

## 4.6 Land Use and Planning

### 4.6.1 Methods and Significance Criteria

#### Methods

This section evaluates the effects on land use and planning that would result from implementation of the proposed action and alternatives.

Anticipated changes in land cover/land use for each alternative are described in Chapter 2, *Proposed Action and Alternatives*. See Section 4.0, *Environmental Consequences*, for a description of the methodology used across all resource chapters for the analysis of cumulative effects.

Impacts related to land use and planning were determined by analyzing the PCCP and Covered Activities and comparing them to the *Placer County General Plan* land use designation map (Placer County 2013), the *City of Lincoln General Plan* land use designation map (City of Lincoln 2008a), and GIS data of land cover types in the Plan Area. Also reviewed were the EIRs for the general plans (City of Lincoln 2008b; Placer County 1994) as well as pertinent Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) guidance regarding wildlife attractants in the vicinity of airports.

#### Significance Criteria

According to Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, a proposed action would be considered to have a significant effect if it would result in any of the following.

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

In addition, based on guidance from the FAA, the proposed action would be considered to have a significant effect if it would result in the following.

- Result in safety hazards due to creation, restoration, or enhancement of habitats that can result in the creation of wildlife attractants in the vicinity of airports as identified in *FAA Advisory Circular 150-5200-33B Hazardous Wildlife Attractants on or Near Airports* (Federal Aviation Administration 2007).

### 4.6.2 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

#### Alternative 1—No Action

As described in Section 4.0, *Environmental Consequences*, Alternative 1 includes reasonably foreseeable activities in the Plan Area associated with urbanization and associated infrastructure

development, operation, and maintenance considered in the various planning documents of the local jurisdictions (i.e., Placer County and the City of Lincoln) as well as future projects of the South Placer Regional Transportation Authority (SPRTA) and Placer County Water Agency (PCWA), such as local transportation and water projects.

**Impact LU-1: Physical division of an established community (NEPA: no impact; CEQA: no impact)**

Because development would occur as planned for and allowed under the *City of Lincoln General Plan* and the *Placer County General Plan*, land use impacts would be the same as those identified for the general plans. In addition, the Covered Activities, including growth associated with the general plans, were found in the EIRs for those plans not to result in the division of established communities. Future projects of SPRTA and PCWA, such as local transportation and water projects, would likely be implemented either outside or on the borders of existing communities, and would be unlikely to physically divide established communities.

**NEPA Determination:** Growth associated with the general plans of the City of Lincoln and Placer County would not result in the division of established communities, and future projects of SPRTA and PCWA would likely be implemented either outside or on the borders of existing communities and would be unlikely to physically divide established communities. Therefore, there would be no impact.

**CEQA Determination:** Growth associated with the general plans of the City of Lincoln and Placer County would not result in the division of established communities, and future projects of SPRTA and PCWA would likely be implemented either outside or on the borders of existing communities and would be unlikely to physically divide established communities. Therefore, there would be no impact.

**Impact LU-2: Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect (NEPA: no impact; CEQA: no impact)**

Under Alternative 1, because development would occur as planned for and allowed under the local jurisdictions' general plans, land use impacts would be the same as those identified for the general plans, and would not result in any new actions or policies that could conflict with land use plans, policies, and regulations.

**NEPA Determination:** Alternative 1 would not result in any new actions or policies that could conflict with land use plans, policies and regulations. Therefore, there would be no impact.

**CEQA Determination:** Alternative 1 would not result in any new actions or policies that could conflict with land use plans, policies and regulations. Therefore, there would be no impact.

**Impact LU-3: Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan (NEPA: no impact; CEQA: no impact)**

The PCCP would not be adopted under Alternative 1. There would continue to be no HCP or NCCP in the Plan Area. The County's Placer Legacy Open Space and Agricultural Conservation Program (Placer Legacy) will remain an active program in the county, and the existing plans are consistent with that program. For these reasons, there would be no impact.

**NEPA Determination:** Under Alternative 1, there would continue to be no HCP or NCCP in the Plan Area, and existing plans are not in conflict with Placer Legacy. Therefore, there would be no impact.

**CEQA Determination:** Under Alternative 1, there would continue to be no HCP or NCCP in the Plan Area, and existing plans are not in conflict with Placer Legacy. Therefore, there would be no impact.

**Impact LU-4: Result in safety hazards due to creation, restoration, or enhancement of habitats that can result in the creation of wildlife attractants in the vicinity of airports as identified in FAA Advisory Circular 150-5200-33B Hazardous Wildlife Attractants on or Near Airports (NEPA: no impact)**

Existing plans do not specifically include development of habitats in the vicinity of airports. Should such projects be proposed in the future, project-specific environmental analysis would address such effects.

**NEPA Determination:** Existing plans do not specifically include development of habitats in the vicinity of airports. Therefore, there would be no impact.

**CEQA Determination:** This impact is not subject to analysis under CEQA.

## Alternative 2—Proposed Action

**Impact LU-1: Physical division of an established community (NEPA: less than significant; CEQA: less than significant)**

Communities could be divided if barriers (such as a major transportation project or a wildlife preserve with no public access) are constructed that would limit existing access to all or part of a community.

Under Alternative 2, the proposed action, implementation of the PCCP would occur. Land use designations as well as approval and standards for development of land and infrastructure would continue to be governed by various local agencies in the Plan Area. The Reserve Acquisition Area (RAA) is shown in Figure 2-2, and although the specific locations of lands that would be acquired for conservation purposes are not currently identified, it is anticipated that they would be located primarily on undeveloped or agricultural lands where there are existing special-status species habitats or populations or that have high connectivity to existing habitat and conservation areas. Such areas would typically be non-urbanized and outside of established communities, including rural communities. The conservation strategy does allow for acquisitions within the Potential Future Growth Area (PFG), particularly in the Valley, potentially resulting in the physical division of existing communities. Such acquisitions—expected to be approximately 2,500 acres (approximately 0.05% of all acquisitions)—would primarily be focused on the Stream System or on large contiguous blocks of vernal pool complex lands adjacent to the RAA. Reserve acquisitions within the PFG would be selected to minimize the adverse edge effects associated with urban interface and to minimize the potential division of existing communities. Reserve acquisitions in the PFG would likely be in and around the Stream System—areas not otherwise suitable for urban development because of floodplain constraints, related general plan policies, and PCCP avoidance and minimization measures. Small avoidance areas and other isolated parcels within existing communities that may have a disruptive effect would not be suitable lands for establishing a reserve that would meet the Plan’s biological goals and objectives because of the incompatible interface with existing urban land uses and the impracticability of suitably managing lands in the PFG in perpetuity.

In addition, the EIRs for the local jurisdictions' general plans concluded that growth associated with implementation of the general plans would not result in the division of established communities. Accordingly, implementation of the PCCP would not result in the division of established communities.

**NEPA Determination:** Alternative 2, the proposed action, would not result in the physical division of established communities. This impact would be less than significant.

**CEQA Determination:** Alternative 2, the proposed action, would not result in the physical division of established communities. This impact would be less than significant. No mitigation has been identified.

**Impact LU-2: Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect (NEPA: less than significant; CEQA: less than significant)**

Under Alternative 2, the proposed action, land use and development would continue to be ultimately governed by the land use elements of the local jurisdictions' general and specific plans subject to Chapter 6 of the Plan. The Plan contains a conservation strategy that includes the acquisition and management of land for conservation purposes within the RAA. However, the Plan does not designate specific lands for conservation and would not reduce or affect the ability of Placer County or the City of Lincoln to regulate land use through their general plans. The land uses allowed by current zoning and land use designations within the RAA would continue to be allowed when the PCCP is implemented. The proposed conservation measures would generally be undertaken in areas where planning and zoning designations would be compatible with open space and would not be in conflict with policies adopted to reduce environmental effects. In addition, the PCCP does not authorize the Covered Activities, which would continue to be regulated through existing land use authority. The local jurisdictions' general plan EIRs found that impacts of implementation of the general plans related to conflicts with plans and policies would be less than significant.

**NEPA Determination:** Alternative 2, the proposed action, would not reduce or affect the ability of the local jurisdictions to regulate land use through their respective general plans and would not authorize specific land uses. Conservation measures would be consistent with the local general plans. This impact would be less than significant.

**CEQA Determination:** Alternative 2, the proposed action, would not reduce or affect the ability of the local jurisdictions to regulate land use through their respective general plans and would not authorize specific land uses. Conservation measures would be consistent with the local general plans. This impact would be less than significant. No mitigation has been identified.

**Impact LU-3: Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan (NEPA: less than significant; CEQA: less than significant)**

Currently there are no HCPs or NCCPs in the Plan Area. Placer Legacy has goals that intentionally overlap and are consistent with some PCCP goals, but it was developed within a broader context of open space (i.e., recreation, agriculture, cultural and historic resources, scenic values, and public safety in addition to biological resources) and local, state, and federal non-regulatory environmental objectives. Placer Legacy largely relies upon existing statutes and general plan policies for implementation. Placer Legacy will remain an active program within the county. Placer Legacy will

continue to acquire land and may—depending upon funding sources and land suitability—be considered as contributing to the PCCP Reserve System.

**NEPA Determination:** Under Alternative 2, the proposed action, the PCCP would operate concurrently in the Plan Area with Placer Legacy, which has a different context, and the two programs would complement each other. This impact would be less than significant.

**CEQA Determination:** Under Alternative 2, the proposed action, the PCCP would operate concurrently in the Plan Area with Placer Legacy, which has a different context, and the two programs would complement each other. This impact would be less than significant. No mitigation has been identified.

**Impact LU-4: Result in safety hazards due to creation, restoration, or enhancement of habitats that can result in the creation of wildlife attractants in the vicinity of airports as identified in FAA Advisory Circular 150-5200-33B Hazardous Wildlife Attractants on or Near Airports (NEPA: less than significant)**

Of the two airports located in the Plan Area, only the Lincoln Regional Airport is located within 5 miles of the Plan Area boundary and is adjacent to areas designated as RAA, as shown in Figure 2-2. As stated in Section 3.6.2, *Environmental Setting*, the Lincoln Regional Airport is covered under the *Placer County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP)*, which states under Policy 2.5 that HCPs are subject to Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) review (Placer County Airport Land Use Commission 2014). An HCP with the potential to increase the attraction of birds or other wildlife that can be hazardous to aircraft operations in the vicinity of an airport is considered a Major Land Use Action. The local jurisdiction and its staff are responsible for a consistency analysis. Copies of the complete text and maps of the plan, ordinance, or regulation proposed for adoption or amendment must be submitted to the ALUC. Any supporting material, such as environmental documents, assessing the proposal's consistency with the ALUCP should be included. The ALUC must respond to the local jurisdiction's request for consistency determination within 60 days, and will determine if the project is consistent with the ALUCP, consistent with the ALUCP subject to compliance measures that the ALUC would specify, or inconsistent with the ALUCP. Small portions of the RAA that lie within 5 miles of this airport are proposed for conservation, but any enhancement activities would be subject to review and determination as to whether wildlife attractants would have a reasonably foreseeable potential to occur. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

**NEPA Determination:** Under Alternative 2, the proposed action, conservation activities associated with the PCCP that could increase hazardous wildlife activities would potentially occur within 5 miles of an airport. Any enhancement activities are subject to ALUC review. Consequently, this impact would be less than significant.

**CEQA Determination:** This impact is not subject to analysis under CEQA.

## Alternative 3—Reduced Take/Reduced Fill

### **Impact LU-1: Physical division of an established community (NEPA: less than significant; CEQA: less than significant)**

Communities could be divided if barriers (such as a major transportation project or a wildlife preserve with no public access) are constructed that would limit existing access to all or part of a community.

Under Alternative 3, a reduced configuration for the Plan would be implemented. Land use designations as well as approval and standards for development of land and infrastructure would continue to be governed by various local agencies in the Plan Area. The conversion of vernal pool complex land in the Valley PFG would be reduced by 10% compared to that under the proposed action. Table 2-17 in Chapter 2, *Proposed Action and Alternatives*, shows the differences in land use conversion. The total extent of land conversion in the Valley PFG would be reduced by 1,000 acres under Alternative 3, compared to the proposed action. This limits increased conversion of non-wetland associated communities to less than 5%, as shown in Table 2-17. The PCCP conservation strategy allows for acquisitions within the PFG, particularly in the Valley, that could result in the physical division of existing communities. Acquisitions would be fewer under Alternative 3 than under Alternative 2, the proposed action. Under Alternative 3, it is assumed that the extent of the Reserve System in the Valley RAA would be reduced by approximately 3,000 acres compared to that under Alternative 2. Reserve acquisitions in the PFG would likely be in and around the Stream System—areas not otherwise suitable for urban development because of floodplain constraints, related general plan policies, and PCCP avoidance and minimization measures. Small avoidance areas and other isolated parcels within existing communities that may have a disruptive effect would not be suitable lands for establishing a reserve that would meet the Plan's biological goals and objectives because of the incompatible interface with existing urban land uses and the impracticability of suitably managing lands in the PFG in perpetuity.

In addition, the EIRs for the local jurisdictions' general plans concluded that growth associated with implementation of the general plans would not result in the division of established communities. Accordingly, implementation of the PCCP would not result in the division of established communities.

**NEPA Determination:** Alternative 3 would not result in the physical division of established communities. This impact is less than significant.

**CEQA Determination:** Alternative 3 would not result in the physical division of established communities. This impact is less than significant. No mitigation has been identified.

### **Impact LU-2: Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect (NEPA: less than significant; CEQA: less than significant)**

As stated under Impact LU-1, the amount of land conversion in the Valley PFG under Alternative 3 would be reduced by 1,000 acres compared to that under Alternative 2, the proposed action. Acquisitions would be fewer under Alternative 3 than under Alternative 2. Under Alternative 3, land use and development would continue to be governed by the land use components of the local jurisdictions' general and specific plans. The PCCP contains a conservation strategy that includes the acquisition and management of land for conservation purposes within the RAA. However, the Plan

does not designate specific lands for conservation and would not reduce or affect the ability of Placer County or the City of Lincoln to regulate land use through their general plans. The proposed conservation measures would generally be undertaken in areas where planning and zoning designations would be compatible with open space and would not be in conflict with policies adopted to reduce environmental effects. In addition, the PCCP does not authorize the Covered Activities, which would continue to be regulated through existing land use authority. Like Alternative 2, Alternative 3 is not anticipated to conflict with the local jurisdictions' general plans.

**NEPA Determination:** Alternative 3 would not reduce or affect the ability of the local jurisdictions to regulate land use through their respective general plans and would not authorize specific land uses. Conservation measures would be consistent with the local general plans. This impact would be less than significant.

**CEQA Determination:** Alternative 3 would not reduce or affect the ability of the local jurisdictions to regulate land use through their respective general plans and would not authorize specific land uses. Conservation measures would be consistent with the local general plans. This impact would be less than significant. No mitigation has been identified.

**Impact LU-3: Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan (NEPA: less than significant; CEQA: less than significant)**

Currently there are no HCPs or NCCPs in the Plan Area. Placer Legacy has goals that intentionally overlap and are consistent with some PCCP goals, but it was developed within a broader context of open space (i.e., recreation, agriculture, cultural and historic resources, scenic values, and public safety in addition to biological resources) and local, state, and federal non-regulatory environmental objectives. Placer Legacy largely relies upon existing statutes and general plan policies for implementation. Placer Legacy will remain an active program within the county. Placer Legacy will continue to acquire land and may—depending upon funding sources and land suitability—be considered as contributing to the PCCP Reserve System.

**NEPA Determination:** Under Alternative 3, the PCCP would operate concurrently in the Plan Area with Placer Legacy, which has a different context, and the two programs would complement each other. This impact would be less than significant.

**CEQA Determination:** Under Alternative 3, the PCCP would operate concurrently in the Plan Area with Placer Legacy, which has a different context, and the two programs would complement each other. This impact would be less than significant. No mitigation has been identified.

**Impact LU-4: Result in safety hazards due to creation, restoration, or enhancement of habitats that can result in the creation of wildlife attractants in the vicinity of airports as identified in *FAA Advisory Circular 150-5200-33B Hazardous Wildlife Attractants on or Near Airports* (NEPA: less than significant)**

Under Alternative 3, although approximately 3,000 fewer acres would be acquired for inclusion in the Reserve System, the RAA boundary is still within 5 miles of the Lincoln Regional Airport. Impacts would be similar to those described for Alternative 2, the proposed action. Lincoln Regional Airport is covered under the ALUC, which states under Policy 2.5 that HCPs are subject to ALUCP review and determination. While small portions of the RAA that lie within 5 miles of this airport are proposed for conservation, any enhancement activities would be subject to review and determination as to

whether wildlife attractants would have a reasonably foreseeable potential to occur. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

**NEPA Determination:** Conservation activities associated with Alternative 3 that could increase hazardous wildlife activities would occur within 5 miles of an airport. Any enhancement activities are subject to ALUC review. Consequently, this impact would be less than significant.

**CEQA Determination:** This impact is not subject to analysis under CEQA.

## Alternative 4—Reduced Permit Term

### **Impact LU-1: Physical division of an established community (NEPA: less than significant; CEQA: less than significant)**

Under Alternative 4, the impacts on communities would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, the proposed action, only for a reduced permit term of 30 years. Land use designations as well as approval and standards for development of land and infrastructure would continue to be governed by various local agencies in the Plan Area. The RAA is shown in Figure 2-2, and although the specific locations of lands that would be acquired for conservation purposes are not currently identified, it is anticipated that they would be located primarily on undeveloped or agricultural lands where there are existing special-status species habitats or populations or that have high connectivity to existing habitat and conservation areas. Such areas would typically be non-urbanized and outside of established communities, including rural communities, with the exception of approximately 0.05% of the Reserve System that may be established within the PFG. In addition, the EIRs for the local jurisdictions' general plans concluded that growth associated with implementation of the general plans would not result in the division of established communities. Accordingly, implementation of the PCCP would not result in the division of established communities.

**NEPA Determination:** Alternative 4 would not result in the physical division of established communities. This impact would be less than significant.

**CEQA Determination:** Alternative 4 would not result in the physical division of established communities. This impact would be less than significant. No mitigation has been identified.

### **Impact LU-2: Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect (NEPA: less than significant; CEQA: less than significant)**

Under Alternative 4, land use and development would continue to be governed by the land use components of the local jurisdictions' general and specific plans. The PCCP contains a conservation strategy that includes the acquisition and management of land for conservation purposes within the RAA. However, the Plan does not designate specific lands for conservation and would not reduce or affect the ability of Placer County or the City of Lincoln to regulate land use through their general plans. The proposed conservation measures would generally be undertaken in areas where planning and zoning designations would be compatible with open space and would not be in conflict with policies adopted to reduce environmental effects. In addition, the PCCP does not authorize the Covered Activities, which would continue to be regulated through existing land use authority.

**NEPA Determination:** Alternative 4 would not reduce or affect the ability of the local jurisdictions to regulate land use through their respective general plans and would not authorize specific land uses. Conservation actions would be consistent with the local general plans. This impact would be less than significant.

**CEQA Determination:** Alternative 4 would not reduce or affect the ability of the local Jurisdictions to regulate land use through their respective general plans and would not authorize specific land uses. Conservation actions would be consistent with the local general plans. This impact would be less than significant. No mitigation has been identified.

**Impact LU-3: Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan (NEPA: less than significant; CEQA: less than significant)**

Currently there are no HCPs or NCCPs in the Plan Area. Placer Legacy has goals that may overlap with some PCCP goals, but it was developed within a different context of local, state, and federal regulatory environmental requirements, relying upon existing statutes and general plan policies for implementation. Placer Legacy will remain an active program within the county. Placer Legacy will continue to acquire land and may, depending upon funding sources and land suitability, be considered as contributing to the PCCP Reserve System.

**NEPA Determination:** Under Alternative 4 the PCCP would operate concurrently in the Plan Area with Placer Legacy, which has a different context, and the two programs would complement each other. This impact would be less than significant.

**CEQA Determination:** Under Alternative 4 the PCCP would operate concurrently in the Plan Area with Placer Legacy, which has a different context, and the two programs would complement each other. This impact would be less than significant. No mitigation has been identified.

**Impact LU-4: Result in safety hazards due to creation, restoration, or enhancement of habitats that can result in the creation of wildlife attractants in the vicinity of airports as identified in *FAA Advisory Circular 150-5200-33B Hazardous Wildlife Attractants on or Near Airports* (NEPA: less than significant)**

Under Alternative 4, the amount of conservation would be less than under Alternative 2, the proposed action, although the areas are not mapped. Nevertheless, the RAA boundary is within 5 miles of the Lincoln Regional Airport. Lincoln Regional Airport is covered under the ALUC, which states under Policy 2.5 that HCPs are subject to ALUCP review and determination. While small portions of the RAA that lie within 5 miles of this airport are proposed for conservation, any enhancement activities would be subject to review and determination as to whether wildlife attractants would have a reasonably foreseeable potential to occur. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

**NEPA Determination:** Conservation activities associated with Alternative 4 that could increase hazardous wildlife activities would occur within 5 miles of an airport. However, any enhancement activities are subject to ALUC review and determination. Consequently, this impact would be less than significant.

**CEQA Determination:** This impact is not subject to analysis under CEQA.

## 4.6.3 Cumulative Analysis

### Alternative 1—No Action

Under Alternative 1, the PCCP would not be adopted and development would occur as currently planned for and allowed under existing and in-progress general and specific plans. Alternative 1 would have no land use impacts and would not contribute to a cumulative impact.

### Alternative 2—Proposed Action

Under Alternative 2, the proposed action, the PCCP would be adopted and implemented. As stated above, land use impacts under this alternative would be less than significant. Covered Activities would be consistent with local general plans. The conservation strategy would focus on non-urbanized areas, would avoid established communities, and would not reduce or affect the ability of Placer County or the City of Lincoln to regulate land use through their general plans. Conservation measures would be consistent with the local general plans. Other reasonably foreseeable projects would be subject to relevant land use plans, policies, and regulations. The impacts of Alternative 2, the proposed action, would not contribute to a cumulative impact.

### Alternative 3—Reduced Take/Reduced Fill

The cumulative impacts under Alternative 3 would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, the proposed action. However, under Alternative 3, land conversion for Valley PFG would be reduced by 1,000 acres, and smaller and potentially less contiguous reserve areas would be acquired in the RAA (approximately 3,000 fewer acres). As stated above, land use impacts under this alternative would be less than significant. Covered Activities would be consistent with local general plans and the ALUCP. Alternative 3 would not reduce or affect the ability of Placer County or the City of Lincoln to regulate land use through their general plans. Other reasonably foreseeable projects would be subject to relevant land use plans, policies, and regulations. Alternative 3 would not contribute to a cumulative impact.

### Alternative 4—Reduced Permit Term

The cumulative impacts under Alternative 4 would be similar to those described under Alternative 2, the proposed action. Under Alternative 4 the PCCP would be adopted and implemented for a reduced permit term of 30 years instead of 50. Land use impacts under this alternative would be less than significant. Covered Activities would be consistent with local general plans and the ALCUP. Alternative 4 would not reduce or affect the ability of Placer County or the City of Lincoln to regulate land use through their general plans. Conservation actions would be consistent with the local general plans. Other reasonably foreseeable projects would be subject to relevant land use plans, policies, and regulations. Alternative 4 would not contribute to a cumulative impact.

## 4.6.4 References Cited

- City of Lincoln. 2008a. *City of Lincoln General Plan*. March. Lincoln, CA. Prepared by Mintier & Associates and Matrix Design Group, Sacramento, CA.
- City of Lincoln. 2008b. *City of Lincoln General Plan Update Final Environmental Impact Report*. State Clearinghouse No. 2005112003. February.
- Federal Aviation Administration. 2007. *FAA Advisory Circular 150-5200-33B Hazardous Wildlife Attractants on or Near Airports*. Available: [https://www.faa.gov/regulations\\_policies/advisory\\_circulars/index.cfm/go/document.information/documentID/22820](https://www.faa.gov/regulations_policies/advisory_circulars/index.cfm/go/document.information/documentID/22820). Accessed: May 22, 2017.
- Placer County. 1994. *Placer County General Plan Update: Countywide General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report*. July. Auburn, CA. Prepared by Crawford Multari & Starr, DKS Associates, Psomas and Associates, Jones & Stokes Associates, Recht Hausrath & Associates, and J. Laurence Mintier & Associates.
- Placer County. 2013. *Placer County General Plan*. Adopted August 16, 1994. Updated May 21, 2013. Auburn, CA.
- Placer County Airport Land Use Commission, 2014. *Placer County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans*. Adopted February 26, 2014. Available: [http://www.pctpa.net/library/aluc/Final%20Report/document/PLC\\_Cover\\_TOC.2014-02-26.pdf](http://www.pctpa.net/library/aluc/Final%20Report/document/PLC_Cover_TOC.2014-02-26.pdf). Accessed February 21, 2018.