3. Summary Revised

The Summary Table in this section lists each potential impact expected as a result of implementation of the General Plan and the measures recommended to mitigate them. These introductory paragraphs list the avoidable and unavoidable significant impacts and briefly describe areas of controversy and the issues yet to be resolved. A full discussion of each impact can be found in the various chapters of this EIR.

Avoidable

Significant Impacts Which Can be Mitigated (Plan Alone)

The impacts which may result from implementation of the General Plan within the unincorporated area alone which have the potential to be significantly adverse but which can be avoided are listed below.

LAND USE

- Housing mix
- Land Use Compatibility - Auburn Folsom/Maidu Drive Mixed Use Area
- Land Use Compatibility - E.V. Cain School Mixed Use Area
- Land Use Compatibility - Dewitt Center Mixed Use Area (visual)
- Land Use Compatibility - North Side Indian Hill Mixed Use Area
- Land Use Compatibility - Russell Avenue Mixed Use Areas
- Land Use Compatibility - Other potential Land Use Compatibility concerns

Ref: Final EIR, p. 3

- Land Use Compatibility - Luther Road/Hwy 49 Commercial area
- 4 du/ac designation in Aeolia Drive Area

Ref: Addendum to Final EIR, p. 2

- Simmons Commercial CD/OSP Designation, SW corner of Indian Hill Road and Auburn Folsom Road
- Procissi MU 6 du/ac CD/OSP designation, NW corner of Auburn Folsom and Indian Hill Road

VISUAL

- Streams and Riparian Areas
- Scenic Corridors within City Limits
- Viewshed of Russell Off-Ramp

GEOLOGY / LANDFORMS

- Erosion
- Seismic Hazards
- Landsliding Potential

Ref: Addendum to Final EIR, p. 2

- Simmons Commercial CD/OSP Designation, SW corner of Indian Hill Road and Auburn Folsom Road

HYDROLOGY / WATER QUALITY

- Impacts of Proposed Bridge and Culvert Improvements
- Increases in Stormwater Runoff and Flooding on Canals
- Impacts of Detention Facilities

- Degradation of Surface Water (generally)
- Impacts of Recommended Water Quality Protection Facilities

BIOTIC RESOURCES

- Impacts on Riparian Habitat
- Impacts to Special Natural Communities

PUBLIC FACILITIES

Ref: Final EIR, p. 4

- Ackerman School District - Facility Financing
- Auburn Union School District - Facility Funding
- Placer Union High School District - Facility Funding
- Increased Demand of Parks and Recreation
- Installation of New Sewer, Water and Power Lines
- Expansion of the City's Wastewater Treatment Plant
- Impacts to the County's Sewer Maintenance District
- Wildland Fire Hazard

NOISE

- Airport Noise, Future Receptors

Avoidable

Significant Cumulative Impacts Which Can be Mitigated (City + County Buildout)

The significant impacts which may result from combined buildout of the proposed City of Auburn General Plan within existing City limits and the proposed Sphere of Influence with buildout of the remaining unincorporated area of the Auburn Bowman Community Plan (proposed) but which can be avoided are listed below.

LAND USE

- Housing mix

Ref: Final EIR, p. 4

GEOLOGY / LANDFORMS

- Cumulative Impacts

HYDROLOGY / WATER QUALITY

- Impacts of Proposed Bridge and Culvert Improvements
- Increases in Stormwater Runoff and Flooding on Canals
- Impacts of Detention Facilities
- Degradation of Surface Water (generally)
- Impacts of Recommended Water Quality Protection Facilities

~~BIOTIC RESOURCES~~

Ref: Final EIR, p. 4

- ~~Impacts on Riparian Habitat~~
- ~~Impacts to Special Natural Communities~~

NOISE

- Airport Noise, Future Receptors

PUBLIC FACILITIES

- Increased Demand on Public Parks

Unavoidable

Significant Impacts which Cannot be Mitigated (Plan Alone)

The impacts which may result from implementation of the General Plan within the unincorporated area which will be significant and unmitigable are:

LAND USE

- Growth Inducing Impacts

VISUAL

- Overall Change in Visual Character
- Scenic Corridors Outside of City Limits

GEOLOGY / LANDFORMS

- Landform Disturbance

HYDROLOGY / WATER QUALITY

Ref: Final EIR, p. 5

- Increases in Stormflows and Flooding within City Limits and Sphere
- Increases in Stormwater Runoff and Flooding in floodplains~~on Canals~~
- Impacts of Regional Downstream Flooding
- Degradation of Surface Waters (Rock Creek Reservoir)
- Impacts on Groundwater

BIOTIC RESOURCES

- Impacts to Oak Woodlands
- Impacts to General Wildlife Species

AIR QUALITY

- Construction Generated Pollutants
- Effects of Motor Vehicle Emissions
- Impacts from Stationary Emissions

CULTURAL RESOURCES

- Impacts to Historic and Prehistoric Resources

TRAFFIC / CIRCULATION

- Increased Congestion on the Street System
- Impacts of Proposed Improvements
- Effects of Increased Traffic on Quality of Life

NOISE

- Increased Traffic Noise
- Railroad Traffic Noise
- Airport Noise, Existing Receptors

PUBLIC FACILITIES

- Sierra College
- Installation of New Transmission Lines

Unavoidable

Significant Cumulative Impacts which Cannot be Mitigated (City + County Buildout)

The significant impacts which may result from combined buildout of the proposed City of Auburn General Plan within existing city limits and the proposed Sphere of Influence with buildout of the remaining unincorporated area of the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan (proposed) and which cannot be mitigated are listed below.

VISUAL

- Overall Change in Visual Character
- Impacts to Scenic Corridors Outside of City Limits

GEOLOGY / LANDFORMS

- Landform Disturbance

HYDROLOGY / WATER QUALITY

- Increases in Stormflows and Flooding
- Increases in Stormwater Runoff and Flooding on Canals
- Impacts of Regional Downstream Flooding
- Degradation of Surface Waters (Rock Creek Reservoir)
- Impacts on Groundwater

BIOTIC RESOURCES

- Impacts to Oak Woodlands
- Impacts to General Wildlife Species

AIR QUALITY

- Emissions due to Buildout of the Plan Area

CULTURAL RESOURCES

- Impacts to Historic and Prehistoric Resources

TRAFFIC / CIRCULATION

- Increased Congestion on Street System
- Impacts of Proposed Road Improvements
- Effects of Increased Traffic on Quality of Life

NOISE

- Increased Traffic Noise
- Railroad Noise
- Airport Noise, Existing Receptors

Relationship to Other Plans and Regulations

Auburn Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan (Adopted 2/87, Revised 3/90 by the Foothill Airport Land Use Commission). The Sierra Planning Organization (named the Foothill Airport Land Use Commission (FALUC) for purposes of implementing the provisions of the Public Utilities Code) adopted a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) for the Auburn Airport in February of 1987. The CLUP limits land uses surrounding the Auburn Airport based upon Federal Aviation Agency (FAA) regulations and other rules established by FALUC. The CLUP has the force and effect of the land use element of a community plan unless any of its provisions are overridden by a 4/5ths vote of the governing body of the jurisdiction within which the land use is proposed.

In order to provide for uses that are compatible with the City of Auburn's Municipal Airport, land use designations in the General Plan have been configured in conformance with the adopted and modified Auburn Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

Other Related Regulations. The General Plan will be implemented by the various programs recommended in the Plan but primarily by the following land use regulations:

Table 3-1
LAND USE IMPLEMENTATION REGULATIONS

City of Auburn Zoning Ordinance
City of Auburn Subdivision Ordinance
City of Auburn Grading Ordinance
City of Auburn Downtown Design Guidelines
Uniform Building Code
Other rules adopted to protect public health and safety, and promote the general welfare of City residents

A number of these regulations will need to be revised or added to implement the new General~~Community~~ Plan.

Ref: Final EIR, p. 7

Relationship to the Placer County General Plan. ~~The Auburn/Bowman Community Plan is the third cooperative, comprehensive planning effort to be undertaken by the City of Auburn and Placer County.~~ The 1964 Auburn General Plan was jointly prepared by the City and County and adopted by both the Auburn City Council and the Placer County Board of Supervisors. The same was true of the 1978/79 Auburn Area General Plan. While there was much cooperation between the City and County staffs and their consultants during this most recent update (some consultants were hired under joint contracts involving both the City and County; in other instances, the same consultant was hired separately by both the City and the County), the two jurisdictions will adopt separate plans.

The City of Auburn's General Plan serves as the official land use policy document within the incorporated City limits. It also serves as the City's guide to development and land use as it adds new area to the City by way of annexation. Although the Plan includes the City's adopted Sphere of Influence as established by the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO), as well as an "area of interest" which the City proposes to add to its Sphere of Influence in the future,

land use policies and designations outside the current City limits have no force and effect until and unless the area in question is formally annexed to the City.

The Auburn/Bowman Community Plan is a component of the Placer County General Plan and serves as the official land use policy document within the unincorporated Plan area. The Community Plan supersedes the 1978/79 Auburn Area General Plan and the 1979 Bowman General Plan, and it has no force and effect within the incorporated limits of the City of Auburn (including the Auburn Airport which is an incorporated "island" not contiguous to the main body of the City).

The differences between the two Plans within the City's proposed Sphere of Influence are discussed in the Alternatives chapter of this EIR.

Growth Inducement

The Plan would facilitate development of land within City limits and the Auburn/ Bowman area. This would result in impacts discussed throughout the EIR. Growth inducing impacts are expected to be significant and unmitigable. A detailed discussion can be found in the Land Use chapter.

Issues to Be Resolved

There are issues which remain to be resolved prior to adoption of the General Plan:

- Which mitigations to incorporate into the Plan.
- Whether or not to utilize any portion of the Alternatives discussed in this EIR and any resulting adjustments which might be necessary. (For instance, elimination of any Mixed Use areas could result in a need to replace these areas with multi-family designations in those locations or elsewhere to ensure that affordable housing targets are met.)

Areas of Controversy

Areas of controversy include the usual range expected in the adoption of a land use plan. However, of particular note are the differences between the City's Plan and the County's Plan in the proposed Sphere of Influence. A key issue is also the City's proposal to increase its Sphere of Influence and the accompanying land use and public facility provision issues.

Speculative Impacts

The issue of whether or not increased exposure of residents to low level electro-magnetic fields will present a significant health risk as buildout of the Plan area proceeds is considered too speculative to reach a conclusion at this time. However, mitigation measures are proposed based on the doctrine of prudent avoidance.

Alternatives Summary
Ref: Final EIR, p. 8

The Alternatives section of this EIR discusses eight alternatives to the Plan as proposed. Three alternatives were prepared by the Citizens Committee~~Planning Department~~ during development of the preferred Plan.

To provide a full range of alternatives, the EIR also includes a No Project/No New Development alternative, a mitigated alternative designed to address critical

impacts, an alternative without the Sphere of Influence additions, and an alternative which uses proposed County designations in the full proposed Sphere of Influence.

The following is a summary of the alternatives discussed in the EIR:

No Project/No Development. The No Project/No Development Alternative provides a base condition with which to compare the development-entailing alternatives; it assumes that no development occurs beyond that which was tabulated as existing in 1992 (Draft Auburn General Plan, p. IV-9). The basic characteristics of this alternative within City limits are:

Table 3-2
NO PROJECT/NO DEVELOPMENT
ALTERNATIVE CHARACTERISTICS

City Limits	Sphere of Influence
The currently developed 173 acres of commercial use The currently developed 66 acres of industrial use The current population of approximately 10,615 persons	The proposed Sphere of Influence is less developed than the area within City limits. It includes large areas of large lot rural residential housing as well as the highly developed Highway 49 corridor.

No Project/Existing Plan. This alternative would be realized if the City took no action on the proposed General Plan - it is truly the No Project alternative because the 1978 Auburn Area, Bowman, and Ophir Plans would remain in effect if no action was taken. The basic features for this alternative are:

Table 3-3
NO PROJECT/EXISTING PLAN
ALTERNATIVE CHARACTERISTICS

Ref: Final EIR, p. 9

City Limits	Proposed Sphere of Influence
274~~275~~ acres of commercial use 206~~203~~ acres of industrial use A population of 24,264	393 acres of commercial use 374 acres of industrial use A population of 20,829

City & Sphere

667 acres of commercial use
580 acres of industrial use
A population of 45,093

Alternative 1. This alternative was prepared by the City during the General Plan formulation. Within the Sphere of Influence, larger lot sizes are proposed in many areas than under the other alternatives and the proposed Plan. Within City limits, this alternative is generally consistent with the proposed Plan, though a slightly lower population would result. Its basic features are:

Table 3-4
ALTERNATIVE #1 CHARACTERISTICS

City Limits	Proposed Sphere of Influence
530 acres of commercial use 105 acres of industrial use A population of 20,800	395 acres of commercial use 908 acres of industrial use A population of 20,400

City & Sphere

925 acres of commercial use
1013 acres of industrial use
A population of 41,200

Alternative 2. This alternative provides for essentially the same population within City limits as Alternative #1. Overall, the total population possible within the City and the Sphere is closest to the proposed Plan of all the alternatives (49,000 vs 51,128 under the proposed Plan). However, increased densities are allowed within the Sphere of Influence. Its basic features are:

Table 3-5
ALTERNATIVE #2 CHARACTERISTICS

City Limits	Proposed Sphere of Influence
565 acres of commercial use 105 acres of industrial use A population of 20,700	406 acres of commercial use 855 acres of industrial use A population of 28,300

City & Sphere

971 acres of commercial use
960 acres of industrial use
A population of 49,000

Alternative #3. This alternative is similar to Alternative 2 in the Sphere of Influence but adds additional density within existing City limits. Its basic features are:

Table 3-6
ALTERNATIVE #3 CHARACTERISTICS

City Limits	Proposed Sphere of Influence
590 acres of commercial use 105 acres of industrial use A population of 26,000	559 acres of commercial use 1021 acres of industrial use A population of 31,400

City & Sphere

1149 acres of commercial use
1126 acres of industrial use
A population of 57,400

Alternative #4 - Mitigated Design. This alternative addresses the significant, unmitigatable Plan impact related to potential pollution of Rock Creek Reservoir by deleting all urban uses in this area. Other significant, unmitigatable impacts addressed are loss of oak woodland and wildlife habitat. Lower densities are recommended in some areas to reduce these impacts, though cumulative impacts are still expected to be unmitigatable. Figure 15-8 calls out the areas which would be revised under this alternative. The basic features of this alternative are:

Table 3-7
ALTERNATIVE #4 MITIGATED DESIGN CHARACTERISTICS

City Limits	Proposed Sphere of Influence
515 acres of commercial use 373 acres of industrial use A population of 22,545~~20,689~~	688 acres of commercial use 523 acres of industrial use A population of 26,377~~34,412~~

Ref: Final EIR, p.11

City & Sphere

1203 acres of commercial use
896 acres of industrial use
A population of 48,921~~55,101~~

Alternative #5 - No Additions to Sphere of Influence. This alternative assumes no additions to the City's Sphere of Influence; proposed County land use designations would guide these areas. The overall population holding capacity of these additional areas would total approximately 916 persons under the City Plan vs the County Plan.

Table 3-8
ALTERNATIVE #5 - NO ADDITIONS TO SPHERE OF INFLUENCE CHARACTERISTICS

Ref: Final EIR, p.12

City Limits	Existing Sphere of Influence
529 acres of commercial use 470~~570~~ acres of industrial use A population of 19,096	689 acres of commercial use 332 acres of industrial use A population of 18,262
Sphere Additions (Cnty designations used)	**City & Sphere**
70 acres of commercial use 191 acres of industrial use A population of 3421	1288 acres of commercial use 993 acres of industrial use A population of 50,211~~40,779~~

Alternative #6 - County Land Designations in Existing and Proposed Sphere of Influence. This alternative assumes no annexations to the City and thus use of County land use designations throughout the entire existing and proposed Sphere of Influence. The basic features of this alternative are:

Table 3-9
ALTERNATIVE #6 - COUNTY LAND USE DESIGNATIONS IN PROPOSED SPHERE OF INFLUENCE CHARACTERISTICS

Ref: Final EIR, p.12

City Limits	Proposed Sphere of Influence (Proposed Cnty designations)
529 acres of commercial use 470 acres of industrial use A population of 19,096	905~~975~~ acres of commercial use 516~~602~~ acres of industrial use A population of 33,251~~32,114~~
City & Sphere	
1435~~1504~~ acres of commercial use 1086~~1072~~ acres of industrial use A population of 56,750~~51,210~~	

The focus of CEQA is on the distinction between avoidable and unavoidable (unmitigatable), significant impacts. For any significant impact, agencies must consider mitigation or alternatives for avoidance. If mitigation is feasible, the need for alternatives is reduced, although the selection of an alternative can be another way of avoiding impacts. Consequently, the alternatives discussion focuses on those impacts which cannot be mitigated (see list in Summary).

Relative Impact of Alternatives — Conclusion

In this case, all of the alternatives will result in significant unmitigatable impacts. The No Project/No Development alternative would result in the fewest number of significant, unmitigatable impacts, followed by the Alternative 4, the Mitigated Design alternative. Since the No Development alternative is not likely ~~not~~ feasible, Alternative 4 is considered the preferred alternative in this analysis.

Table 10
LAND USE PLAN ALTERNATIVES SUMMARY - SIGNIFICANT, UNMITIGATABLE IMPACTS

No Proj No Dev ment	No Proj Existing Plan	Alternative 1	2	3	4	5	6	Proposed Project
12	25	26	26	26	23	25	25	25

Mitigation Monitoring Plan

The State of California requires an annual Plan progress report to be conducted before the Planning Commission. As part of this review process, progress in implementing each goal, policy, and implementation measure should be determined and quantified when possible. In some cases provisions for actions which must be taken if implementation is not occurring or if Plan targets are not met is spelled out in the Plan. Where not defined, policy makers should determine what actions should be taken if Plan targets are not being met. Plan assumptions should also be reviewed for any changes which could affect the validity of the Plan. It is recommended that this process be spelled out within the Plan.

Ref: Final EIR, p.13

The State-required annual General Plan progress report will serve as the primary ~~a~~ mitigation monitoring program and is critical to the conclusions in this EIR. Most of the recommended mitigation measures will be implemented via revisions to the draft Plan and, thus, monitoring will not be required. However, in many cases, the EIR concludes that significant impacts will be avoided if certain policies and programs are vigorously implemented. This EIR attempts to determine if implementation is reasonably assured based on wording of the text, funding available, and assignment of responsibility. Annual monitoring will add to this assurance.

Individual project review and environmental review in the future will also serve as mitigation monitoring. Future project review should include a comparison to project related mitigation measures in this EIR.

MODIFIED FINAL EIR
SUMMARY TABLE

The following Summary Table duplicates the Summary Table in the DEIR incorporating changes made in the Final EIR and the Addendum to the Final EIR (changes shaded). An additional column is also added "Level of Impact: Final Adopted Plan." The intent in this column is to make obvious which mitigation measures were adopted in the final General Plan and thus the final level of impact. In many cases, reference is given to the General Plan Findings which note measures incorporated into the final Plan which serve the same purpose as the recommended mitigation measures. Where measures not adopted do not include a reference to the Findings, please refer to Findings pages 32-44 which discuss overriding considerations.

Table 3-11 Revised
SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING OF MITIGATION MEASURES
LAND USE										
1. Use of land – increased degree of suburbanization and urbanization.		(See impacts below)					(See measures below)			
2. Jobs/Housing Balance, City Alone		✓					2-3 Add specific targets for implementation.	2-3 Revision to final Plan	2-3. Less than significant	2-3 Yearly Plan progress report
3. Cumulative Jobs/Housing Balance, City Plan plus County Plan (outside Proposed Sphere of Influence) Buildout Combine - Target may not be met in Plan period.		✓								
4. Housing Land Use Mix	✓					✓	4. Housing Land Use Mix Balance. a) Entire Plan Area: Create quantified objectives by income category for housing programs; b) Sphere of influence as annexations occur: require full 30% of Mixed Use Areas to be built out in multi-family residential and require all multi-family areas to be built out at 15 du/ac on the average (including 25% density bonus for affordable housing) or allow credits to be transferred to multi-family designated lands when higher densities are achieved on other lands. (This will ensure some flexibility in the application of the highest densities in Mixed Use areas where environmental conditions may call for the lower end of the allowed	4. Revisions to Final Plan	4. Less than significant Housing Element Implementation Measures K,L,G accomplished mitigation. Ref: General Plan Findings, p. 25	4. Yearly Plan progress report

Table 3-11 Revised
SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING MITIGATION MEASURES
LAND USE (Cont.)										
							density range); c) consider the use of inclusionary zoning.			
5. Cumulative Housing Land Use Mix Balance - City plus County (Outside proposed Sphere of Influence) Combined.				✓	✓		5. Same as #4.	5. Revisions to Final Plan	5. Less than significant	5. Yearly Plan progress report
6. Land Use Mix - Mineral Resources		✓					6. None recommended.	n/a	6. Less than significant	n/a
7. Land Use Mix - Agricultural Land, proposed Plan		✓					7a. Reduce FAR allowed within Open Space designation. Three open space designations are provided for in the Plan - Open Space Private (OSP), Open Space Schools (OSS), and Open Space (OS). 7b. Reduce densities allowed on Williamson Act lands via Land Use Map or implementing zoning.	7. Plan revision	7. Less than significant	7. Yearly Plan review
8. Land Use Mix - Agricultural Land, Cumulative City plus County Buildout.		✓					8. See 7, above.	8. Plan revision	8. Less than significant	8. Yearly Plan review
9. Land Use Mix - Timber resources.		✓					9. None recommended.	n/a	9. Less than significant	n/a
Land Use Compatibility										
10 Land Use Compatibility - A[illegible]n Folsom at Maldu D[illegible] Mixed Use Area	✓					✓	10. Auburn Folsom Road at Maldu Dr Mixed Use Ar[illegible] Resignation of the site to call [illegible] Open Space on	10. Revisions to final Plan.	10. Significant, unmitigable	10. Development review

Table 3-11 Revised
SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING MITIGATION MEASURES
LAND USE (Cont.)										
Ref: Final EIR, p.17							hillside and Commercial in a 200-ft band at the base of hill ~~or add CD/OSP designation overlay to accomplish a similar goal~~.		Was not mitigated. Ref: General Plan Findings, p. 39	
11. Land Use Compatibility - Luther Road / Highway 49 Mixed Use Area	✓		✓			✓	11. See Mitigation Measure #18 ~~None recommended.~~	N/A	11. Significant, mitigable Alternative measure adopted in Final Plan. Ref: General Plan Findings, p. 25 (Constraints Overlays)	N/A
12. Land Use Compatibility - E.V. Cain School Mixed Use Site. (Highway 49 area between I-80 and Marguerite Mine Road, including the E.V. Cain site)	✓				✓		12a The previously referenced Nevada Street Rezoning EIR (Planning Concepts, 1990) contains specific measures to mitigate impacts on the parcels east of Nevada Street which are within this area. These measures should be referred to for creation of similar conditions on projects proposed in this area. 12b Design review. All commercial development within Auburn undergoes Civic Design Review by the Planning Commission. It would be appropriate to adopt a statement of specific design concerns for the Nevada Street corridor and this entire Mixed Use Area calling for conditions attached to project design consistent with or complementary to the concepts called for in the Nevada Street Rezoning EIR.	12. Revisions in final Plan Development review	12a. Significant, mitigable To be addressed in development review. 12b. Significant, mitigable To be addressed in development review.	12. Development review

Table 3-11 Revised
SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING MITIGATION MEASURES
LAND USE (Cont.)							Issues addressed included a landscaped parkway buffer, parking lot, tree coverage requirements, ridgeline view concerns, etc.			
13. Land Use Compatibility - Gold Country Fairgrounds Mixed Use Site.		✓					13. None recommended.	N/A	13. Less than significant	N/A
14. Land Use Compatibility - DeWitt Center Mixed Use Site.	✓ (visual)	✓ (land use compatibility)			✓		14. Add specific text calling for a similar percentage of landscaped open space as that existing today for future development, as well as a two-story limit on structure height.	14. Revisions in final Plan	14. Significant mitigable Can be implemented through zoning	14. Development review
15. Land Use Compatibility - North Side, Indian Hill Road Mixed Use Area.	✓				✓		15. North side of Indian Hill Mixed Use Area. 15a Redesignate area with a Residential designation and CD/OSP overlay ULDR-CD (2 du/ac Clustered).	15. Revisions to final Plan	15. Significant, mitigable Only CD/OSP added and designation reduced from 10 du to 6 du/acre Ref: General Plan Findings, p. 25	15. Development review
Ref: Final EIR, p.18							15b When the Scenic Corridor provisions of the Zoning Ordinance are prepared consistent with the General Plan implementation measures, standards for Indian Hill Road should be considered which are consistent with the Valley Hills	15b Zoning Ordinance update	Ref: General Plan Findings, p. 26	15b Review of Zoning Ordinance Update against EIR recommendations
Ref: Final EIR, P.18										

Table 3-11 Revised
SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING MITIGATION MEASURES
LAND USE (Cont.)							~~project Add specificity in text for this area calling for compatibility with Indian Hill Road's scenic character and general consistency with roadway corridor provisions required of the neighboring Valley Hills project. Add specific text requiring:~~ - A 30-ft landscape easement from the ultimate edge of pavement is recommended. This is consistent with a 30-ft front yard setback, typical for a suburban road. - If a residential noise barrier is needed, a planted berm should be used instead of a full soundwall where possible, to retain the more rural character of the scenic road corridor. Walls are superior to berms only in areas where a berm would result in tree removal. - Natural appearing landscaping along Indian Hill Rd. Formal landscaping along Indian Hill Road should be eliminated or designed to mirror surrounding vegetation through use of drought tolerant native grasses and wildflowers and oaks. Dry season appearance should be similar			

Table 3-11 Revised
SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING MITIGATION MEASURES
LAND USE (Cont.)										
Ref: Final EIR, p.20							to surroundings. A lush, green irrigated appearance would be visually inconsistent with the surrounding area. – Require 50% tree preservation minimum with 3:1 replacement for tree loss. The intent is to achieve visual consistency in the corridor and a reflection of the corridor's current visual character.			
16. Land Use Compatibility - Russell Avenue Mixed Use Areas		✓				✓	16. Land Use Compatibility, Russell Rd Mixed Use Areas 16a Allow only office professional uses or uses designed to be compatible with the adjacent neighborhood on western piece. Activity hours consistent with a residential neighborhood are a particular concern. 16b Retain wooded buffer on eastern piece highway ramp. See Visual Mitigation Measure 8a for details. 16c See measures related to I-80 viewshed and tree protection on eastern parcels.	16. Revisions to final Plan	16. Less than significant Designation changed to Commercial Office and Tree Ordinance to be prepared. Ref: General Plan Findings, p. 28	16. Development review
17. Land Use Compatibility - Auburn Airport		✓					17. An implementation measure should be included in the Plan which would place an overlay zoning designation ove[illegible] airport overflight	17. Revisions in final Plan.	17. Less than significant	17. Annual Plan progress report

Table 3-11 Revised
SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING MITIGATION MEASURES
LAND USE (Cont.)										
							and noise impact zones requiring use permits of all development under the City's jurisdiction. Delineate these zones on Land Use Map also.			
18. Other Potential Land Use Compatibility Concerns.	✓				✓		18. Add detail to buffer requirements (percent screening, type of fencing, buffer width). Note areas of concern (Figure 4-4 on the Land Use Map and Zoning Map (as an overlay or other methodology) as well as Land Use Designation Revision Sites F/14, E/22, F/28, and G/28. Specify solutions in the Design Guidelines called for in this Implementation section of the EIR. Require clustering to retain open space and open character of the Collins Ave. MDR area.	18. Revision in final Plan.	18. Significant, unmitigable (F/2e) Provisions not adopted in Final Plan for other properties but can be implemented in Civic Design process	18. Annual Plan progress report
19. Growth Inducing Impacts.	✓					✓	19 An implementation measure calling for third party market and fiscal analysis to be conducted on large-scale non-residential annexations relative to their impact on downtown Auburn should be added to the Plan.	19. Revisions in final Plan (a-b)	19. Significant, unmitigable	19. Annual Plan progress report
20. 4 du/ac designation in Aeolia Drive area	✓				✓		20. Add CD/OSP Overlay.	20. Revisions in final Plan	20. Significant, unmitigable Was not mitigated. Ref: GP Findings, p.40	20. Development review
21. Commercial uses at NW and SW Corners at Auburn/Folsom Rd + Indian Hill	✓				✓		21. Require 1-story limit for non residential uses	21. Development review	21. Less than significant Adopted in final Plan.	21. Development review

Ref: Final EIR, p.21

Ref: Addendum 11/23/93 p. 3

Table 3-11 Revised
SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING OF MITIGATION MEASURES
VISUAL RESOURCES										
1. Overall change in visual character of the area.	✓					✓	1. None recommended. This impact is considered unmitigable.	N/A	1. Significant, unmitigable	N/A
2. Existing agricul tural lands and open spaces.		✓					2. See Land Use chapter.	N/A	2. Less than significant	N/A
3. American River Canyon.		✓					3. None recommended.	N/A	3. Less than significant	N/A
4. Landforms		[See Geology Chapter]					4. See Geology chapter.	N/A	N/A	N/A
5. Streams and riparian areas	✓				✓		5. See Biotic Resources chapter.	N/A	5. Significant, mitigable	N/A
6. Scenic corridors	✓				✓	✓ (outside City limits)	6a. Designate additional scenic corridors in Plan text: Indian Hill, Marguerite Mine Rd, Nevada St, Ophir Rd, Mt. Vernon Rd, Atwood Rd.	6. Revisions to final Plan.	6. Less than significant 6a. Mitigated by OS/Cons. E1. Goal 1, Policies 1.1, 1.4, 1.7, and Implementation G. Ref: General Plan Findings, p. 26	6. Review of development plans
							6b. Delineate scenic corridors on Land Use Map and Zoning Maps.		Reference to constraints maps was included on Land Use Map and Table IV-14. Ref: General Plan Findings, p. 26	
							6c. Add detail to implementation Measure G OS/Conservation Element calling for Specific Guidelines for each corridor: – Landscape/roadway setbacks		Recommendations will be used in Scenic Corridor Ordinance Ref: General Plan Findings, p. 26	

Table 3-11 (contd.)
SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	MONITORING OF MITIGATION MEASURES
VISUAL RESOURCES (Cont.)									
							(Larger lot sizes of range allowed, directly adjacent to cCorridor may be required.)		
							6d. Apply measures from Geology/ Landforms chapter.		
							6e. Apply measures from Biotic Resources chapter.		
7. Viewsheds of heavily travelled roads.		[See Geology chapter]					7. Viewsheds of heavily travelled roads: See Geology chapter.	N/A	N/A
8. Viewshed of Russell Offramp	✓				✓		Viewshed of Russell Rd Offramp: 8a. Establish a no-disturbance building setback and tree preservation corridor along Russell Road from Lincoln to the I-80 right-of-way. Suggested depths are: – 50 feet north of road – 100 feet south of road Require a tree preservation buffer along I-80 (eastern side) of 25 ft. 8b. Future development should provide for the realistic preservation of 60% of remaining oak trees falling outside of these corridors or include landscaping/ revegetation with native oaks as the dominant feature. 8c. See Biotic Resources chapter for additional measures to be applied regarding oak woodland loss (where not superseded by measures here).	8. Revisions to final Plan	8. Review of development plans

Table 3-11 Revised
SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING OF MITIGATION MEASURES
VISUAL RESOURCES (Cont.)										
							– Architecture and planting materials specific to individual corridors – Building setbacks appropriate to the character of the corridor. (Larger lot sizes of range allowed, directly adjacent to Corridor may be required.)			
							6d. Apply measures from Geology/ Landforms chapter.			
							6e. Apply measures from Biotic Resources chapter.			
7. Viewsheds of heavily travelled roads.		[See Geology chapter]					7. Viewsheds of heavily travelled roads: See Geology chapter.	N/A	N/A	N/A
8. Viewshed of Russell Offramp	✓				✓		Viewshed of Russell Rd Offramp: 8a. Establish a no-disturbance building setback and tree preservation corridor along Russell Road from Lincoln to the I-80 right-of-way. Suggested depths are: – 50 feet north of road – 100 feet south of road Require a tree preservation buffer along I-80 (eastern side) of 25 ft. 8b. Future development should provide for the realistic preservation of 60% of remaining oak trees falling outside of these corridors or include landscaping/ revegetation with native oaks as the dominant feature.	8. Revisions to final Plan	8. Less than significant Mitigated by change of designation to Commercial Office. Ref: General Plan Findings, p. 26 Mitigated by Tree Ordinance Implementation Measure A, OS/ Cons. Element. Ref: General Plan Findings, p. 26	8. Review of development plans

Table 3-11 Revised
SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING MITIGATION MEASURES
VISUAL RESOURCES (Cont.)										
							8c. See Biotic Resources chapter for additional measures to be applied regarding oak woodland loss (where not superseded by measures here).		Mitigated by Tree Ordinance Implementation Measure A, OS/Conservation Element Ref: General Plan Findings, p. 26	
9. Cultural/historic resources	[See Cultural Resources chapter]						9. See Cultural Resources chapter.	N/A	N/A	N/A
10 Cumulative City plus County buildout.	✓					✓	10. None recommended.	N/A	10. Significant, unmitigable	N/A

Table 3-11 Revised
SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING OF MITIGATION MEASURES
GEOLOGY										
1. Landform Disturbance	✓	(potentially)				✓	1a. Include in Plan Implementation Measure IVA: – All mixed-use development including residential components. – Design guidelines for Mixed Use Areas should provide for variable residential/commercial mix to tailor development to each site. – All projects in these categories should have design review, regardless of size. 1b. Add to Plan Implementation Measure IVB. Text and graphics to include: – Development standards based upon relevant specific slope categories. – All sites having slopes equal to, or in excess of 4% should be addressed within the hillside development ordinance. – Floor area ratio specifications/implement coverage minimums by slope category. – Stipulation of percentages of maximum lot area allowed to be padded (Mass-pad grading prohibition) – Apply standards to all grading operations (see thresholds for permits recommended in 1d). – Sketch-based guidelines illustrating preferred access, siting, and site-adaptive techniques for hillside development	1. Revisions to final Plan.	1. Significant, unmitigable 1a-d To be implemented in Grading Ordnance revisions. *(Please note all projects go through Civic Design Review, third, bullet 1a was inaccurate)* Ref: General Plan Findings, p. 27	1. Annual Plan progress report

Table 3-11 Revised
SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING MITIGATION MEASURES
GEOLOGY (Cont.)							1c. Add to Implementation VIIA: – Text to restrict biotically significant vegetation loss due to avoidable grading impacts 1d. Add Implementation Measure for revision of Grading Ordinance to: – Review grading permits for adherence to hillside development ordinance guidelines – Require grading permits for operations on slopes of 20% or greater that disturb over 10 cubic yards of soil or 1000 sq.ft. of area. 1e. Revise land use designation text and add policies to specify the following: **Table 6-7** **SLOPE RELATED RECOMMENDED POLICY REVISIONS** - Medium Density Residential (MDR) and greater density designations not to be utilized in areas exceeding 15% slope (occurs within the City limits – see impact discussion for areas of concern - Table 6-5) - Urban Low Density Residential (ULDR and greater density designations) not to be utilized in areas exceeding 20% slopes (occurs within the City limits, as well as the existing and new spheres of influence – see impact discussion for areas of concern - Table 6-5). - No development in areas exceeding 30% slope (occurs within the existing and new Spheres of Influence – see impact discussion for areas of concern - Tables 6-3, 6-5). - Limit Industrial/Commercial designations to areas of less than 15% slope (occurs within the existing and new Spheres of Influence – see impact discussion for areas of concern Table 6-3).		To be incorporated into Grading Ordinance Ref: General Plan Findings, p. 27	

Table 3-11 Revised
SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING MITIGATION MEASURES
GEOLOGY (Cont.)							1f. Revise Land Use Map to reflect the criteria above as shown below.			

Table 6-8
SLOPE/GRADING RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE 1f
RECOMMENDED LAND USE MAP REVISION
(See Figure 6-3 for locations)

Location #	Area	Proposed Designation	Concern	Mitigated Density Recommended	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*
Within City Limits					
1	Auburn Folsom Rd at Maldu	Mixed Use	Potential for High Density Residential development on 5-15% slopes	Open Space on slopes, Commercial on level corner of Maldu Rd	1 CD/OSP added
2	Area between Hwy 49 and Nevada St, north of Fulweller	Mixed Use	Potential for High Density Residential development on 5-15% slopes	No density change. Use of design measures recommended in Nevada St EIR and Land Use section of this EIR	2 Can be implemented at Civic Design stage
9	Indian Hill Road	Mixed Use	Potential for High Density Residential development on 5-15% slopes	2 du/ac Clustered	9 CD/OSP added
10	Along Luther Road	ULDR (4 du/ac)	Slopes of 5-15%	4 du/ac Clustered off steepest slopes (over 10%)	10 CD/OSP added
11	Marguerite Mine Rd including Auburn Ravine Intersection	ULDR (4 du/ac) MDR (10 du/ac) HDR (5-15 du/ac)	Slopes of 10-30%	2 du/ac Clustered on slopes less than 10%; Open Space on areas over 20% slope	11 CD/OSP added to ULDR Designation
15	Borland Avenue (Area C/11)	Industrial	Potential for large structures on moderate to steep	Add CD/OSP	15 CD/OSP Added to Residential and portion of Industrial

Ref: Final EIR, p.27

Table 3-11 Revised
SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING MITIGATION MEASURES
GEOLOGY (Cont.)							Table 6-8 (cont.)			

Location #	Area	Proposed Designation	Concern	Mitigated Density Recommended	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*
Outside of City Limits within Existing Sphere of Influence					
3	East side of Hwy 49 between Bell and Dry Cr Road	Industrial/Commercial/Mixed Use	Potential for large structures on moderate to steep slopes (5-10%)	No land use change Add CD/OSP to ensure F.A.R. restrictions on slopes over 10%	3 CD/OSP added
4	Southwest of the Bowman undercrossing Interchange along I-80	Industrial / Commercial	Potential for large structures on moderate to steep slopes (10-15%)	No land use change Add CD/OSP to ensure F.A.R. restrictions on slopes over 10%	4 CD/OSP added
5	East of Highway 49 at Marguerite Mine Road [includes Area F/28]	Industrial	Potential for large structures on moderate to steep slopes (10-30%)	No land use change –Add CD/OSP to ensure F.A.R. restrictions on slopes over 10% (Area F/28 to Residential use)	5 *Note: Mitigation not used in Final Plan. Statement of Overriding Consideration was adopted.*
6	Bell Road and New Airport Road	Industrial	Potential for large structures on moderate to steep slopes (5-15%)	(Recommended in Land Use section also) Add CD/OSP to ensure F.A.R. restrictions on slopes over 10%	6 Area north of Bell changed to Comm/Off-CD/OSP; area south of Bell unchanged. 12 2 ac change made: CD/OSP added (RDR-CD/OSP)
12	Mt Vernon, West Bell & Joeger Roads area (NW Sphere)	LDR (1 du/ac)	Slopes ranging to over 30%	Mt Vernon Area – 2 ac Lots recommend in Biotic sect Joeger Rd area – No change, will be addressed by text changes in Mitigation Measure 1e.	13 CD/OSP added to RDR/.5 and LDR in steepest areas
13	North and South of Foresthill Rd [includes area G50 & G/2D]	RDR (.25 du/ac) RDR (~~5~~1/2 du/ac) LDR (1 du/ac) ULDR (4 du/ac)	Slopes ranging to over 30%	CD/OSP to ensure no 1 du/ac over 10% slopes; no ~~5~~1/2 du/ac lots over 20% slopes; no development over 30% slopes	14 CD/OSP added to LDR. No undeveloped ULDR on final map
14	Southern Sphere	RDR (~~5~~1/2 du/ac)	Slopes ranging to	Require Clustering in	

Ref: Final EIR, p.28

Table 3-11 Revised
SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING OF MITIGATION MEASURES
GEOLOGY (Cont.)										

Table 6-8 (cont.)
SLOPE/GRADING RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE 11
RECOMMENDED LAND USE MAP REVISION

Location #	Area	Proposed Designation	Concern	Mitigated Density Recommended	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*
Outside of City Limits Within New Sphere of Influence					
6	Bell Road and New Airport Road	Industrial Commercial	Potential for large structures on moderate to steep slopes (5-15%)	Open Space to ensure F.A.R. restrictions on slopes over 10%	6 See PG 3-23, #6
7	East of I-80/Bell Rd Interchange along railroad tracks	Industrial/Commercial; Mixed Use	Potential for large structures on moderate to steep slopes (15-30%)	No land use change – Add CD/OSP to ensure F.A.R. restrictions on slopes over 10%	7 CD/OSP added
8	North and South of Ophir Rd	Industrial	Slopes ranging to over 30%	Industrial-[redacted] Commercial/Development-Open Space to protect slopes	8 CD/OSP added and changed to residential
12	Mt Vernon, West Bell & Joeger Roads area (NW Sphere)	LDR (1 du/ac)	Slopes ranging to over 30%	Mt Vernon Area – 2 ac Lots recommended in Biotic section Joeger Rd area – No change, will be addressed by text changes in Mitigation Measure 1e.	12 See #12
13	North and South of Foresthill Rd [redacted]	[redacted] RDR (1/2 du/ac) LDR (1 du/ac) ULDR (4 du/ac)	Slopes ranging to over 30%	CD/OSP to ensure no 1 du/ac over 10% slopes; no 1/2 du/ac lots over 20% slopes; no development over 30% slopes	13 See #13
14	Southern Sphere	RDR (1/2 du/ac) LDR (1 du/ac) ~~ULDR (3 du/ac~~	Slopes ranging to over 30%	Require Clustering in ULDR	14 See #14
[redacted]					15 Not mitigated. Ref: General Plan Findings, p. 40

Effectiveness o[illegible]sures: These measures if rigorously applied are expected to reduce landfo[illegible]urbance to a less than significant level. However, measures such as these a[illegible]n controversial, and increased funding for additional grading

Ref: Final EIR, p.29

Ref: Addendum 11/23/93 p. 4

Ref: Final EIR, p.29

Ref: Adden 11/23/93 p. 4

Table 3-11 Revised
SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING MITIGATION MEASURES
GEOLOGY (Cont.)										
2.Erosion Control	✓	(potentially)			✓		2a. See measures under 1, above. 2b. Include measure calling for Revision of Grading Ordinance to: a) Allow for the prohibition of grading on projects in all land use designations occupying environmentally-sensitive, steep or exceptionally erodible sites, using the following criteria: projects or grading which will occur on slopes over 20% OR which will disturb over 100 cubic yards OR exposure of more than 10,000 sq.ft. of soil except on slopes over 8% which should use a lower threshold of 25 cubic yards OR 1000 sq.ft. of disturbance. b) Develop a Memorandum of Understanding specifically outlining the Department of Public Works responsibilities in erosion control mitigation monitoring and provisions for fee collection. 2c The areas described on Table 6-5 should be redesignated.	2. Revision in final Plan	2. Significant, mitigable 2a,b To be implemented in grading ordinance revisions. Ref: General Plan Findings, p. 27 All but Asolla Drive area changed in Final Map.	2. Annual Plan progress report

Table 3-11 Revised
SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING MITIGATION MEASURES
GEOLOGY (Cont.)										
3. Seismic Hazards	✓ (potentially)				✓		3. Add implementation measure calling for individual site review for fault location within potential Bear Mountain fault branch. 3b. Add measure calling for a detailed geotechnical report during the environmental review process for public and private developments in high hazard areas, completed by a registered geologist or other qualified specialist. 3c. Require a soils report on all building permits and grading permits within areas of known slope instability or where significant potential hazard has been identified.	3. Revisions in final Plan	3. Significant, mitigable 3a-c Not adopted in Final Plan. Alternative mitigation noted in Findings. Ref: General Plan Findings, p. 27	3. Annual Plan progress report
4. Landsliding potential / other geologic hazards.	✓				✓		4. See Measures 3a-c, above.	4. Revisions in final Plan	4. Significant, mitigable Not adopted in Final Plan. Alternative mitigation noted in Findings. Ref: General Plan Findings, p. 27	4. Annual Plan progress report
5. Cumulative Impacts City v County	✓				✓		5. See Measures 1,2,3, above.	5. Revision to final Plan	5. Significant, mitigable Not adopted in Final Plan. Alternative mitigation noted in Findings. Ref: General Plan Findings, p. 27	5. Annual Plan progress report

Table 3-11 Revised
SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING MITIGATION MEASURES
HYDROLOGY										
1. Increases in stormflows and flooding - Within City Limits - Within proposed Sphere of Influence *Ref: Final EIR, p.28*	✓ (if proposed improvements are not funded)					✓	1a. Addition of a policy to the General Plan establishing on-site detention or other related facilities as the City's means of preventing increased flooding within City Limits. 1b. No additional measures are available to assure funding currently for drainage improvements within the City.	1. General Plan revision	1. Significant, mitigable 1a Measure incorporated into final Plan, but will not fully mitigate. Ref: General Plan Findings, p. 23	1. General Plan adoption process
2. Impacts of proposed bridge and culvert improvements	✓				✓		2. Biological field studies and resulting mitigations for the impacts of proposed bridge and culvert improvements.	2. Community Development Department scoping of environmental review for drainage improvements.	2. Significant, mitigable To be implemented via environmental review	2. Environmental review
3. Increases in stormwater runoff and flooding in floodplains.	✓					✓	3. Levees and floodwalls for any homes or other flood sensitive structures found to be located in floodplains and funding through user fees, development fees or similar mechanisms.	3. Flood Control District	3. Significant, mitigable Ref: General Plan Findings, p. 28	3. On-going Flood Control District efforts
4. Increases in stormwater runoff and flooding on canals.	✓				✓		4. Addition of a policy to the General Plan establishing methods of protection water canals, such as canal encasement, land use controls, and interceptor ditches/ diversion structures.	4. Environmental review	4. Less than significant See OS/Conservation Element Imp. Measure C Ref: General Plan Findings, p. 28	4. Environmental review
5. Impacts of regional downstream flooding	✓					✓	5. Continued efforts by the Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District to establish regional stormwater management facilities, including regional detention facilities if necessary.	5. Environmental review	5. Significant, mitigable Ref: General Plan Findings, p. 28	5. Environmental review

Table 3-11 Revised
SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING MITIGATION MEASURES
HYDROLOGY (Cont.)										
6. Impacts of detention facilities	✓				✓		6. Required biological surveys, wetland replacement, basin fencing, proper basin drainage and maintenance, and soils testing and proper disposal of sediments to address detention basin and water quality facility effects. The following studies and basin design features should be included in the project description submitted for environmental review: 6a. Botanical and biological surveys of areas to be affected by proposed detention basins. 6b. Recommended measures, such as wetland replacement, to offset impacts on biotic resources. 6c. Non-visually obtrusive fencing capable of restricting small children from any basins with permanent or semi-permanent standing water. 6d. Proper basin design and maintenance to prevent the occurrence of stagnant water and mosquito breeding. 6e. Periodic soils testing of accumulated sediments for hazardous substances and disposal a site approved to receive hazardous materials.	6. Environmental Review	6. Less than significant General Plan Final Mitigation: OS/Conserv. Element Implementation Measure D calls for Habitat Protection Ordinance. Also see Goals 7 and policies 7.1-7.6 Ref: General Plan Findings, p. 28	6. Environmental review

Table 3-11 Revised
SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING OF MITIGATION MEASURES
HYDROLOGY (Cont.)										
7. Degradation of surface waters	✓				✓	✓ (Rock Creek Reservoir)	7,9. Addition of a policy so that Best Management Practices are required throughout the Plan area and particularly in the upper Rock Creek watershed, particularly 7a. Utilize the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan Hydrology Study recommendations as a source of implementation tools for Best Management Practices. 7b. In the Rock Creek watershed wet scrubbing of parking areas with a scrubbing/vacuum machine should be added as a BMP. 7c. Adopt the sedimentation basin/bypass channel approach to protection of Rock Creek Reservoir water quality or comparable means.	7. General Plan revisions	7a. Less than significant. Measures incorporated into final Plan via DS/Conservation Measure D and Goal 7; policies 7.1-7.6 Ref: General Plan Findings, p. 28 7b-c. Significant, unmitigable. Rock Creek Reservoir. Specific measures not included in final Plan, unmitigable regardless. Rock Creek Reservoir. Specific measures not included in final Plan, unmitigable regardless.	N/A
8. Impacts of recommended water quality protection facilities	✓				✓		8. See Measure #6 for measures to avoid impacts of water quality protection facilities.	N/A	8. Less than significant. See #6.	N/A
9. Impacts on groundwater	✓					✓	9. See Measure #7 for measures to protect groundwater quality.	N/A	9. Significant, unmitigable	N/A
10 Effects of urbanization on groundwater recharge		✓					10. No further measures are necessary to limit the effects of urbanization on groundwater recharge.	N/A	10. Less than significant	N/A

Table 3-11 Revised
SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING MITIGATION MEASURES
HYDROLOGY (Cont.)										
11. Cumulative effects of joint City and County development – considered above.				✓		✓	11. No additional measures are available to the City regarding cumulative City/County impacts beyond those described above.	N/A	11. Significant, Unmitigable	N/A

Table 7-8
POTENTIAL BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES (BMPs) FOR THE AUBURN GENERAL PLAN AREA

Rural and Agricultural BMPs
- Animal Waste Management
- Range and Pasture Management
- Streamside Management Zones
- Agricultural Chemical Management

Urban and Commercial BMPs
- Litter Control/Solid Waste Management
- Street Cleaning
- Minimization of Directly Connected Impervious Areas
- Grass-lined or Vegetated Swales
- Public Education
- Filter Strips
- Dry Extended Detention Basins
- Wet Extended Detention Basins
- Constructed Wetlands
- Trapped Catch Basins
- Urban Landscaping
- Water Quality Inlets (Oil/Grit Separators)

Construction Site BMPs
- Dike and Berm Controls
- Ditch and Swale Controls
- Sediment Collection
- Land Grading Controls
- Vegetation and Mulching Controls
- Structure Slope Stabilization
- Litter Control/Solid Waste Management

Table 3-11 Revised
SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING MITIGATION MEASURES
BIOTIC RESOURCES										
1. Impacts to oak woodlands - within City Limits - within Sphere of Influence	✓					✓	1. Guidance on oak woodland protection should be incorporated into the General Plan. This guidance should address the following points - The percentage of any given project site's oak woodland acreage which should be set aside -- minimum of approx. 20% is recommended for oak woodlands which are adjacent to permanent open spaces containing natural habitat; a higher percentage, setaside, perhaps as much as 50% should be required where land use proposals will create islands of habitat; - The criteria for determining acceptable setaside lands (see text for details) - The management of the setaside woodlands into the future; - If exceptions from the setaside requirements are to be granted replacement requirements should be addressed (see 1b, below). This guidance could be part of implementation A which calls for a Tree Ord. or perhaps more comprehensively as a new implementation for Policy 3.3 which calls for planned unit developments.	1. General Plan revision, Tree Preservation Ordinance, and environmental review procedures.	~~Less Significant, unmitigable (Remains unmitigable.)~~ Final mitigation included in General Plan: OS/Conserv. Element Goal 1, policies 1.1, 1.4, 1.7, Imp. Measure A (Tree Ordinance). These recommendations will be used as a guide to Tree Ordinance. Ref: General Plan Findings, p. 29. Unmitigable, regardless.	1. General Plan adoption procedure environmental review process.

Table 3-11 Revised

SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING MITIGATION MEASURES
BIOTIC RESOURCES (Cont.)										
							1b. Oak woodland replacement requirements. Requirements should be considered for incorporation into the Draft General Plan policies and possibly into Tree Preservation Ordinance: – Developers should be required to provide off-site lands, or adequate fees, for tree plantings if woodlands over one acre cannot be protected on site. – Oak woodland restoration plans should include consideration of effects on habitat at the off-site locations. – Oak woodland restoration plans should incorporate native understory plantings in order to create a plant community rather than a simple stand of trees; – Unavoidable impacts to native oaks, other than blue and valley oaks, should be mitigated for through replacement at 5:1 for trees greater than four inches diameter at breast height (dbh) and at 1:1 for trees less than four inches dbh. For blue and valley oaks, the replacement requirement for less than four inch dbh trees should b[illegible]creased to 3:1			

LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE

Table 3-11 Revised

SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT			PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING MITIGATION MEASURES
BIOTIC RESOURCES (Cont.)						
			due to the poor regeneration of these species. – The restoration plans should be prepared by qualified specialists experienced in restoration ecology.			
			1c. Application of the Clustered Development (CD) and Open Space Private (OSP) overlay designations to areas D and I described in the Impact section. Additionally, the CD/OSP Designation should be applied to the following areas, numbered according to the map showing Planning Commission changes to the September, 1992 Draft General Plan: • G/25 [not added] • F/28 [not added] • C/44 [added] • C/50 • D/52D [OS] • C/11 [most to CD/OSP] • G/2D			
2. Impacts on riparian habitat	✓	✓	2a. Additional implementation defining the conditions under which wetlands may be destroyed and the requirements for replacement in these situations. (see text for details)	2. Revision of Draft Community Plan Land Use Map	2. Significant, mitigable Ref: General Plan Findings, p. 29	N/A

3-34a

Ref: Final EIR, p.38

Table 3-11 Revised

SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING MITIGATION MEASURES
BIOTIC RESOURCES (Cont.)										
							2b. Reference to constraints maps, including the wetland maps, on Land Use Map. The constraints maps, including wetland maps should be referred to by a note on the Land Use Map. Application of the Open Space is preferred, but this is a major change to the proposed Plan and constitutes an alternative rather than mitigation. For the purposes of mitigation, the note should refer to the General Plan's constraints maps and worn the user that constraints may affect maximum residential densities and land use intensities; the intent is to provide a notice to prospective developers/land owners of the significant constraint and to facilitate complete project review by City staff.		Included on General Plan Land Use Map and Table IV-4. Ref: General Plan Findings, p. 29	
							2c. Additional supplemental policy language. The General Plan policies should be revised to include : – All stream and wetland environments should be identified, delineated, and quantified within individual project development maps and related documents. If areas are suspected of supporting stream or wetland habitats, it is the responsibility of the project		Implemented by Open Space/Conservation policies 1.1, 1.7, (see 2a) Also see OS/Cons., Policy 1.9 and Imp. Measures C, D Ref: General Plan Findings, p. 29	

Table 3-11 Revised

SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING MITIGATION MEASURES
BIOTIC RESOURCES (Cont.)										
							proponent to contract with a qualified botanist, biologist, or wetland specialist to verify presence or absence. – All identified stream and wetland habitats must be fully protected through the establishment of open space buffers. These buffers shall consist of the standard widths of 100-ft above the banks or edge of any perennial streams or wetland habitats and 50-ft above the banks or edge of all intermittent or seasonal streams or wetlands unless circumstances justify different distances which are approved by the Dept of Fish and Game. This setback should extend beyond the recommended distances if necessary to protect all on-site riparian wetland habitat.		See OS/Cons., Policy 1.4 Ref: General Plan Findings, p. 29 Also see Policies 1.3, 1.5, 1.6	
3. Impacts to special plant species and natural communities		✓ (special plants) ✓ (potentially for special natural communities)			✓		3. Addition of a policy specifically recognizing and protecting special natural communities. (No additional measures are needed specifically for impacts to special plants.)	3. Draft Plan revision	3. Less than significant Final mitigation included in General Plan: OS/Cons. Element policies 1.1, 1.4, 1.7 Ref: General Plan Findings, p. 29	3. Plan adoption procedure.

Table 3-11 Revised

SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING MITIGATION MEASURES
BIOTIC RESOURCES (Cont.)										
4. Impacts to Special Animal Species		✓					4-6 No additional mitigation measures are necessary for impacts to special animals, other important wildlife species, 20-year impacts, and existing Plan impacts.	N/A	4. Less than significant See discussion under Biotic Impacts 1,2, & 3	
5. Impacts to general Wildlife Species	✓					✓	(See 4, above)	(See 4 above)	5. Significant, unmitigable - regardless See discussion under Biotic Impacts 1,2, & 3	(See 4 above)
6. Impacts of cumulative City and County buildout				✓(potentially)		✓	(See above)		6. Significant, unmitigable - regardless	

Table 3-11 Revised
SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING MITIGATION MEASURES
CULTURAL RESOURCES										
1. Impacts to historic and prehistoric resources - Existing City Limits - Sphere of Influence	✓			✓		✓	1a. Implementation Measure B should be revised to require adoption of an ordinance requiring review of development in Areas I, II, III, and IV per the Development Guidelines. The text on Plan page XI-7 should be revised accordingly. 1b. Addition of more specific implementation program. The following program elements would address the concerns noted in the impact section for areas and issues not covered by the Development Guidelines. – Require record search as part of all grading permits, building permits and land use applications requiring environmental review and require appropriate treatment per resulting recommendations. (This will address historic and prehistoric concerns.) – Require demolition permit and historical analysis by an accredited historian of all structures (including outbuildings) over 30 years in age.	1. Text addition to final Plan.	1. Significant, unmitigable (Remains unmitigable) Final General Plan mitigation: - Special designations for Old Town and Downtown - Public hearings for all demolitions within 1948 townsite Ref: General Plan Findings, pp. 34-35	1. Individual project review and yearly Plan progress report.

Table 3-11 Revised
SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING MITIGATION MEASURES
CULTURAL RESOURCES (Cont.)							– Develop demolition ordinance prohibiting demolition of structures over 30 years in age if they contribute to the historic fabric of the community. (Individual historic significance is of concern as well as the overall historic backdrop of the community.) – Redesignate the following areas: 1. Pioneer Trail alignment to Open Space ~~where it occurs on private undeveloped land and where existing uses do not occur. [Consultant change]~~ 2. ~~Key landmarks within Full length of~~ First Continental Railroad alignment to Open Space ~~where existing uses do not occur. [Consultant change]~~ 3. Historic canals & ditches rights-of-way to Open Space – Work with PCWA on retaining historic canals and ditches which is counter to the agency's policy.			

Ref: Final EIR, p.43

Table 3-11 Revised
SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING MITIGATION MEASURES
CULTURAL RESOURCES (Cont.)										
Ref: Final EIR, p.44							– Call for specific site protection in Plan text. The Plan text should be revised to call for the protection and retention within future development of the ~~following~~ sites [listed on Table 9.4 [Consultant change]. (These sites are located within land use designations which are generally appropriate to provide for retention or adaptive reuse.) These sites should also be called out on the Land Use Map where possible. This list should be added to as new inventories are conducted. f. Add stream setback policy. See Biotic Resources section for detailed wording. g. Revise land use designations as new information becomes available. h. Request that the cultural resources inventory underway by the Department of Museums include non-structural historic features as well as outbuildings and orchards/ vegetation groupings which contribute to the historic fabric of the area.			

Table 3-11 Revised
SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING MITIGATION MEASURES
CULTURAL RESOURCES (Cont.)										

Table 9-4
SITES TO BE SPECIFICALLY PROTECTED AND INCLUDED WITHIN FUTURE DEVELOPMENT

Existing City Limits

Non-Structural & Other Historic Features such as:
stone walls, signs, flumes, fences, orchard remnants, mining/ agricultural remains, outbuildings/barns when possible.
Historic Structures which:
may be outside the designated Historic Areas (I-IV).

Existing Sphere of Influence

Auburn Rancheria

Specific Sites:
6. Cal-Ida Lumber Co.
16. Southern Pacific Underpass at Luther/Hwy 49
20. Mt Vernon Grange Hall
34. Gasoline Alley
35. Edgewood Grocery Store
46. Mark Beecher Home
47. Bettreunds Home
49. Oak Ridge Farm
50. Ray Weller Home
51. Fellencer Farm
52. Lester Millam House
62. Goldsberry Ranch, 3605 Grass Valley Hwy/ Rock Creek School Site
67. Bissett Ranch

Historic Structures which:
may be outside the designated Historic Areas (I-IV).

Proposed Sphere of Influence Additions

Non-Structural & Other Historic Features such as:
stone walls, signs, flumes, fences, orchard remnants, mining/ agricultural remains, outbuildings/barns when possible.

Specific Sites:
1. WPA Bridge
4. Wpa Bridge
5. WPA Bridge
7. Glenoaks Auto Court
8. Armbuster Home
15. Southern Pacific Culvert/Rock wall
22. Bowman Store Site
23. Bowman Auto Court
25. Ackerman School
48. Channel Hill Grocery
69. Halborn Ranch
71. PG&E Bridge over Wise Canal

Note: Sites within the Sphere of Influence can be located on the Confidential Cultural Resources Inventory in the Placer County Planning Dept.

Table 3-11 Revised
SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING OF MITIGATION MEASURES
TRAFFIC/CIRCULATION										
1 Increased congestion on the street system. - Congestion within City limits - Congestion within the Sphere of Influence *Ref: Final EIR, p.45*	✓					✓	1a The Draft General Plan should identify the means by which specific intersection deficiencies will be identified and how improvements will be funded. ~~1b. Addition of a policy to the General Plan calling for incorporation of needed Sphere of Influence improvements into the City's Capital Improvement Program as annexations take place.~~ 1~~b~~c. Addition of a policy and implementation measures calling for a joint City/County mitigation fee program to address impacts to the City's street system (particularly downtown) and appropriate locations in the Sphere of Influence. (See text for examples) 1~~c~~e. Identification of specific Transportation Control Measures in the General Plan.	1. a,b,c) General Plan update process; d) Primarily implemented through requirements on new and existing uses, possibly through a Trip Reduction Ordinance.	1. Significant, unmitigable 1a Not adopted in final Plan. Circulation Element measure L. Not specifically adopted in final Plan. Will be adopted independent of General Plan.	1. a,b,c) General Plan update process; d) On going monitoring by the Air Pollution District
2. Impacts of proposed improvements	✓					✓	2. Identification of the following mitigation needs in the General Plan to address the effects of road improvements:	2. Road improvement design	2. Significant, unmitigable	2. Further environmental review.

Table 3-11 Revised
SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING MITIGATION MEASURES
TRAFFIC/CIRCULATION (Cont.)							2a. Maximum feasible wetland avoidance and replacement and erosion control of exposed surfaces to reduce impacts on wetlands. (See details in text). .1 Shifts in proposed road alignments to miss wetlands .2 Use of retaining walls to reduce fill slopes .3 Where wetlands cannot be avoided, recreation of wetlands in the project corridor or nearby. .4 Failing the above, payment of a mitigation fee for wetland banking. Erosion control during and after construction is another important measure. 2b. Tree avoidance and tree replantings. Planned road improvements should be designed to provide maximum feasible avoidance of trees. In some cases, this may involve a slight adjustment of alignment and in others a selective use of retaining walls. Trees lost should be replaced in the vicinity at a minimum 2:1 ratio. 2c. Minimization of cut and fill extent through selective use of retaining structures, and through complete	2. Road improvement design	2. Significant, unmitigable 2a-d Measures not specifically adopted in final Plan. Will be adopted independent of General Plan.	2. Further environmental review.

Table 3-11 Revised
SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING MITIGATION MEASURES
TRAFFIC/CIRCULATION (Cont.)										
							revegetation with a variety of plant materials.			
							2d. Identification of all rural roads in the General Plan as locally scenic and specification of the above measures and others as aesthetic standards.			
3. Effects of increased traffic on Quality of Life.	✓					✓	3. No mitigations are available to address significant impacts to quality of life on residential streets.	N/A	3. Significant, unmitigable	N/A
4. Increased demand on transit service.		✓					4,5 No mitigations are needed related to less than significant effects on transit and air transportation services.	N/A	4,5 Less than significant	N/A
5. Increased demand on air transportation		✓								
6. Cumulative traffic impacts of City and County Plans				✓		✓	6. See #1-3 above.	N/A	6. Significant, unmitigable	N/A

Table 3-11 Revised
SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING OF MITIGATION MEASURES
AIR QUALITY										
1. Construction generated pollutants	✓					✓	1. Construction generated pollutants - Add policy requiring APCD review and approval of grading plans.	1. Revision of final Plan	1. Significant, unmitigable (Remains unmitigable) Measure not adopted in final Plan. Unmitigable regardless.	N/A
2. Effects of motor vehicle emissions due to buildout of the Plan area	✓					✓	2. Motor vehicle emissions. Add policies to the Plan related to air quality improvement. Throughout the Plan, various policies require pedestrian and bicycle facility promotion provisions. (See text for details)	2. Revisions of final Plan.	2. Significant, unmitigable (Remains unmitigable) Measure not adopted in final Plan. Unmitigable regardless.	N/A
3. Impacts of stationary sources of emission with buildout of Plan area	✓					✓	3. Stationary source review. Point sources are required to obtain permits from the APCD and no additional measures are recommended For area sources add the following policies related to woodstoves: a. Require that new residential developments install only EPA certified woodstoves. b. Require new development projects requiring discretionary approval participate in the APCD's woodstove replacement program as a condition of project approval.	3. Revision of final Plan	3. Significant, unmitigable 3a-b (Remains unmitigable) Measures not adopted in final Plan. Unmitigable regardless.	N/A
4. Cumulative impacts: City plus County buildout				✓		✓	4. Add policy of cooperation in Land Use, Circulation, and Housing Element sections of the Plan.	4. Policy addition in final Plan	4. Significant, unmitigable (Remains unmitigable) Measures not included in final Plan. Unmitigable regardless.	4. Yearly Plan progress report

Table 3-11 Revised
SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING MITIGATION MEASURES
NOISE										
1. Increased traffic noise due to buildout of proposed plan	✓			✓		✓	1.& 2. a. Acoustical analyses in critical areas with all building permits. b. Add new policy to Plan for consideration of Plan area-wide noise impact fee to retrofit existing residential uses with noise walls and for interior noise insulation. c. Study noise wall feasibility and create noise wall master plan.	1,2 Revision to final plan and overlay zoning (s)	1,2 Significant, unmitigable 1a-c (Remains unmitigable) Measures not adopted in final Plan. Unmitigable regardless.	1. Annual Plan progress report
2. Railroad noise	✓			✓		✓				
3. Noise from non-transportation sources. a. Calif. Dept. of Forestry Hellpad b. Auburn Truss & Lumber c. Chevreaux Concrete d. Public Address Systems e. Airport Industrial Area f. Auburn Container Co. g. Auburn Placer Disposal		✓					3. Add new policy requiring noise analysis be performed for any land uses proposing use of public address system in which noise sensitive land uses are located or could be located within 100 feet of facility.	3. Revision of final Plan.	3. Less than significant	3. Annual Plan progress report and individual development review
4. Airport noise - Existing receptors - Future receptors	✓ ✓			✓ ✓	 ✓	✓	4. Require residential clustering within the 65 dB Ldn contour to the east of airport. Implement overlay zoning. Show airport influence zone and noise contours on Land Use Map and Zoning Maps.	4. Revision to final Plan and overlay zoning.	4. Existing: Significant, unmitigable; future: Less than significant Final mitigation incorporated into General Plan: reference to Constraints on Land Use Map & Table IV-4, 2 ac residential density, and CD/OSP in airport area. Ref: General Plan Findings, p. 3	4. Yearly Plan progress report. Individual development review.
5. Cumulative Impacts		See sections above.								

Table 3-11 Revised
SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING MITIGATION MEASURES
PUBLIC FACILITIES										
Schools										
Increased need for School Facilities										
1. Auburn Union School Dist										
1a. New schools needed		✓					1a-c. None recommended.	1. Policy addition in final Plan	1a-c Less than significant	1. Annual Plan progress report
1b. Southern area school needed.		✓					1d. Add policy to assist school districts in capturing monies lost from in-fill projects by adding land use policies which:		1d. Less than significant Final mitigation included in General Plan: Land Use Element Policy 12.11 and inclusion of school master plans in General Plan "Supporting Documents"; inclusion of school sites on Land Use Map. Ref: General Plan Findings, pp. 29-30	
1c. Airport setback required for schools.		✓					.1 Require the City to deny any building permit(s) for new residential or commercial construction where a school district has declared impaction and has developed a facility financing plan unless the project complies with the financing plan;			
1d. Facility financing.	✓				✓		.2 It would be appropriate for the Plan to include an implementation measure requiring that development impact fees and facility user fees be adjusted regularly to ensure that new development mitigate impacts to a level considered acceptable to the AUSD.			
							1e. Add policy noting the City's support for year-round schools.			

Table 3-11 Revised
SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING OF MITIGATION MEASURES
PUBLIC FACILITIES (cont)										
2. Ackerman School District										
2a. New school and needed site funding		✓					2a. New school needed - None recommended. 2a.1 Add policy noting the City's support for year round schools.	2. Policy addition to Plan	2. Less than significant Measure not adopted in final Plan.	2. Annual Plan progress report
2b. Proximity to Airport		✓					2b. None recommended.			
3. Placer Union High School District										
3a. Two new schools needed.		✓					3a. None recommended.	3. Policy addition in final Plan	3. Less than significant	3. Annual Plan progress report
3b. Facility funding	✓			✓			3b. Add policy recommended in 1.d above 3c. Add policy noting the City's support for year-round schools.		See 1d discussion. Measure not included in final Plan	
4. Sierra College	✓	(potentially)				✓	4. Add policy: assist Sierra College in meeting its goals. The City d 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.	4. Policy addition in final Plan	4. Significant, unmitigable Measures not adopted in final Plan, potentially unmitigable regardless.	4. Annual Plan progress report

Table 3-11 Revised
SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING MITIGATION MEASURES
PUBLIC FACILITIES (cont)										
Parks & Recreation										
1. Increased demand on public parks	✓				✓		1,2 Add policy under Goal #3 of the Open Space/Conservation Element related to site acquisition and full fee charges. Suggested wording follows: – Require full mitigation of park and recreation impacts from new development and priortize parkland acquisition in lieu of payment of impact fees. (Implementation could be via a fee which represents actual park acquisition and recreation development costs, developer construction of sites, or other measures which could be identified in the ARD Master Plan).	1,2 Inclusion of policies in final Plan	1,2. Less than significant Final mitigation: City is working with ARD on master plan and will require all residential land uses to participate in funding. Imp. D calls for Landscape and Lighting Districts. Ref: General Plan Findings, p. 30	1,2 Annual Plan progress report
2. Cumulative impacts				✓	✓					
Telephone										
1. Buildout of Plan area.		✓					1. None recommended.	N/A	1. Less than significant	N/A
2. Installation of new lines.	✓ (potentially)				✓		2. Add the following policies to the Circulation Element: 2a. Add policy formalizing requirement for utility line undergrounding of new developments. 2b. Add policy requiring mitigation attention to the installation of new telephone	2. Revision to final plan.	2. Significant, mitigable Measure already implemented in City Code. Will be implemented in Grading Ordinance	2. Annual Plan progress report

Implementation

Table 3-11 Revised
SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING MITIGATION MEASURES
PUBLIC FACILITIES (cont)										
							could be via inclusion of more detailed questions regarding these impacts on the Initial Environmental Study checklist.			
							2c. Add policy calling for a priority list for undergrounding of existing lines priority list based on those areas currently most visually impacted by lines.		Measure already implemented in City Code	
Gas & Electric										
1. Increased power demand		✓					1. None recommended.	N/A	1. Less than significant	N/A
2. Impacts from installation of new distribution and transmission lines.	✓ (potentially)				✓ (distrib lines)	✓ (transmis. lines)	2. Add the following policies to the Circulation Element:	2. Revision to final Plan	2. Significant, mitigable	2. Yearly Plan progress report and development plan review
							2a. Include a policy formalizing City utility line underground requirements.		Measure already implemented in City code.	
							2b. Include a policy in the Plan requiring mitigation of potential impacts from power line installation. Implementation could be via inclusion of questions regarding these impacts on the Environmental Review Checklist form.		Will be implemented in Grading Ordinance.	
							2c. Add policy for an undergrounding of existing lines priority list based on those areas currently most impacted by lines.		Measure already implemented in City code.	

Table 3-11 Revised
SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING MITIGATION MEASURES
PUBLIC FACILITIES (cont)										
3. Health risk from electro-magnetic radiation (EMF).			(Unresolved)				Health Risk from EMF: Include policies recommended in the Circulation Element of the Plan based on the doctrine of prudent avoidance (see table below)	3. Revisions to final Plan	3. Unresolved	3. Review of development plans by Community Development Department

Table 13
RECOMMENDED GOALS FOR NEW ELECTRICAL FACILITY PLANNING, SITING, AND CONSTRUCTION

A. Planning for expansion, siting, and construction of future facilities should attempt to minimize EMF near sensitive areas (e.g., schools, hospitals, playgrounds), existing ares of high EMF exposure, and areas of future development.
B. The City will inform all affected citizens of the projected EMF during the design phases of new transmission lines, substations, and substation distribution lines.
C. The PG&E company and the Community Development Department should coordinate joint review of land use applications where significantly increased EMF exposure may be anticipated.
D. In siting new transmission and distribution lines and substations, public exposure to EMF should not be increased where practical alternatives exist.
E. Substations shall be fenced to discourage public access to substation property. Substations shall be landscaped to mitigate adverse impacts on the surrounding properties.
F. For all new substation facilities, the City shall follow the site review process, including review by Planning Commission.
H. Where reasonable or practical, the City should seek to systematically reduce public exposure to EMF from existing electrical facilities. This should include dwellings, schools, playgrounds, hospitals, and public assembly areas.
I. The City shall encourage other entities with electrical facilities within the Plan area to adopt the policy of reducing public exposure to EMF.

Policies

1. Transmission and distribution lines should be designed using the best available technology to reduce EMF to the lowest practical level, consistent with reasonable costs.
2. Require all new electric transmission project have an EMF mitigation Plan as an element in the project's environmental document.

Table 3-11 Revised
SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING MITIGATION MEASURES
PUBLIC FACILITIES (cont)										
4. Cumulative impacts - City plus County buildout.		✓					3. See Measures under #2 above.	N/A	4. Less than significant	N/A
Solid Waste										
1. Increased and cumulative demand on the Western Regional Landfill.		✓					1. Add policy requiring implementation of the City's SRRE.	1. Policy addition to final Plan	1. Less than significant	1. City Community Development Dept.
2. Increased demand on the Auburn Transfer Station.		✓					2 Add policy protecting transfer station site and surrounding lands from incompatible land uses.	2. Policy addition to final Plan	2. Less than significant	2. City Community Development Dept.
3. Cumulative impacts – City plus County Plan buildout.		✓					3. None recommended beyond those recommended above.	N/A	3. Less than significant	N/A
Sewage Disposal										
1. Increased demand on the Auburn's wastewater treatment plant		✓					1. None recommended.	N/A	1. Less than significant	N/A
2. Impacts due to expansion of the City's Treatment Plant	✓				✓		2. Implement measures recommended in the Wastewater Treatment Plan Draft EIR (QUAD, 1992)	2. Conditions of plant construction	2. Less than significant Referenced as part of "Master Plans/Specific Plans" to be implemented as part of Plan, Ref: General Plan Findings, p. 30	2. Department of Public Works ongoing oversight
3. Impacts related to collection line adequacy/ construction.	✓ (potentially) ✓ (collection line adequacy)					✓	3. Add policy calling for mitigation of these impacts to the degree possible by individual developers and the City Public Works Department.	3. Policy addition to final Plan.	3. Significant, mitigable Ref: General Plan Findings, p. 30	3. Annual Plan progress report

Table 3-11 Revised
SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING MITIGATION MEASURES
PUBLIC FACILITIES (cont)										
4. Health/water quality impacts in areas not suitable for septic systems.		✓					4. Health/water quality impacts in areas not suitable for septic systems – Add policy calling for the County Environmental Health Division and the City 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. Require sewering of these areas if annexation occurs.	4. Policy addition to final Plan.	4. Less than significant Measure not adopted in final Plan, less than significant regardless.	4. Annual Plan progress report
5. Cumulative City plus County Buildout.		✓					5. The City and County should work toward ultimate sewer jurisdictional boundaries within the City's Sphere of Influence which based on gravity flow.	N/A	5. Less than significant	N/A
6. Impacts to SMD.	✓				✓		6. Add policy recommending a joint planning effort/study be established between the City and county to provide the most efficient wastewater service in the City of Auburn and Auburn/Bowman Community Plan areas.	6. Policy addition to final Plan	6. Less than significant Within Wastewater Treatment referenced in Plan. Ref. General Plan Findings, p. 30	6. Annual Plan progress report
Police Protection										
1. Increased demand for police services a. Existing City Limits b. Proposed Sphere of Influence		✓					1. None recommended.		1. Less than significant	N/A

Table 3-11 Revised
SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING MITIGATION MEASURES
PUBLIC FACILITIES (cont)										
2. Cumulative police protection demand		✓					2. A structure for evaluating fiscal impacts of individual large commercial developments and City annexations Special District boundary adjustments should be incorporated into the Plan implementation measures.	2. Add policy/implementation measure to Final Plan	2. Less than significant. Measure not included in final Plan.	2. Year Plan progress report
Water Supply										
1. Increased demand on surface water supplies		✓					1. No additional measures recommended.	N/A		
2. Impacts related to new water system facilities.	✓ (potentially)				✓		2. Add policy calling for mitigation of these impacts to the degree possible by individual developers and the City Public Works Department.	2. Policy addition in final Plan	2. Less than significant. See Safety Element Policies 5.1, 5.2, 5.4 Ref: General Plan Findings, p. 30	2. Department of Public Works review of Improvement Plans
3. Cumulative water supply (City plus County buildout)		✓					3. Add implementation measure requiring that development impact fees be adjusted annually to ensure that new development fully pays for the cost of needed services and facilities.	3. Policy addition to final Plan.	3. Less than significant. Measure not included in final Plan	3. Yearly progress report
Fire Protection										
1. Increased demand on fire protection services a Placer Foothill Consolidated Fire Protection District		✓					1a. Add policy supporting higher level of fire protection service in southern Plan area and Bowman area.	1. Revisions to final Plan and Land Use Map	1. Less than significant. See Safety Element Policies 1.2, 3.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.4 and Land Use Map. Ref: General Plan Findings, p. 30	1. Annual Plan progress report

Table 3-11 Revised
SUMMARY TABLE

TOPIC / IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Cumulatively Significant	Mitigable	Unmitigable	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES	*LEVEL OF IMPACT FINAL ADOPTED PLAN*	MONITORING MITIGATION MEASURES
PUBLIC FACILITIES (cont)										
Increased demand on fire protection services (cont.) b Bowman Area / Christian Valley							1b. Add designations on the Land Use Map of new fire station sites currently being evaluated by the Auburn Fire Department.		See Safety Element Policies 1.2, 3.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.4 and Land Use Map. Ref: General Plan Findings, p. 30	
c Southern Plan area							1c. Add implementation measure requiring that development impact fees be adjusted annually to ensure that new development fully pays for the cost of providing services and facilities and that the City should adopt fee similar to the consolidated fee to ensure maintenance of ISO ratings.		See Safety Element Policies 1.2, 3.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.4 and Land Use Map. Ref: General Plan Findings, p. 30	
2. Wildland fire hazard.	✓				✓		2. Add policy requiring implementation of CDF fire safe regulations and Fire Department review of all development proposals.	2. Revisions to final Plan	2. Less than significant See Safety Policy 3.6 and Measure A. Also Safety Policies 1.2, 3.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.4 Ref: General Plan Findings, p. 30	2. City of Auburn, Consolidated, CDF, and Newcastle Fire Districts
3. Cumulative impacts		✓					3. No additional measures needed.	N/A	3. Less than significant	N/A