Clean Water Act Section 401 Permit – Water Quality Certification

If an USACOE permit, or any other federal permit, is required for this project due to the disturbance of waters of the United States (such as streams and wetlands), then a Water Quality Certification must be obtained from the Central Valley Water Board prior to initiation of project activities. There are no waivers for 401 Water Quality Certifications.

Waste Discharge Requirements

If USACOE determines that only non-jurisdictional waters of the State (i.e., "non-federal" waters of the State) are present in the proposed project area, the proposed project will require a Waste Discharge Requirement (WDR) permit to be issued by Central Valley Water Board. Under the California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, discharges to all waters of the State, including all wetlands and other waters of the State including, but not limited to, isolated wetlands, are subject to State regulation.

For more information on the Water Quality Certification and WDR processes, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/help/business_help/permit2.shtml.

Low or Limited Threat General NPDES Permit

If the proposed project includes construction dewatering and it is necessary to discharge the groundwater to waters of the United States, the proposed project will require coverage under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. Dewatering discharges are typically considered a low or limited threat to water quality and may be covered under the General Order for *Dewatering and Other Low Threat Discharges to Surface Waters* (Low Threat General Order) or the General Order for *Limited Threat Discharges of Treated/Untreated Groundwater from Cleanup Sites, Wastewater from Superchlorination Projects, and Other Limited Threat Wastewaters to Surface Water* (Limited Threat General Order). A complete application must be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board to obtain coverage under these General NPDES permits.

For more information regarding the Low Threat General Order and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_decisions/adopted_orders/general_orders/r5-2013-0074.pdf

For more information regarding the Limited Threat General Order and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_decisions/adopted_orders/general_orders/r5-2013-0073.pdf

If you have questions regarding these comments, please contact me at (916) 464-4684 or tcleak@waterboards.ca.gov.

Trevor Cleak

Trevor Cleak
Environmental Scientist

cc: State Clearinghouse Unit, Governor's Office of Planning and Research, Sacramento

MIWOK MAIDU United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria

Gene Whitehouse, Chairman | John L. Williams, Vice Chairman | Danny Rey, Secretary | Brenda Adams, Treasurer | Calvin Moman, Council Member

RECEIVED
FEB 21 2014
ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATION SERVICES

February 12, 2014

Maywan Krach
County of Placer
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190
Auburn, CA 95603

Subject: PGPA T20130025 - Sheridan Community Plan Update

Dear Maywan Krach,

Thank you for requesting information regarding the above referenced project. The United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC) of the Auburn Rancheria is comprised of Miwok and Southern Maidu (Nisenan) people whose tribal lands are within Placer County and whose service area includes El Dorado, Nevada, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, and Yuba counties. The UAIC is concerned about development within its aboriginal territory that has potential to impact the lifeways, cultural sites, and landscapes that may be of sacred or ceremonial significance. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this and other projects in your jurisdiction.

In order to ascertain whether or not the project could affect cultural resources that may be of importance to the UAIC, we would like to receive copies of any archaeological reports that have been, or will be, completed for the project. We also request copies of future environmental documents for the proposed project so that we have the opportunity to comment on potential impacts and proposed mitigation measures related to cultural resources. The UAIC would also like the opportunity to have our tribal monitors accompany you during the field survey. The information gathered will provide us with a better understanding of the project and cultural resources on site and is invaluable for consultation purposes.

The UAIC's preservation committee has identified cultural resources within your project area and in close proximity, and would like to request a site visit to confirm their locations and meet with you regarding this project. Thank you again for taking these matters into consideration, and for involving the UAIC early in the planning process. We look forward to reviewing the aforementioned documents as requested. Please contact Marcos Guerrero, Cultural Resources Manager, at (530) 883-2364 or by email at mguerrero@auburnrancheria.com if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Gene Whitehouse,
Chairman

CC: Marcos Guerrero, CRM

SHINGLE SPRINGS RANCHERIA
P.O. BOX 1340; SHINGLE SPRINGS, CA 95682
(530) 676-8010; FAX (530) 676-3582

February 20, 2014

Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 140
Auburn, CA 95603

RE: PGPA T20130025-Sheridan Community plan update

Dear Christopher Schmidt

Thank you for your letter dated for January 2, 2014 seeking information regarding the PGPA T20130025-Sheridan Community plan update. Based on the information provided, the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians is not aware of any known cultural resources on this site. However, SSR would like to have continued consultation through updates, as the project progresses this will foster a greater communication between the Tribe and your agency.

SSR would also like to request any and all completed record searches and or surveys that were done in or around the project area up to and including environmental, archaeological and cultural reports.

If during the progress of the project new information or human remains are found we would like to be able to go over our process with you that we currently have in place to protect such important and sacred artifacts (especially near rivers and streams).

Please contact the following individuals if such finds are made:

Andrew Godsey, Assistant Cultural Resource Director / NAI
Office: (530) 698-1403 agodsey@ssband.org

And copy all communications to:
Cynthia Franco, Administrative Assistant (530)698-1557 cfranco@ssband.org

Thank you for providing us with this notice and opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Daniel Fonseca
Cultural Resource Director
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO)
Most Likely Descendent (MLD)

RECEIVED
FEB 24 2014
PLANNING DEPT.

Attachment 'E' – Zoning Text Amendment

Section 1. Section 17.04.030 of Chapter 17 of the Placer County Code is hereby amended as follows:

17.04.030 Definitions of Land Uses, Specialized Terms and Phrases

******

"Live/work unit" or **"live/work space"** means a building or spaces within a building used jointly for commercial and residential purposes where the residential use of the space is secondary or accessory to the primary use as a place of work. A live/work unit (a) combines a commercial activity allowed in the zone with a residential living space for the owner of the commercial business, or the owner's employee, and that person's household; (b) where the resident owner or employee of the business is responsible for the commercial activity performed; and (c) where the commercial activity conducted takes place subject to a valid business license associated with the premises. Live/Work units are an allowed use within the Town Center Commercial (-TC) combining district.

Section 2. Section 17.52 of Chapter 17 of the Placer County Code is hereby amended as follows:

17.52.135 Town Center Commercial (-TC)

A. **Purpose and Intent**

1. The Board of Supervisors finds that the Town Center Commercial (-TC) district is an overlay district which allows flexibility in the underlying general district regulations (including both permitted Use Types and Development Standards) by reference to regulations adopted in the Community Plan which applies to the property so classified.

2. The -TC, Town Center Commercial district is intended to be applied in circumstances where the desired mix of uses cannot be achieved with standard Commercial or Residential zoning.

B. **Combining District Requirements**

1. **Land Use Permit Requirements.** The Board of Supervisors, in approving a zoning reclassification may combine the -TC, Town Center Commercial district with any residential or commercial district, where said combining district has been identified in a community plan. The -TC, Town Center Commercial District section of the applicable Community Plan shall specify the types of uses allowed or disallowed in the combining district. The allowed uses shall follow the permit requirements of the underlying zone district.

2. **Development Standards.** Where property is zoned -TC, Town Center Commercial district, development standards provided in the applicable Community Plan shall supersede development standards contained in this Title for the underlying zone district. If a standard is not addressed within the applicable Community Plan, it shall be governed by the standards established by the underlying zone district.

Attachment ‘F’

Correspondence

JAN. 15 2014

PLACER COUNTY
PLANNING SERVICES DIVISION
ATTN: CHRISTOPHER SCHMIDT
3091 COUNTY CENTER DR, SUITE 190
AUBURN, CA 95603

DEAR MR. SCHMIDT,

AFTER READING AND REVIEWING THE DRAFT SHERIDAN COMMUNITY PLAN THRU CHAPTER 8, I HAVE A FEW CONCERNS AND COMMENTS ABOUT WHAT PART THAT I HAVE READ

1. REGARDING HIGHER DENSITY HOUSING, IT WAS MY UNDERSTANDING THAT WE GOING TO LIMIT HIGHER DENSITY HOUSING ONLY FOR THE TRAILOR PARK, BUT I FIND LISTED ON PAGE 17, ITEM 10, PAGE 19 ITEM 1.3 AND 2.4, AND ON PAGE 38 ITEM 12.

2. THERE APPEARS TO BE A FLAG LOT ON CAMP FAR WEST ROAD BETWEEN RIOSA RD AND H STREET. HOW IS IT GOING TO BE AFFECTED BY THIS PLAN?

3. REGARDING GROUNDWATER YOU SHOULD CONTACT THE FACILITY SERVICES DIVISION REGARDING THIS ITEM AS THEY DID A STUDY OF THE GROUNDWATER SITUATION IN SHERIDAN FOR THE NEW WELL WHICH WOULD GIVE YOU BETTER DATA, ON PAGE 118

4. ON PAGE 119 YOU REFERENCE WINDS. SOME WINDS FROM THE NORTH HAVE BEEN KNOW TO REACH SPEEDS OF 45 TO 60 MPH BASED ON READINGS AT BEALE AFB.

5. ON PAGE 142 YOU TALK ABOUT INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL NOISE SOURCES, BUT YOU DO NOT INCLUDE CEMEX GRAVEL PLANT IN YOUR DISCUSSION. THE MAC UNS RECEIVE SEVERAL COMPLAINTS ABOUT THE NOISE FROM CEMEX PLANT AND TRUCKS GOING THRU TOWN TO AND FROM

THE CEMAX PLANT

6. IN THE CIRCULATION CHAPTER 8 THERE IS NO MENTION OF A PLANNED UPGRADE TO THE BRIDGE ON DOWD ROAD AT COON CREEK. SHOULD THIS BE INCLUDED IN THIS CHAPTER?

NOTE TO HAVE READ AND COMMENTED ON CHAPTERS 9 AND 10 IN THE NEXT TWO WEEKS.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND WORK ON THIS PROJECT.

SINCERELY

Lee Bastien

LEE BASTIEN
P.O. BOX 417
SHERIDAN, CA 95681

Christopher Schmidt

From: Pamela Lane <reneelane1@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 06, 2014 10:05 PM
To: Christopher Schmidt
Subject: #1 proposed HS-UP-DC

Christopher Schmidt, Senior Planner:

I will vote no to the #1 proposed site to change from farm and barn to HS-UP-Dc. My family and myself have discussed the idea of a Service Station being put on our next door neighbor's property. The fumes from the station will make it intolerable for us to enjoy outside activities. Also, the noise from the cars and motorcycles will keep us up all night.

Please reconsider using the #1 proposed site next to our 5831 N. Hwy 65 home.

Thank you for your time in this important matter.

Pamela Lane

FEB 7, 2014

RECEIVED
FEB 13 2014
PLANNING DEPT.

PLACER COUNTY
PLANNING SERVICES DIVISION
ATTN: CHRISTOPHER SCHMIDT
3091 COUNTY CENTER DR, SUITE 140
AUBURN, CA 95603

DEAR MR. SCHMIDT,

JUST FINISH READING CHAPTERS NINE AND TEN AND ONLY HAVE ONE COMMENT REGARDING THEM. IN CHAPTER 10 PUBLIC SERVICES ON PAGE 201, YOU TALK ABOUT LIBRARY SERVICES, BUT YOU MAKE NO REFERENCE OF THE LIBRARY BOOK MOBILE WHICH COMES TO SHERIDAN, I'M NOT SURE OF THERE SCHEDULE, SO YOU MAY WANT TO CONTACT LIBRARY SERVICES.

AS I MENTION AT THE LAST MEETING THE NORTH SIDE OF F STREET AND SHERIDAN-LINCOLN BLVD MIGHT MAKE A GOOD LOCATION FOR A GAS STATION OR A DRIVE THRU.

ANOTHER GENTLEMAN CONCERN ABOUT HAVING RESIDENCES ON 13RD STREET IS ALSO A CONCERN OF MINE UNLESS THERE ARE ATTACHED TO A BUSINESS AS WE DISCUSS FOR MIX/USED.

ONE OTHER MINOR PROBLEM ON THE DRAFT COPY THAT I RECEIVED ~~AN~~ MY LAST NAME IS MISSPELLED ON THE MAC MEMBER LISTING, IT IS BASTIEN NOT BASTIAN

THANKS FOR ALL YOUR HELP AND ASSISTANCE ON THIS PROJECT

SINCERELY

Lee Bast

LEE BASTIEN
P.O. BOX 417
SHERIDAN, CA 95681

Christopher Schmidt

From: Pamela Lane <reneelane1@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 13, 2014 8:03 AM
To: Christopher Schmidt
Subject: No on proposed land change #1

Dear Mr. Schmidt:

At the last couple of meetings with the Sheridan Community Plan public workshop, I have voiced my opinion about my next door neighbor #1 proposed highway service parcel. I do not want this parcel to change from farm and barn to HS-UP-DC. I believe that a better place for HS-UP-DC is in the town of Sheridan, CA, or below us toward Lincoln.

A service station next door to our property 5831 Sheridan Lincoln Blvd. will force us to sell our existing animals and God forsaken have to move. We have owned our property for over 50 years. Please listen to me and drop the proposed existing #1 site.

I have given you my final say on this subject.

Pamela Lane
583l Sheridan Lincoln Blvd.
Sheridan, CA 95681

To: Christopher Schmidt (Senior Planner) February 13, 2014

Regarding: Sheridan Community Plan

Chris,

Thank you for all your hard work in developing the Sheridan Community Plan. It has evolved into a good plan which I think will benefit the residents of the Sheridan community in the years ahead. It has been challenging, trying to develop a good plan and be respectful and considerate of the diverse needs and desires of the many people. You have been exceptional in this regard.

However, as you are aware, Pamela Lane and her family, all long-time Sheridan residents, have been visibly upset regarding a proposed highway service designation earmarked for a gas station on land just north of the Highway 65 off ramp, adjacent to their property (a farm) They are concerned regarding the change in the quality of their lives if a business such as a gas station becomes their neighbor. It will be very difficult trying to mitigate their concerns without significantly hampering the viability of the service station.

Even though this does look like a reasonable location for a service station, there are many reasons why this would not be good for the community. There are certainly many good, and I think, better options for the location of a service station.

The parcel in question for a service station is not large. There would be a significant cost in developing a service station there and at the same time, adequately mitigating the concerns of the Lanes. It would probably be prohibitively expensive to bring sewer and water under the railroad tracks to this isolated parcel alone to develop it as a service station. This would hamper or even preclude the development of this parcel as a service station which is the whole purpose of changing the zoning of this parcel in the first place. There was an overriding concern of the Sheridan Subcommittee that this Sheridan Community Plan encourage development that would benefit the community in terms of services available and in terms of bringing in needed tax revenue to pay for needed services in the Sheridan community. Providing zoning for a service station, which would be extremely difficult to develop in this location, probably would not advance these goals.

The Highway 65 offramp travelers provide a great opportunity for Sheridan

businesses. (especially on 13th Street) If travelers turn left on Sheridan Lincoln Blvd. to purchase gas (and snacks at the convenience market which is part of the service station), they will likely just get back on the highway. If on the other hand, travelers turn right on Sheridan Lincoln Blvd. to purchase gas and snacks at a service station on Sheridan Lincoln Blvd, 13th Street or on Wind Flower Place, they are entering the developed area of Sheridan and will visibly see the businesses on 13th Street, etc. and hence, will benefit the local business community. (In contrast, the parcel proposed for the service station, by turning left on Sheridan Lincoln Blvd, is in an isolated area where there is no development and where there will be no other development and where the travelers would not be visually or geographically introduced to the local businesses of Sheridan)

My personal concerns complement the concerns of the Lanes. There was a consensus of the Sheridan Subcommittee that the forty acres bordered by Wind Flower Place and Highway 65 be zoned for industrial or business professional or commercial. The intention at the time was to provide an opportunity for a developer to have a large enough parcel (or parcels) to be financially able to bring in sewer and water to develop the property. As you mentioned, the Placer County Planning Department recommended that only the north twenty five acres of the forty acre parcel be included in the Business Park in order to keep the environmental review to a negative declaration and to avoid an Environmental Impact Report.

Including the excluded fifteen acres in the Business Park would be beneficial to the residents of the Sheridan community. This would encourage travelers to travel south of the Riosa offramp to Highway 65 where the Sheridan business community resides and not north of the offramp, where no business interests are served. (At the subcommittee meeting, someone suggested an ice cream parlor on 13th Street and someone else said that you needed customers and it is evident how highway travelers going south off the offramp could help this business person, but wouldn't even know the ice cream parlor exists if they turn left off the offramp and go north on the Sheridan Lincoln Highway to get their gas and snacks)

Including the fifteen acres (which is proposed by the Planning Committee to remain agricultural) in the Business Park will run the developable parcel approximately another one half mile south (This is a long, thin, triangular parcel-not very good for a single family home/ranchette) which brings the parcel one half mile closer to a possible extension of the Lincoln sewer system, which at build out of the Villages of Lincoln would be approximately three miles from Sheridan. (at a million dollars a mile to lay sewer line, that is not insignificant)

Our original parcel was three hundred twenty acres (bordered by Dowd, Riosa, Dalbey, and the canal) This parcel was an approved subdivision of thirty two rectangular ten acre ranchettes which I had great plans for, including the building of my home on one of these ten acre parcels. When Caltrans took fifty acres by eminent domain for the highway, splitting our subdivision, I was left with two hundred thirty acres to the west of the highway and forty acres to the east of the highway (the forty acres in question) These forty acres are now being split again, leaving me with an isolated, long, thin fifteen acre parcel, which is not very suitable for a ranchette (a far cry from our original subdivision of ranchettes)

Reincorporating these fifteen acres back into the Business Park as recommended by the Sheridan Subcommittee could easily be accomplished without the need for an Environmental Impact Report by removing the parcel north of the Riosa offramp and/or removing a southernly portion of the parcel zoned industrial bordered by Wind Flower Place and Sheridan Lincoln Blvd.

There was a consensus of the Sheridan Subcommittee to diversify and expand the economic base and to provide services to meet the needs of all the residents. Facilitating these goals should be the goal of the final Sheridan Community Plan as well. I think these goals can best be reached by considering the ideas mentioned above.

Thank you again for all your help in this matter.

Sincerely,

Jim McMonagle

Christopher Schmidt

From: Jennifer Byous
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2014 10:18 AM
To: Christopher Schmidt
Subject: FW: #1 F-B on Sheridan Community Plan problem

Hi Chris-
This is for you. Hope all is going well with the project.
Jen

-----Original Message-----
From: Pamela Lane [mailto:reneelane1@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2014 9:15 AM
To: Jennifer Byous
Subject: #1 F-B on Sheridan Community Plan problem

Hi Jennifer:

I am a Sheridan, CA resident for 28 years. When I voted on the Sheridan Community Plan, I voted for open spaces keeping the existing farm and barns.

I agree with all the proposed land changes except #1 on the map. For sixty+ years the 6 acres has remained farm and barn. Mr. and Mrs. Rice planted many trees on the #1 property. There are a dozen Oak trees along with three Honey Locust trees, two evergreen trees, a huge Palm tree, and an old Centurion plant.

I believe that before the MAC team vote in April on #1 property to change from F-B to HS-UP-Dc there should be an environmental assessment on the land under CEQA.

Thank you for your concern in this matter.

Pamela Lane

Christopher Schmidt

From: Pamela Lane <reneelane1@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2014 10:49 AM
To: Christopher Schmidt
Subject: Take #1 property off the Sheridan Community Plan map

Christopher Schmidt, Senior Planner:

As a Placer County land owner, I request you to take the existing property for #1 on the Sheridan Community Plan map off. I believe the property is 5830 Sheridan Lincoln Blvd.

My property, 5831 Sheridan Lincoln Blvd., Sheridan, CA, is land with my family and animals.

I fear that by putting a Service Station next to my property will be an air and soil pollution problem for my family and animals.

Also, the existing #1 property on the Sheridan Community Plan map have a dozen Oak trees that are protected by Placer County CEQA and County's Preservation Ordinance.

Regards,
Pamela Lane
5831 Sheridan Lincoln Blvd.
Sheridan, CA 95681

Christopher Schmidt

From: Pamela Lane <reneelane1@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2014 10:00 AM
To: Christopher Schmidt
Subject: Re: New Buffering Language

Christopher Schmidt:

I am a Placer County resident of 28 years, and my husband has owned this property for about 50 years. Our property and our next door neighbors property, #1 on the Sheridan Community Plan map, have been farm and barn for over 50 years. I voted last year for open spaces and to keep the existing farm and barn lands to stay the same.

My family and I do not want you to change the existing @1 from farm and barn to HS-UP-Dc.

Please look into all other possibilities to place #1 on the Sheridan Community Plan map.

I do not agree with your buffering language ideas because I do not want a Service Station next door to my family.

Do your job wisely as my Placer County Senior planner.

Thank you
Pamela Lane

On Wed, 2/19/14, Christopher Schmidt <CRSchmid@placer.ca.gov> wrote:

Subject: New Buffering Language
To: "Pamela Lane" <reneelane1@yahoo.com>
Cc: "Lyndell Grey" <LGrey@placer.ca.gov>, "Crystal Jacobsen" <CJacobse@placer.ca.gov>
Date: Wednesday, February 19, 2014, 8:47 AM

Hi Pamela-

There are currently lighting, setback, noise, and buffering policies in the Plan but I want to get more specific on what would be required in a Highway Service zone, if approved. Below is some language I've prepared:

Provide a landscaped buffer wherever necessary to minimize the conflicts inherent to adjoining properties of different zoning intensity, density, or adverse uses. The buffer area is intended to provide noise abatement and an effective visual barrier between different land uses.

Buffers shall be a minimum width of 50 foot. The setting and selection of plants shall be such as to assure securing eighty percent (80%) opacity within twelve (12) months after the landscaping is begun. A buffer may be reduced to not less than 25 foot where the buffer includes a combination of features such as an 8 foot screening fence (lower if placed upon a berm), landscaped berms with trees and shrubbery, and/or dense landscaping, with guarantees of proper, ongoing landscaping maintenance.

We will discuss this and the Plan in general at the MAC meeting on March 12. The MAC will not be voting on the Plan at this meeting. The earliest that will happen will be April. The meeting on the 12th will just be an overview (shorter than the public meeting, I promise), plus a question and answer period.

Please call if you have any questions.

Chris
530.745.3076