also includes lands along Indian Hill Road just west of the Auburn city limits.

Located in the community of Newcastle, the fire station is situated at the intersection of Newcastle Road and Indian Hill Road, approximately 1.5 miles west of the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan boundary. With six part-time paid fire suppression personnel, four fire engines, one water tanker and a rescue truck, an ISO rating of 7 has been established for the District.

Impacts

1. **Increased demand on fire protection services with buildout of the Plan area.**

   a. **Placer Foothill Consolidated Fire Protection District.** The PFCFPD will have to add additional paid and volunteer firefighters in addition to adding/replacing fire fighting equipment with buildout of the Plan area. While the Plan has a lower dwelling unit and commercial/office professional holding capacity than the previous Plan it has approximately 100 additional industrially designed acres. However, in general fire protection impacts under the previous and updated plans would be similar. Impacts will result from incremental growth guided by the Plan; the District will need specialized equipment and manpower to meet the changes in fire protection demand that occurs when an area changes from a rural to an urban setting. In particular, hazardous material response capabilities will need to be improved as well as aerial capabilities if maximum structure height is increased. According to PFCFPD Chief Ron Wright, the District's annual Fire Suppression fee of $48 for single-family, $24 for mobile homes, and

5 cents/sq.ft. for commercial buildings with a maximum fee of $300 for Commercial buildings with sprinklers and $600 for buildings without sprinklers has been adequate to fund personnel and equipment needs as a result of incremental growth. However, Chief Wright has indicated that recent decisions by the State legislature to divert money away from local governments will force the District to look for other revenue sources to fund operations, purchase equipment, and construct stations. The Plan includes Fire Protection Implementation Measure 12 requiring will-serve letters which will ensure that fees are paid as development occurs. In addition, yearly progress reports on Plan implementation as called for in the Plan will monitor public facilities level-of-service. Mr. Wright also indicated that the land use distribution proposed in the Plan is not expected to result in a need for additional stations or relocation of fire stations in the PFCFP over the 20 year Plan period or at ultimate buildout.

b. **Bowman Area/Christian Valley.** The present level of fire protection service in the Bowman/Christian Valley area northeast of Auburn does not meet the generally accepted fire standards available to the other portions of the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan area; any further buildout of these areas without adequate fire protection provisions could have significant adverse impacts. It should be noted that the Fire Protection Implementation Measures 1 and 2 should ensure that the fire protection service level in this area increases as buildout occurs.

Annexation to the PFCFPD would increase the Level of Service. This would require Station #3 being closed and the equipment being relocated to a new station north of Dry Creek and West of I-80. Mr. Wright indicated that in order to facilitate the relocation of the District's Station #3, to purchase equipment and fund personnel, the County would need to establish a development impact fee for the station, equipment, and a tax exchange and an annual Fire Suppression Assessment fee to maintain the station and equipment and pay for manning and operating costs. Preliminary estimates place construction and development costs at $500,000 for this facility, a 4000 square foot structure which includes living quarters for 24-hour fire protection services. Additional equipment would be needed to serve the annexed area. The needed equipment would include a water tender, 100-foot aerial engine, and a wildland/grassland fire truck which would cost approximately $200,000 to $250,000 (1991 dollars). The new facility should be staffed by three full-time fire suppression personnel during the week with night and weekends being covered by part-time employees and paid volunteers providing backup support for fire calls and emergency medical services. This site is not shown on the proposed Land Use Map. Alternately, Hank Weston, CDF Ranger Unit Chief indicated that CDF could provide additional urban type fire protection services to the Bowman/Christian Valley area if Placer County would contract for the higher service level.

However, Chief Wright indicated that if the Christian Valley area were protected by his District it would receive an ISO rating of 4, meaning lower residential insurance rates to homeowners. This probably would not be the case if CDF increased their level of service to the Bowman/Christian Valley area. This is due in part to CDF serving this area from their Lincoln Way station and Consolidated providing a new station in the Christian Valley area.

c. **Southern Plan area.** This area is served by both the CDF through a contract with Placer County from its Bowman headquarters and the Newcastle Fire Protection District from its Newcastle station. (see Figure 42 for service area boundaries). The land use designations in the portion served by CDF will result in only a minor increase in residential densities in the southwest corner of the Plan. Current agricultural (10-80 acre minimum) land use designations will be changed to Rural Estate (4.6-10 acre minimum). According to Ranger Unit Chief Hank Weston, CDF can continue to provide urban fire protection service to this area and he does not expect the new land use designations to significantly affect the CDF.

The land use designations for the portion of the Plan area served by the Newcastle Fire Protection District have not changed from existing designations. NFPD Chief Ray Vega indicated the District has adequate equipment and personnel to continue serving their portion of the Plan area and does not expect any adverse impact from Plan implementation.

The public facility report prepared by Quad Consultants (1991) for the Placer County Planning Department contained the following recommendation for fire protection services in the southern portion of the Plan area (pp. 4-3 to 4-5):

> In the Southwestern portion of the Plan area the Newcastle Fire Protection District and/or the Auburn Fire Department provide a reasonable level of service, although it would be more logical for the area, including the Indian Rancheria, to be served exclusively by the City of Auburn.
>
> Although the Newcastle Fire Protect District can serve the southwestern portion of the Plan area, as development occurs, the city of Auburn should extend fire protection to this territory. City fire protection service has been significantly improved in the southern portion of the community with recent construction of the City's Maidu Fire Station located at the northeast corner of Auburn Folsom Road and Maidu Drive. Response time from this station would not exceed 5 minutes.

According to NFPD Chief Ray Vega, the revenue loss which would result from a transfer of service from the NFPD to the AFD would not financially impact his district. However, Mr. Vega, likewise, does not feel continued service to the Rancheria will impact the NFPD primarily because of the adequacy of the District's fee structure.

requiring will serve letters which will ensure that fees are paid as development occurs. In addition, yearly progress reports on Plan implementation called for in the Plan will monitor public facilities levels of service.

Conclusion: Based on the impact evaluation criteria and discussion above, implementation of the Plan is not expected to result in significant impacts to any of the fire protection districts. The District's impact mitigation fees and annual fire suppression fees appear to be adequate to meet the growing demands in each district.

2. **Wildland fire hazard.** The continuation of the drought conditions in El Dorado, Placer and Nevada Counties makes the Auburn/Bowman area particularly susceptible to wild land fires originating in surrounding counties as well as from within Placer County. This hazard is based on the combination of highly flammable vegetation, steep terrain, extremely dry climate and the presence of structures. Figure 42 shows the location of areas that have potential for extreme, high and moderate fire hazard.

The Plan would serve to reduce wildland fire potential by designating approximately 3909 acres of open space land previously designated in the previous Plan for large lot residential land uses. In addition, the urbanization pattern in the Plan area would redirect growth somewhat to an urban core area and reduce densities in the outlying Plan area. For example, the northeastern portion of the Plan (north of Dry Creek Road) designates a substantial amount of open space lands and increases the minimum parcel size for the Rural Estate land use designations from the existing 2.3-4.6 acre minimum to a 4.6-10 acre minimum parcel size.

The State Responsibility Area (SRA) Fire Safe Regulations provide fire safe standards for emergency access, signing and building numbering, private water supply reserves for emergency fire use, and vegetation modification. These regulations do not set minimum lot sizes in the various fire hazard classifications.

There are areas designated for urban densities which are located in high fire hazard areas. For example, the proposed mixed use area north of the Dewitt Center has been designated as a high fire hazard area by CDF but contains high density land use designations. However, it is assumed that the fairly high densities proposed will reduce wildland fire hazard by removing most of the flammable vegetation in this area. The southeastern portion of the Plan area designated Rural Residential (2.3-4.6 acre lots) is also in an area mapped by CDF as an extreme fire hazard area. Therefore, the Plan will result in residential structures being located in areas mapped as extreme fire hazards.

Conclusion: Based on the discussion above and the impact evaluation criteria, significant, wildland fire hazards

will remain with buildout of the Plan. Impacts are considered significant, and unmitigable.

3. **Cumulative impacts - City plus County Buildout.** As annexations occur, fiscal impacts due to loss of funding to the surrounding fire districts could result in reduced ability to serve the unincorporated area. However an existing agreement between the City and the PFCFPD allows fire protection after annexation to remain with the PFCFPD. The Newcastle Fire Protection District does not include any of the City's sphere of influence other than the Indian Rancheria.

Conclusion: Based on the discussion above, impacts are expected to be less than significant.

Additional Discussion

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

Summary - Previous Plan vs Updated Plan Impacts. As discussed above under the individual impact areas, the Plan has a lower dwelling unit and commercial/ office professional holding capacity than the previous Plan and approximately 100 additional industrially designated acres. As a result, in general, fire protection impacts under the previous and updated plans would be similar.

Mitigation Measures

1. **Increased demand on fire protection services. No additional mitigation measures needed beyond those contained in the Plan.**

Effectiveness of Measure/Relevant Plan Provisions: Less than significant impact. Fire Protection Goals 2 and 3 and Implementation Measures 2,3,4 and 5 should ensure a high level of fire protection service throughout the Plan area.

Implementation: N/A

2. **Wildland fire hazard exposure — No mitigation available.**

Effectiveness of Measure/Relevant Plan Provisions: Significant, ummitigable impact. Due to the location of rural residential densities in high fire hazard areas, impacts are considered significant and unmitigable. No mitigation measures have been identified to reduce this impact to a less than significant level. Relevant Plan provisions include Fire Protection Policies 3 and 4, and Implementation Measures 1,2,3,4,6,7,8 and 12.

Implementation: N/A

3. **City plus County buildout - None recommended for this less than significant impact.**

Effectiveness of Measure/Relevant Plan Provisions: See discussion under 1-2 above.

Implementation: N/A