

4.6 UTILITIES AND PUBLIC SERVICES

This section provides an overview of existing utilities and public services for the City of Rocklin and the proposed project area, including water supply, wastewater service, solid waste management, electrical service, natural gas service, telephone service, fire protection, police service, public schools, and parks. Impacts are evaluated in relation to increased demand for utilities and public services associated with the proposed project and actions needed to provide the services that could potentially lead to physical environmental effects.

Analysis provided in this section is based on review of agency documents and consultation with local public services providers. Impacts related to stormwater management and water quality are addressed in Section 4.10, “Hydrology, Drainage, and Water Quality”.

4.6.1 EXISTING SETTING

This section addresses impacts associated with water resources, including groundwater, and local, area, and regional impacts of the proposed project’s water supplies. Information in this Draft EIR has been excerpted from descriptions contained in the PCWA *American River Pump Station EIS/EIR* (PCWA and Reclamation, 2001) and the *American River Basin Cumulative Report* prepared by Reclamation as part of the references EIR/EIR (August 2001). The analysis from these documents pertaining to surface water supply is incorporated herein.

WATER SUPPLY AND CONVEYANCE

Water service would be provided to the site by the Placer County Water Agency (PCWA). The PCWA was created under State legislation adopted in 1957 by the California Legislature. PCWA carries out a broad range of responsibilities, including water resource planning and management, retail and wholesale supply of irrigation water and drinking water, and production of hydroelectric energy.

The City of Rocklin is located entirely within PCWA Zone 1, which includes Rocklin and the rest of the Loomis Basin, the City of Lincoln, an industrial corridor along Highway 65, and residential areas south of Baseline Road and west of Roseville. Agricultural lands near Highway 65 are within Zone 5, and the PCWA has determined that the sources of water to meet demands in Zone 1 and Zone 5 were the same. PCWA does not have significant amounts of groundwater rights for use in Zones 1 and 5, and relies on surface water entitlements, which include:

- ▶ 100,400 acre-feet of water per year (afy) from the Yuba/Bear River system that is purchased from PG&E. This is PCWA’s primary source of supply for Zone 1. This has been PCWA’s primary source of supply for Zone 1 since PCWA began retailing water in 1968. The term of this contract is to 2013, but PCWA expects the contract to be renewed after the expiration of the present term. This water supply has a high reliability during normal, single-dry, and multiple-dry years, but the supply is fully utilized. For example, between 1987 and 1992, the state experienced five years of drought, during which many areas in the state had reduced supplies. During that period, PCWA had a full Yuba/Bear River supply each year. 1977 was the only year in which PCWA had to impose drought restriction on its customers due to reduced PG&E supply. PCWA’s *Urban Water Management Plan* was adopted on December 15, 2005, and contains a water shortage contingency analysis that includes a five-stage rationing plan that would be invoked during a declared water shortage.
- ▶ 120,000 afy from the Middle Fork Project on the American River. PCWA’s Middle Fork Project (MFP) water right permits provide that this water supply may be diverted from the American River at either Auburn or at Folsom Reservoir. This water supply has historically been very reliable, even during drought periods. PCWA has done extensive modeling of the MFP system to determine its reliability during drought events using California’s hydrologic record, which dates back to 1921. The conclusion of that analysis is that the MFP can provide 120,000 afy, even in dry years as severe as the 1976-1977 hydrologic event.

PCWA is currently completing the permanent American River Pump Station and designing the Auburn Tunnel Pump Station and the Ophir Water Treatment Plant project (PCWA 2006) to have the necessary facilities in place to fully exercise their rights to this American River water. When completed, the ARPS will divert for treatment 35,500 afy of MFP water rights water, some of which will also be delivered to the existing Foothill Water Treatment Plant. Diversions from the MFP at the American River Pump Station location were previously evaluated in the *American River Pump Station Final EIS/EIR, American River Basin Cumulative Impact Report*, 2001.

- ▶ 35,000 afy from the Central Valley Project water supply contract with the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. This water supply has been cut back up to 25% during single-dry and multiple-dry years. This water was originally to be provided to PCWA at Auburn Reservoir, but the contract, as amended now provides for its diversion at Folsom Dam or other locations mutually agreed on by the parties. However, PCWA is pursuing a diversion at the Sacramento River in accordance with the Water Forum Agreement in order to ensure the long-term availability of this supply, as described in more detail below.

According to PCWA's October 2005 Draft *Integrated Water Resources Plan*, PCWA plans to supplement its CVP contract supply with groundwater in dry years to improve the reliability to the point where the full contract amount can be relied upon to serve urban development needs.

- ▶ 5,000 afy purchased from South Sutter Water District (SSWD). This supply is only available when it is surplus to SSWD's needs, and this water would be made available only as a supplemental supply to agricultural customers in Zone 5. Water is not expected to be available from this source during dry years. Additionally, this source is considered temporary because it is expected that the available supply will eventually be fully utilized by SSWD.

The total water available to Zones 1 and 5 is 255,400 afy of permanent water supply and 5,000 afy of temporary water. Out of that permanent supply, PCWA has contracted to deliver up to 25,000 afy to San Juan Water District for use within the Placer County portion of its service area and up to 30,000 afy to Roseville. Deliveries to the San Juan Water District and the City of Roseville would only occur during surplus water years.

In 2004, PCWA used 112,768 af to meet the needs of its Zone 1 and Zone 5 customers. In addition to this amount, to date PCWA has approved applications for water service totaling an additional 5,753 afy, resulting in a total current committed demand of 118,521 afy. In 2004, PCWA delivered 13,562 af to San Juan and 465 af to Roseville.

Table 4.6-1 summarizes PCWA's existing water supply entitlements and demands, and shows the total surface water available for future demands.

PCWA's permanent water supply includes the 35,000 afy of Central Valley Project water from the American River. PCWA is authorized through a contract with Reclamation to take 35,000 afy of Central Valley Project contract water at Folsom Reservoir or other places that are agreed to by the affected parties. PCWA is pursuing a 35,000 afy diversion at the Sacramento River in accordance with the Water Forum Agreement. A separate EIR/EIS is currently in process for the water diversion project and an initial alternatives analysis has now been completed (*Sacramento River Water Reliability Study Initial Alternatives Report*). The Draft EIR/EIS is currently still in production and is projected for public release some time in late 2007.

There is a reasonable certainty that the water supply from the Sacramento River will become available in the future. As noted above, PCWA has Middle Fork American River water rights. Thus, the Sacramento River diversion entitlement is not analogous to the uncertain State Water Project (SWP) "entitlements" – a term no longer used -- that the appellate courts have said included substantial amounts of "paper water." (See *Planning and Conservation League v. Department of Water Resources* (2000) 83 Cal. App. 4th 892, see also *Santa Clarita Organization for Planning the Environment v. County of Los Angeles* (2003) 106 Cal. App. 4th 715) (Placer County 2007).

Table 4.6-1 Water Supply Entitlements and Demands	
Source	Total Water Supply (afy)
Entitlements	
Yuba/Bear River water through PG&E	100,400
Middle Fork Project on the American River	120,000
Central Valley Project through the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation	35,000
Total Entitlements	255,400¹
Demands	
2004 usage by Zones 1 and 5	112,768
Approved applications for water service	5,753
Total Demand	118,521²
Surface water availability for future demands	136,879
Notes:	
¹ The total entitlements sum shown here does not include the 5,000 afy from South Sutter Water District because this supply is only available when it is surplus to SSWD's needs, and would be made available only as a supplemental supply to agricultural customers in Zone 5.	
² The 2004 delivery to San Juan was 13,562 af, and the 2004 delivery to Roseville was 465 af; however, because of the surplus nature of the water supply contracts to these areas, these figures are not included in permanent demand for PCWA.	
Source: City of Rocklin 2005	

Quite notably, the Sacramento River diversion project has the support of both the Water Forum Agreement signatories and, it appears, the U.S. Congress. The Water Forum Agreement represents a regional consensus that water purveyors, such as PCWA, with unexercised water rights on the American River could reduce the environmental impacts of their future diversions based on those rights if they agreed instead to pursue diversions of like amounts of water from the Sacramento River. Because of local environmentalist support for this approach, the Sacramento River supply is less likely to encounter environmental opposition than would supplies taken from the American River. Thus, on page 14 of the Introduction and Summary of the Water Forum Agreement (January 2000), "expansion of Sacramento River diversion and treatment facilities" is listed as one of the major water supply projects that will receive Water Forum support upon signing the Water Forum Agreement, which has long since occurred. The project is also contemplated by federal legislation known as Public Law 106-554, Appendix D, Division B, Section 103 (April 24, 2000). Subdivision (a) of Section 103 provides:

The Secretary of the Interior shall conduct a feasibility study for a Sacramento River, California, diversion project that is consistent with the Water Forum Agreement among the members of the Sacramento, California, Water Forum dated April 24, 2000, and that considers:

1. consolidation of several of the Natomas Central Mutual Water Company's diversions;
2. upgrading fish screens at the consolidated diversion;
3. the diversion of 35,000 acre-feet of water by the Placer County Water Agency;
4. the diversion of 29,000 acre-feet of water for delivery to the Northridge Water District;

5. the potential to accommodate other diversions of water from the Sacramento River, subject to additional negotiations and agreement among the Water Forum signatories and potentially affected parties upstream on the Sacramento River; and
6. an inter-tie between the diversions referred to in paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) with the Northridge Water District's pipeline that delivers water from the American River.

For reasons suggested above in discussing the Water Forum Agreement, the Sacramento River diversion project is relatively benign from an environmental perspective. Essentially, the project would take water from the Sacramento River rather than the American River, thereby avoiding potential adverse environmental impacts on the American River, which, with its lower flows, is much more environmentally sensitive than the Sacramento River (Placer County 2007).

The City recognizes that there are regulatory hurdles that the Sacramento River diversion project must overcome before it can come to fruition. First, the project must complete the environmental review processes under both CEQA (with PCWA as lead agency) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (with Reclamation as the federal lead agency) (Placer County 2007).

Among the approvals the project will need are (i) an exchange agreement between PCWA and Reclamation, (ii) an application from Reclamation to the State Water Resources Control Board for an additional point of "rediversion" at the Sacramento River Water Reliability Study (SRWRS) site, and (iii) actions by PCWA and Reclamation amending their water delivery contract to provide for delivery at the site. The project must also obtain a "Section 404" wetlands fill permit under the Clean Water Act from the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). As the federal lead agency, Reclamation is obligated under section 7 of the federal Endangered Species Act to consult with both the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries to determine whether the direct or indirect effects of the project could jeopardize the continued existence of any federally listed endangered or threatened species or cause the destruction or adverse modification of the designated critical habitat of any such species. Given the ecological pressures on both aquatic and terrestrial species from continuing population growth and agricultural activities in California, there is always the chance that these environmental processes and Endangered Species Act (ESA) requirements could lead to delays, which could postpone the acquisition by PCWA of this water supply. Further, although it is not anticipated, there is always the chance that alternatives other than PCWA's entire 35,000 afy could be approved (Placer County 2007).

The local agencies participating in the Sacramento River diversion project, namely, the City of Sacramento, PCWA, the City of Roseville, and Sacramento Suburban Water District (SSWD) intend to try to minimize the indirect effects of the water supply on federally listed terrestrial species by agreeing that they will not undertake to provide new water service from SRWRS Project facilities to any new projects unless such new development can demonstrate that it is in compliance with the ESA. Under such a self-imposed limitation, the partners in the Sacramento River diversion project would not provide water to any developer who cannot prove "ESA compliance" in connection with its development plans (Placer County 2007).

Finally, virtually all water supplies in California that have yet to be perfected suffer from some uncertainty due to combination of evolving environmental factors. One such factor is possible future species listings under the ESA and its State analogue, the California Endangered Species Act (CESA), which could affect both Central Valley Project (CVP) and SWP operations, as well as the timing and extent of other water diversions throughout California (Placer County 2007).

WATER CONVEYANCE AND TREATMENT

In the vicinity of the proposed project, existing water conveyance facilities are located west of Interstate 80 in Taylor Road and in Sierra College Boulevard, Rocklin Road, Barton Road, and Dias Lane. Private water lines extend through part of the site to serve an adjacent property just east of the project site.

PCWA has indicated that the 20-inch water main in Sierra College Boulevard, the 12-inch main in Dias Lane, and/or the existing 16-inch water main in the Croftwood development project access roadway would serve the proposed project (Trejo, pers. comm., 2005; Reintjes, pers. comm., 2008).

The PCWA treats water for the City of Rocklin at two treatment facilities, the Foothill Water Treatment Plant (WTP) and Sunset WTP. The Foothill WTP is located one mile south of Newcastle, northeast of the City. In addition to serving the City, this plant serves Penryn and Loomis. The PCWA completed the most recent expansion of its Foothill WTP in 2005, and treatment plant capacity of this facility was increased from 27 mgd to 55 mgd. The Sunset WTP plant is located northeast of the City. The maximum design flow for the Sunset WTP is 8 mgd. The total treatment capacity for the Sunset/Foothill water treatment system is 63 mgd.

There are three properties (APNs 045-043-052, 045-043-030, and 045-043-009) adjacent to the project site that are owned by the Ramsey family and have individual PCWA irrigation water services (hereafter collectively referred to as “Ramsey property”). If the Rocklin Crossings project proceeds prior to the Rocklin 60 project, water to the Ramsey property is anticipated to be delivered to the Rocklin 60 property line at a location corresponding to easements granted to the Ramsey property by the Rocklin 60 project. The Rocklin 60 project will relocate irrigation lines into the new easements on the Rocklin 60 property to serve the Ramsey property. Access across the Rocklin 60 property would be granted to facilitate access to the distribution box. Once across the Rocklin 60 property, access to the distribution box is expected to be granted by the Rocklin Crossings project.

If the Rocklin 60 project proceeds prior to the Rocklin Crossings project, the Rocklin 60 project will relocate irrigation lines into easements on the Rocklin 60 property to its boundary adjacent to the Rocklin Crossings project to serve the Ramsey property. Access to the distribution box would be via an easement to the Rocklin 60/Rocklin Crossings property line, and from that point, access to the distribution box would be via easements across the Rocklin Crossings property.

Gravity flow to the Ramsey property will be maintained by maintaining a continuous slope from the irrigation distribution box to the Ramsey property. Irrigation service to the Ramsey property is not expected to be interrupted for any extensive period of time. The property owner(s) would be notified prior to commencing work and relocation of PCWA raw water lines.

WASTEWATER COLLECTION AND TREATMENT

Wastewater treatment for the City of Rocklin is provided by the South Placer Municipal Utility District (SPMUD), through its membership in the South Placer Wastewater Authority (SPWA). SPMUD and the SPWA operate sewer collection, conveyance, and treatment facilities and provide sewer maintenance and engineering services. In the vicinity of the proposed project, there is an 18-inch sewer main being constructed to serve a nearby project, commonly known as Croftwood, that would be extended to serve the project site (SPMUD 2006).

SPMUD’s 1986 Sewer Master Plan concluded that there would be increasing greenfield development activity, in addition to infill development, in the northwest portion of the City and in the areas east of Interstate 80. The plan envisioned that Rocklin would have a total of 52,604 sewered equivalent dwelling units at ultimate buildout. SPMUD has planned for growth in the City, and the sizing of sewer infrastructure has been based on plan projections (City of Rocklin 2005).

The Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant provides wastewater treatment facilities for the SPMUD. This plant serves the Dry Creek Basin, consisting of the cities of Roseville, Rocklin, and Loomis, as well as the surrounding unincorporated areas. The Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant's current design capacity is 18 mgd Average Dry Weather Flow (ADWF) and 45 mgd Average Wet Weather Flows (AWWF) (South Placer Wastewater Authority 2006). The plant's flows average 12 mgd ADWF and 30 mgd average wet weather flows (AWWF). The Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant provides tertiary level wastewater treatment through the process of screening, grit removal, primary clarification, aeration, secondary clarification, full nitrification capacity, filtration, chlorination, and dechlorination. The plant discharges into Dry Creek under standards established by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board. An additional regional wastewater treatment facility, the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant, was recently constructed with an initial design capacity of 12 mgd ADWF and 30 mgd AWWF, respectively.

SOLID WASTE

In western Placer County, Auburn-Placer Disposal Service provides garbage pickup services. The company also provides pickup service for recyclable materials. The project site is within the service area of Auburn-Placer Disposal Service.

Once collected, solid waste is transported to the Western Regional Landfill at the southwest corner of Athens Road and Fiddymont Road, west of the City. The 281-acre landfill is operated by the Western Placer Waste Management Authority (WPWMA), a regional agency comprised of Placer County and Roseville, Rocklin, and Lincoln. Waste disposal services at the landfill are provided to these cities, as well as for Auburn, Colfax, and Loomis. An additional 465 acres of land for landfill expansion is located to the west of the current landfill site. The additional acreage is not yet permitted for landfill use by the Integrated Waste Management Plan (IWMP).

The landfill accepts municipal solid waste from the adjacent Materials Recovery Facility (MRF), as well as sewage sludge and other materials. The landfill is permitted to accept Class II and Class III wastes. At present, the Western Regional Landfill is permitted to accept 1,900 tons per day (tpd) of solid waste. The landfill has a total capacity of 36 million cubic yards, and a remaining capacity of 29 million cubic yards. At the current remaining capacity, the Western Regional Landfill could continue to be used until 2036. (California Integrated Waste Management Board 2005.)

RECYCLING FACILITIES

The WPWMA developed the 29-acre MRF adjacent to the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill to recover recyclable materials from the waste stream within the County. The MRF has the flexibility to handle all waste, whether mixed waste from the Auburn-Placer Disposal Service, or source-separated recyclables from other recycling programs in the community. The MRF recovers recyclable materials such as glass, metals, paper, plastics, wood waste and other compostable materials. Unrecyclable solid waste received at the MRF is then disposed of at the adjacent Western Regional Sanitary Landfill. Currently, the MRF diverts approximately 40% of the material received from the landfill. To continue meeting recycling goals, the MRF has, as of the writing of this document, nearly completed work on a substantial expansion. Notices of completion on this work are expected in November of 2007 (Ford, pers. comm. 2007). This expansion will double its processing capacity and increase the amount of recyclable materials recovered from the waste stream by about 20% (WPWMA 2006).

ELECTRICAL SERVICE

PG&E provides electrical service to the City through State-regulated public utility contracts. PG&E delivers approximately 81,923 million kilowatt-hours of electricity to its 13 million customers throughout the 70,000-square-mile service area in northern and central California. Two 60 kilovolt (kV) lines supply three electric substations that serve the City planning area electric distribution load. Existing substations within the planning area include the Rocklin Substation on South Grove Street and the Del Mar Substation on Corporation Yard Road

off Sierra Meadows Drive. The third substation is the Pleasant Grove Substation located on Industrial Boulevard north of Sunset Boulevard.

The City recently worked with PG&E and the State Public Utilities Commission to design and locate a 115-kV transmission line corridor through the City. The preferred PG&E route relocated the line along the Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way between the Roseville city limits and Sierra Meadows Drive to the Delmar substation (City of Rocklin 2005).

PG&E has existing 12 kV and 21 kV overhead power lines on the west side of Sierra College Boulevard, and existing 12 kV power lines on the east side of Dias Lane. In addition, 12 kV overhead power lines are located on the project site (Wallace-Kuhl & Associates 2006).

NATURAL GAS SERVICE

PG&E provides natural gas service to the City through State-regulated public utility contracts. Gas is delivered to the City and the proposed project area through portions of PG&E's 46,000 miles of natural gas pipelines. In the project area, gas transmission lines are located along Granite Drive east of the project site and along Rocklin Road south of the site.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

Telephone service would be provided by AT&T. There is an existing underground telephone cable on the east side of Sierra College Boulevard and along Dias Road.

Cable service for the proposed project would be provided by Wave Broadband Services. In the project vicinity, underground conduit runs parallel to Interstate 80 and along Dias Lane. Wave Broadband is working with Caltrans and the City of Rocklin to install a conduit duct structure system across the Sierra College/I-80 overpass. These structures will intercept existing conduit structures on the north side of I-80 and will intercept with the overhead pole line on the south side of I-80. This project will accommodate service break-off points along Sierra College Boulevard in this vicinity (Ellingson, pers. comm. 2007).

FIRE AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL RESPONSE

The project site is served by the Rocklin Fire Department. The department provides fire prevention, suppression, emergency medical, and technical rescue services to the City. In addition to emergency response and rescue, the department maintains the fire stations, fire apparatus, and water systems essential for fighting fires in the community. The department also conducts weed abatement and fuel modification programs, and provides a variety of public safety and educational programs (Rocklin Fire Department 2006).

The Rocklin Fire Department currently has 45 full-time personnel, including administration, prevention, and suppression staff, with an additional volunteer firefighting and support force (Rocklin Fire Department 2006). The department maintains a service ratio of one fire fighter per 1,000 residents. The Rocklin Fire Department operates three fire stations:

- ▶ Fire Station No. 1 at 4060 Rocklin Road
- ▶ Fire Station No. 2 at 3401 Crest Drive.
- ▶ Fire Station No. 3 at 2001 Wildcat Boulevard

A fourth station is now in the planning stage at the future intersection of Park Drive and Valley View Parkway. The nearest fire station to the project site is Fire Station No. 1, which is located approximately 2.0 miles southwest of the project site.

The Rocklin Fire Department responded to approximately 3,000 calls in 2005. Response times averaged less than 5 minutes 80% of the time. The City also belongs to a statewide mutual aid system, through which fire suppression assistance is provided to a member agency when it has exhausted its own resources. Bordering fire jurisdictions participate with the City in the statewide mutual aid system.

Funding for department operations comes from the City's general fund. In addition, the City collects a Capital Improvements Fee on new construction for the development of new capital facilities including fire stations, equipment, and engines.

American Medical Response (AMR) provides ambulance services to the City, and maintains response times under 10 minutes for the majority of calls. AMR serves western Placer County and strategically locates ambulances throughout the region, including within the City (City of Rocklin 2005).

LAW ENFORCEMENT

The Rocklin Police Department provides law enforcement services for the project site. The Police Department is headquartered at 4080 Rocklin Road, approximately 2 miles southwest of the project site. The following information on the department was obtained, in part, from the department's website (Rocklin Police Department 2006). As of September 2006, the department employed approximately 57 sworn officers, 37 administrative personnel, 15 reserve police officers, and citizen volunteers. The department has a number of units and specialties including: uniformed patrol; traffic enforcement; neighborhood, and school resource; investigations; canine units; crime prevention programs; dispatch; records; evidence; and animal control. The City is divided geographically into four patrol beats and 35 Reporting Districts. The department currently provides a service ratio of 1.2 sworn officers per 1,000 people.

The Rocklin Police Department responds to approximately 3,000 incidents per month. The department currently has a response time of just over four minutes for Priority 1 calls, which range from office alarms to burglaries and violent felonies. For calls deemed an imminent danger, the response time is generally substantially lower than four minutes. In 2005, the City's crime rate was approximately 27.2 crimes per 1,000 people. The City also has an interagency agreement with the Placer County Sheriff's Department, whereby each agency provides supplementary support in the other's jurisdiction.

Funding for department operations comes from the City's general fund. The department is currently working on a five-year strategic plan to address additional growth in the City (Nottoli pers. comm. 2006). New police services, including officers and equipment, are funded on an as-needed basis through approval from the City Council.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The Placer County Office of Education oversees 18 school districts and the provision of education to students from kindergarten through 12th grade (Placer County Office of Education 2006). The project site is currently within the boundaries of the Loomis Union School District (grades K-8) and the Placer Union High School District (grades 9-12).

Loomis Union School District

The Loomis Union School District serves the City in areas east of Sierra College Boulevard, south of Pacific Street, and east of Del Mar Avenue, north of Pacific Street. The Loomis Union School District currently operates five elementary schools (Loomis Union School District 2006):

- ▶ Franklin Elementary at 7050 Franklin School Road
- ▶ H. Clarke Powers Elementary at 3296 Humphrey Road
- ▶ Loomis Elementary at 3505 Taylor Road

- ▶ Penryn Elementary at 6885 English Colony Way
- ▶ Placer Elementary at 8650 Horseshoe Bar Road

For the 2005–2006 school year, the Loomis Union School District had an enrollment of approximately 2,157 students (Table 4.6-2).

Table 4.6-2 Loomis Union School District Enrollment, 2005–2006¹	
School Name	Current Enrollment
Franklin Elementary	589
H. Clarke Powers Elementary	410
Loomis Elementary	391
Penryn Elementary	264
Placer Elementary	503
Total	2,157
¹ Student enrollment in the district changes daily as more students enroll and others leave; therefore, this table does not reflect exact current enrollment. Source: Education Data Partnership 2006	

The district is currently exceeding its design capacity of 1,884 students. Elementary school students in the project area would attend Franklin Elementary School (grade K–8), approximately 2.1 miles southwest of the project site.

Placer Union High School District

Students within the Loomis Union School District attend Del Oro High School at 3301 Taylor Road, which is part of the Placer Union High School District. The Placer Union High School District encompasses approximately 900 square miles in Placer County. The district serves the communities of Loomis, Penryn, Newcastle, Ophir, Auburn, Bowman, Christian Valley, Meadow Vista, Applegate, Weimar, Foresthill, Colfax, Dutch Flat, and Alta (Placer Union High School District 2006).

During the 2005-2006 school year, 1,622 students were enrolled at Del Oro High School (California Department of Education 2006). Currently, there are 1,650 students enrolled. The District, in recognition of the need to provide additional capacity, brought in temporary portable classrooms and added students to each existing classroom prior to the start of the 2007-2008 school year. The District considers the current capacity to be 1,650 (Marquand, pers. comm. 2007). Del Oro High School is approximately 2.5 miles northeast of the project site. However, the district has an open enrollment policy that allows students to request attendance at any district school site as space is available.

School Funding

School improvements are funded by 50% state and 50% local sources. The district can receive local funding through developer impact fees, tax revenue from Mello-Roos districts, and General Obligation bonds. Developer impact fees comprise the major source of funding for the district. The statutory fee (Level I) as of January 2006 is \$2.63 per square foot for residential construction. Developer fees may be used to finance new schools and equipment, and to reconstruct existing facilities to maintain adequate housing for all the district’s students.

The Loomis School District Board of Trustees passed a resolution calling for a school bond election in November 2006. The bond measure was passed for \$19.5 million. The bond will enable the district to provide increased health and safety for students by replacing aging classrooms with newly modernized classrooms and constructing

new facilities. The bond will also provide funding to replace aging portables with permanent classrooms and consolidate student service facilities. (<http://www.sacbee.com/674/index.html>).

PARKS

The City of Rocklin Community Services and Facilities Department develops, maintains, and operates all City-owned park and recreation facilities. The City currently owns 29 parks totaling 366 acres, including approximately 155 improved acres. An additional eight parks (one community park and seven neighborhood parks) totaling an estimated 75 acres are included within future development projects. At build-out, the City is anticipated to operate 37 parks totaling an estimated 440 acres. Rocklin Unified School District provides additional recreational field space and open space within the City (City of Rocklin Parks and Recreation 2006, City of Rocklin 2005.)

LIBRARIES

Library services in Rocklin are provided by the Auburn-Placer County Library District, which was formed in 1967 with the consolidation of Auburn Public Library and the Placer County Library. This system of libraries serves all of Placer County with the exception of the cities of Roseville and Lincoln, which own and operate their own municipal library systems.

The Auburn-Placer County Library District operates a main branch in the City of Auburn, a law library, children's programs, nine branch libraries and a mobile service that serves many areas throughout rural Placer County. The Auburn-Placer County Library District evaluated its 2002-2010 Service Plan in May of 2007. The Plan includes service guidelines to determine appropriate levels of service for Placer County communities. According to this Plan, the minimum library will be 3,000 square feet in size and libraries will provide 0.4 square feet per capita. A minimum population of 4,000 in the service area is required before a library is built (Parker, pers. comm. 2007).

Auburn-Placer County Library District provides a branch library in Rocklin at 5460 Fifth Street. Because of population growth in the City, the Rocklin library is currently planning an expansion of facilities, staff, and the collection to maintain the level of service. The Rocklin Library features a diverse collection of materials serving the needs of community, including recreational and informational reading for adults, a collection for children, magazines, newspapers, and a variety of media, as well as public computer work stations (Placer County Library 2006).

4.6.2 REGULATORY SETTING

STATE

California Integrated Waste Management Act

To minimize the amount of solid waste that must be disposed of by transformation and land disposal, the State Legislature passed the California Integrated Waste Management Act (CIWMA) of 1989 (AB 939), effective January 1990. According to the CIWMA, all cities and counties were required to divert 25% of all solid waste from landfill facilities by January 1, 1995, and 50% by January 1, 2000. Each city is required to develop solid waste plans demonstrating integration of the CIWMA plan with the county plan. The plans must promote (in order of priority) source reduction, recycling and composting, and environmentally safe transformation and land disposal.

California Public Utilities Commission

California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) Decision 95-08-038 contains the rules for the planning and construction of new transmission facilities, distribution facilities, and substations. The decision requires permits for the construction of certain power line facilities or substations if the voltages would exceed 50 kV or the

substation would require the acquisition of land or an increase in voltage rating above 50 kV. Distribution lines and substations with voltages less than 50 kV do not need to comply with this decision; however, the utility must obtain any nondiscretionary local permits required for the construction and operation of these projects. CEQA compliance is required for construction of facilities constructed in accordance with the decision.

Building Energy Efficiency Standards

The project would be required to comply with recently adopted changes to Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations regarding energy efficiency, which became effective on October 1, 2005. These new energy efficiency standards were developed in response to the State's energy crisis, as well as Assembly Bill 970 in regards to improving residential and nonresidential building energy efficiency, minimizing impacts to peak energy usage periods, and reducing impacts on overall state energy needs.

State School Funding

California Education Code Section 17620 authorizes school districts to levy a fee, charge, dedication, or other requirement against any development project for the construction or reconstruction of school facilities, provided that the district can show justification for levying of fees. California Government Code Section 65995 limits the fee to be collected to the statutory fee unless a school district conducts a Facility Needs Assessment (Government Code Section 65995.6) and meets certain conditions.

Senate Bill 50 (Chapter 407, Statutes of 1998) instituted a new school facility program by which school districts can apply for State construction and modernization funds. This legislation imposed limitations on the power of cities and counties to require mitigation of school facilities impacts as a condition of approving new development. It also provided the authority for school districts to levy fees at three different levels:

- ▶ *Level I fees* are the current statutory fees allowed under Education Code Section 17620. As mentioned above, this code section authorizes school districts to levy a fee against residential and commercial construction to fund school construction or reconstruction. These fees are adjusted every two years in accordance with the statewide cost index for Class B construction as determined by the State Allocation Board. As of January 2006, the maximum Level I fees are \$2.63 per square foot for residential construction and \$0.42 per square foot for commercial construction.
- ▶ *Level II developer fees* are outlined in Government Code Section 65995.5. This code section allows a school district to impose a higher fee on residential construction if certain conditions are met. These conditions include having a substantial percentage of students on multitrack year-round scheduling, having an assumed debt equal to 15–30% of the district's bonding capacity (the percentage is based on revenue sources for repayment), having at least 20% of the district's teaching stations housed in relocatable classrooms, and having placed a local bond on the ballot in the past 4 years that received at least 50% plus one of the votes cast. A Facility Needs Assessment must demonstrate that the need for new school facilities for unhoused pupils is attributable to projected enrollment growth from the construction of new residential units over the next 5 years.
- ▶ *Level III developer fees* are outlined in Government Code Section 65995.7. This code section authorizes a school district that has been approved to collect Level II fees to collect a higher fee on residential construction if state funding becomes unavailable. This fee is equal to twice the amount of Level II fees. However, if a district eventually receives state funding, this excess fee may be reimbursed to the developers or subtracted from the amount of state funding.

Quimby Act

The Quimby Act (California Government Code Section 66477) was established by the California legislature in 1965 to preserve open space and parkland in the rapidly urbanizing areas of the state. This legislation was in

response to California's increased rate of urbanization and the need to preserve open space and provide parks and recreation facilities for California's growing communities. The Quimby Act authorizes local governments to establish ordinances requiring developers of new subdivisions to dedicate land for parks, pay an in-lieu fee, or perform a combination of the two.

The Quimby Act provides two standards for the dedication of land for use as parkland. If the existing area of parkland in a community is greater than 3 acres per 1,000 persons, then the community may require dedication based on a standard of up to 5 acres per 1,000 persons residing in the subdivision. If the existing amount of parkland in a community is less than 3 acres per 1,000 persons, then the community may require dedication based on a standard of only 3 acres per 1,000 persons residing in the subdivision. The Quimby Act requires a city or county to adopt standards for recreational facilities in its general plan recreation element if it is to adopt a parkland dedication/fee ordinance.

The City collects Quimby Act in lieu fees. These fees contribute to a fund that would be used to acquire properties for parkland. The City's standards for parkland dedication under the Quimby Act are provided in the discussion of local regulations below.

LOCAL

City of Rocklin General Plan

The following goals and policies from the Public Facilities and Services Element of the City General Plan (1991) are applicable to the proposed project:

Goal: To ensure that adequate public services and facilities are provided to meet the needs of residents of the City.

- ▶ **Policy 1:** To maintain the provision of adequate public services and facilities to the existing areas of the City and to ensure that new development is served by a full range of public services.
- ▶ **Policy 2:** To cooperate with school districts serving the City to meet their adopted district standards and State standards. All residential development project applications shall be evaluated for the impact on school services and facilities. Where an impact is found, the project may be conditioned to the extent and in the manner allowed by law, to mitigate the impact, such as requiring payment of school district fees and participation in a community facilities district to fund school facilities.
- ▶ **Policy 6:** To require garbage collection services to ensure the maintenance of health standards.
- ▶ **Policy 7:** To maintain existing public services and provide new facilities consistent with community needs.
- ▶ **Policy 8:** To require developer participation in providing public services and facilities (including equipment) where development proceeds in advance of the City's ability to provide the services of facilities. Participation could consist of the formation of assessment districts, payment of fees, and/or the construction and dedication of facilities.
- ▶ **Policy 17:** To encourage the undergrounding of existing and proposed utility lines, where possible.
- ▶ **Policy 18:** To encourage programs to reduce, recycle, and reuse solid waste materials to the extent possible.

The following goals and policies from the Open Space, Conservation, and Recreation Element of the City General Plan (1991) are applicable to the proposed project:

Goal: To designate, protect, and conserve natural resources, open space, and recreation lands in the City; and provide opportunities for recreational activities to meet citizen needs.

- ▶ **Policy 5:** To encourage energy conservation in new developments.
- ▶ **Policy 7:** To provide for recreational and park needs through any or all of the following: collection of park fees, dedication of parkland, rehabilitation of existing park and recreation facilities, installation of park improvements, and provision for operation and maintenance.
- ▶ **Policy 8:** To require dedication of park lands as a condition in the early stage of development process, including approval of rezonings, where it is necessary to insure consistency with or implementation of goals and policies contained in the General Plan.
- ▶ **Policy 9:** To provide park facilities in accordance with adopted park standards and phasing.
- ▶ **Policy 12:** To encourage the location of parks in areas not presently being served.
- ▶ **Policy 13:** To require new development to annex into the Park Development and Maintenance District.
- ▶ **Policy 17:** To consider acquisition and development of small areas along creeks at convenient and safe locations for use by the general public.
- ▶ **Policy 18:** To promote, where appropriate, the joint use of streams for flood control, open space, conservation of natural resources, and limited recreation.

The following goal and policies from the Community Safety Element of the City General Plan (1991) are applicable to the proposed project:

Goal: To minimize the danger of natural and man-made hazards and to protect residents and visitors from the dangers of earthquake, fire, flood, other natural disasters, and man-made dangers.

- ▶ **Policy 10:** To enforce the City building code, fire code, and City ordinances in regard to fire safety and fire protection.
- ▶ **Policy 13:** To require new annexations, and projects proposed land use changes in the General Plan resulting in higher densities or intensity, to annex into the City's existing Community Facilities District No. 1 for the maintenance of fire suppression service, to create other financing districts as necessary.
- ▶ **Policy 15:** To encourage residential development to locate within approximately two road miles from a fire station, and to encourage high density commercial development to be located approximately one and one-half road miles from a fire station, unless special fire suppression measures are incorporated into the development.

Rocklin Municipal Code Title 16, Subdivisions

Chapter 16.28, Improvements and Dedications, of the Rocklin Municipal Code requires the collection of park fees and/or parkland dedication for new residential developments at the time the subdivision map is processed. The ordinance establishes a park acreage standard for the City of 5 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents. Subdivisions of 50 parcels or more are required to dedicate land for park purposes or to pay an in lieu fee, or a combination of both to meet the development's proportion of the adopted park acreage standard.

4.6.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

METHODOLOGY

Impacts on utilities and public services that would result from the project were identified by comparing existing service capacity against future demand associated with project implementation. When possible, a quantitative comparison was used to determine impacts of the proposed project on future demands. Evaluations of potential utilities and public services impacts are based on a review of documents pertaining to the proposed project area, including the City General Plan (1991), and through consultation with appropriate agencies and field review of the project site and surroundings.

Population projections for the proposed project were calculated based on the construction of 179 single-family dwelling units multiplied by the City General Plan Housing Element estimate of 2.74 persons per dwelling unit (City of Rocklin 2004). Based on this estimate, the proposed project would generate a total of 490 persons.

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Based on Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, a utilities impact is considered significant if implementation of the proposed project under consideration would do any of the following:

- ▶ Create a water supply demand in excess of existing entitlements and resources;
- ▶ Result in the determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments;
- ▶ Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable RWQCB;
- ▶ Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects;
- ▶ Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects;
- ▶ Require or result in the construction of new or expanded landfill facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts; or,
- ▶ Exceed capabilities of electrical, natural gas, or telecommunications service providers to serve the project.

A public services impact is considered significant if implementation of the proposed project under consideration would do any of the following:

- ▶ result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of or need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for:
 - fire protection,
 - police protection,
 - schools,
 - parks, and
 - other public facilities;

- ▶ create circumstances where existing services and facilities could not meet established performance standards (i.e., response times, provider per resident ratios); or,
- ▶ result in the increased use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.

IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

IMPACT 4.6-1 **Increased Demand for Water Supply, Treatment, and Conveyance Facilities.** *The PCWA would provide water service to the project site and would be served by the Foothill WTP. The project applicant would pay all PCWA required fees and charges for water service. Sufficient water supplies, water treatment capacity, and conveyance infrastructure are available to serve the project. This impact would be a **less than significant**.*

The PCWA has a first-come, first-serve policy for serving new customers.

The project site would be served by the Foothill WTP. The PCWA completed the most recent expansion of the Foothill WTP in 2005, and treatment plant capacity of this facility was increased from 27 mgd to 55 mgd. Combined with the Sunset WTP, which has a capacity of 8 mgd, the Foothill/Sunset system has a treatment capacity of 63 mgd. In 2005, the maximum daily demand for the Foothill/Sunset system was 50 mgd, leaving 13 mgd of unused capacity available to serve new demands.

The project's internal water distribution system would be constructed, as needed, and will be required to be adequately sized to accommodate project-related water demands and fire flow demands. PCWA has indicated that the 20-inch water main in Sierra College Boulevard, the 12-inch main in Dias Lane, and/or the existing 16-inch water main in the Croftwood development project access roadway would serve the proposed project (Trejo, pers. comm., 2005; Reintjes, pers. comm., 2008). The 12-inch main in Dias Lane will be required by PCWA to be looped to connect to the Sierra College Boulevard main (Trejo, pers. comm., 2005).

As required by the PCWA, the project applicant would be responsible for paying all fees and charges including the Water Connection Charges. The project applicant is required by the PCWA to enter into a Facilities Agreement with the agency to provide any onsite pipelines or other facilities needed to supply water for domestic or fire protection purposes. The PCWA makes commitments for service only on execution of a pipeline extension or service order agreement and the payment of all fees and charges required by the agency.

The PCWA would provide water service to the project site and would be served by the Foothill WTP. In order to obtain water service, the project applicant will be required to enter into a facilities agreement with the PCWA to provide any onsite or off site pipelines or other facilities if they are needed to supply water for domestic or fire protection purposes, and pay all fees and charges required by PCWA, including Water Connection Charges (Trejo pers. Comm.). Because sufficient water supplies, water treatment capacity, and conveyance infrastructure would be available to serve the project, and because this project would not create the need for expansion to facilities, the implementation of which could create potentially significant impacts, this impact would be **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measure 4.6-1: Increased Demand for Water Supply, Treatment, and Conveyance Facilities.

No mitigation is necessary.

IMPACT 4.6-2 **Demand for Wastewater Treatment and Conveyance Facilities.** *Implementation of the project would increase demand for wastewater treatment and conveyance facilities. Existing wastewater treatment facilities and the planned wastewater conveyance facilities currently under construction would be adequate to serve the project. This impact is would be **less than significant**.*

SPMUD's 1986 Sewer Master Plan envisioned that Rocklin would have 52,604 sewer equivalent dwelling units within the City at ultimate buildout, and the sizing of sewer infrastructure has been based on this projection. The City of Rocklin is expected to contain 27,400 housing units, as well as industrial, commercial, and retail development. SPMUD has planned for growth in Rocklin, and the City does not need to take actions to ensure the availability of sewer infrastructure. SPMUD has indicated it will be able to serve the City of Rocklin's future wastewater treatment needs during the planning period for Rocklin General Plan (City of Rocklin 2005). Using a rough estimate of 190 gallons per day per acre, the project would generate roughly 11,000 gallons per day of wastewater (Placer County 2006). Wastewater generated by the project would be treated at the Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant. The Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant's current design capacity is 18 mgd. The plant's flows average 12 mgd average dry weather flow (ADWF) and 30 mgd average wet weather flows (AWWF). The project's wastewater generation would represent approximately 0.18% of the treatment plant's total remaining dry weather estimated capacity. This increased demand would not be expected to adversely affect the wastewater treatment plant's capacity. Therefore, the additional wastewater volume produced by the proposed project would not have a significant adverse impact on the wastewater treatment services provided by SPMUD.

The project's internal wastewater conveyance system would be constructed, as needed, and would be adequately sized to accommodate project-related wastewater flows. The SPMUD requires all facilities to conform to the district's Standard Specifications.

This project would connect to, and be served by those certain trunk facilities planned to be built under the project known commonly as Croftwood located southeast of the project site (Stein pers. comm. 2005). This development is currently under construction, and these conveyance facilities are expected to be available to serve the proposed project.

Existing wastewater treatment facilities and the planned wastewater conveyance facilities currently under construction would be adequate to serve the project. Because existing wastewater treatment facilities and the planned wastewater conveyance facilities currently under construction would be adequate to serve the project, this impact is would be **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measure 4.6-2: Demand for Wastewater Treatment and Conveyance Facilities.

No mitigation is necessary.

IMPACT **Increased Generation of Solid Waste.** *The proposed project would incrementally increase the amount of solid waste generated in the City. However, the Western Regional Landfill, which would receive solid waste from the project, has long-term available capacity. Therefore, the project's impact on solid waste disposal is considered less than significant.*

4.6-3

Based on the CIWMB's generation rates for Placer County (0.36 tons per resident per year) and the estimated total population for the proposed project at buildout of 490; the solid-waste generation from project residents would be approximately 176.4 tons per year (0.48 tpd).

Solid waste collected from the project site would be sorted at the materials recovery facility (MRF) with the remaining refuse taken to the Western Regional Landfill. The Western Regional Landfill is permitted to accept 1,900 tpd of solid waste. On a daily basis, the waste volume generated by the proposed project would represent approximately 0.03% of the landfill's maximum daily disposal capacity. The landfill has a total capacity of 36 million cubic yards, and a remaining capacity of 29 million cubic yards. The closure date of the Western Regional Landfill is anticipated to be approximately 2036 (CIWMB 2005). This landfill has sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. The project would also comply with all federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste reduction and recycling. Because the Western Regional Landfill has long-term available capacity to serve the project, this impact would be a **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measure 4.6-3: Increased Generation of Solid Waste.

No mitigation is necessary.

IMPACT 4.6-4 **Increased Demand for Electricity and Required Extension of Electrical Infrastructure.** *Implementation of the proposed project would increase demand for electricity and electrical infrastructure. PG&E would be able to provide electricity to the project site. Because the proposed electrical utility improvements would be required to comply with all existing City, PG&E, and CPUC requirements, and applicable Uniform Building Code requirements, it is anticipated that the proposed electrical utility improvements would be sufficient to serve the proposed project. Therefore, this impact would be **less than significant**.*

Implementing the proposed project would increase electrical demand in the project area. PG&E provides electrical services to the City through State-regulated public utility contracts, and PG&E would provide underground electric service within all new development at the project site. In the project area, PG&E has existing 12 kV and 21 kV overhead power lines on the west side of Sierra College Boulevard, and existing 12 kV power lines on the east side of Dias Lane. In addition, 12-kV overhead power lines are located on the project site. Project development would connect to extensions of the existing service lines, with the ultimate configuration to be approved by PG&E. PG&E is required to comply with CPUC Decision 95-08-038 for the installation or upgrading of electric facilities. No new offsite electrical lines would be required for development of the proposed project. The onsite service lines would be sized to meet the demands of the project, and public utility easements would be dedicated for all underground facilities. The location of this infrastructure would be identified in the final project design.

As new development occurs, construction or reconstruction of existing overhead distribution facilities is needed to supply underground circuits in new developments. PG&E now requires the City or developer to pay the costs of reconstruction or replacement of overhead transmission facilities, if needed, to serve new development (Kennedy, pers. comm.).

As part of the project approval process, the project applicant would coordinate with the City and PG&E regarding the extension and locations of onsite infrastructure. The proposed electrical utility improvements would be required to comply with all existing City, PG&E, and CPUC requirements, and applicable Uniform Building Code requirements. It is anticipated that the proposed electrical utility improvements would be sufficient to serve the proposed project. Because proposed electrical utility improvements would be sufficient to serve the proposed project, and because this project would not create the need for expansion to facilities, this impact would be **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measure 4.6-4: Increased Demand for Electricity and Required Extension of Electrical Infrastructure.

No mitigation is necessary.

IMPACT 4.6-5 **Increased Demand for Natural Gas and Required Extension of Natural Gas Infrastructure.** *Implementation of the proposed project would increase demand for natural gas. PG&E would provide natural gas to the project site. Proposed natural gas infrastructure would be required to comply with all existing City and PG&E requirements. This impact is considered **less than significant**.*

Implementing the proposed project would increase natural gas demand in the project area. PG&E provides natural gas services to the City through State-regulated public utility contracts, and PG&E would provide natural gas to the project site. Natural gas lines are in the vicinity of the project site parallel to existing road rights-of-way. Project development would connect to extensions of the existing offsite service lines, with the ultimate configuration to be approved by PG&E. If PG&E determines additional offsite infrastructure is required for development of the proposed project, the project applicant would coordinate with PG&E, and new offsite infrastructure would be installed in existing utility rights-of-way. Additional onsite service lines would be sized to meet the demands of the project, and public utility easements would be dedicated for all underground facilities. The location of infrastructure would be identified in the final project design. As part of the project approval

process, the project applicant would coordinate with and meet the requirements of the City and PG&E regarding any extensions of offsite infrastructure and the locations of onsite infrastructure.

Proposed natural gas infrastructure would be required to comply with all existing City and PG&E requirements. Because PG&E would provide natural gas and associated infrastructure would be sufficient to serve the project, and because this project would not create the need for expansion to facilities, this impact would be **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measure 4.6-5: Increased Demand for Natural Gas and Required Extension of Natural Gas Infrastructure.

No mitigation is necessary.

IMPACT 4.6-6 **Required Extension of Telecommunications Services.** *Implementation of the proposed project would require extension of existing telecommunication services. AT&T and Wave Broadband Services would provide telephone and cable services, respectively, to the project site and upgrade existing facilities, as necessary, to serve the project. This impact would be less than significant.*

Telecommunications infrastructure is currently located throughout the City and in the vicinity of the project site. Telephone service would be provided by AT&T, and there is an existing underground telephone cable on the east side of Sierra College Boulevard and along Dias Lane. Cable service for the proposed project would be provided by Wave Broadband Services, and underground conduit runs parallel to Interstate 80 and along Dias Lane. As noted, Wave Broadband is working with Caltrans the City of Rocklin to install a conduit duct structure system across the Sierra College/I-80 overpass in Rocklin. This will provide service break-off points along Sierra College Boulevard.

AT&T and Wave Broadband Services would augment their existing facilities, as necessary, in the project vicinity and extend service into the project site. As part of the project approval process, the project applicant would coordinate with and meet the requirements of AT&T and Wave Broadband Services regarding the extension and locations of onsite infrastructure. All new onsite infrastructure would be installed in conformance with City and AT&T or Wave Broadband Services standards. This project would not create the need for expansion to facilities. Because extension of existing telecommunication services would be sufficient to serve the project, this impact is would be **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measure 4.6-6: Required Extension of Telecommunications Services.

No mitigation is necessary.

IMPACT 4.6-7 **Increased Demand for Fire Protection Facilities, Systems, Equipment, and Services.** *Development of the proposed project would result in increased demand for fire protection facilities and services. Because project designs would incorporate all Rocklin Fire Department and Uniform Fire Code requirements, and project applicant would be required to pay their fair share of costs through payment of the Public Facilities Impact Fees, this impact would be less than significant.*

Development of the proposed project would result in increased demand for fire protection facilities and services. The Rocklin Fire Department would provide fire protection services to the project site. The nearest fire station to the project site is Fire Station No. 1 approximately 2.0 miles southwest of the project site. Response times generally average 5 minutes or less 80% of the time.

The proposed project would result in an estimated residential population of 490 persons. Using the department's ratio of one fire fighter to 1,000 residents, a minimum of ½ of a fire fighter would be needed to serve the project. The project applicant would be required to incorporate all applicable Rocklin Fire Department rules and regulations and Uniform Building Code regulations adopted by the City of Rocklin, including adequate onsite

circulation, equipment access during emergency conditions, adequate fire fighting water flow, and other fire safety standards.

The City of Rocklin requires new development projects to pay specific impact fees (a portion of which is directed to the Fire Department). In addition, the project would be required to annex into the City-wide Community Facility District No. 1 and pay yearly City-wide Fire Department impact fees, which are adjusted, as needed. The City Fire Department has indicated that the department has no concern regarding the proposed project (Petitclerc pers. comm. 2006).

Because project designs would incorporate all Rocklin Fire Department and Uniform Fire Code requirements, and project applicant would be required to pay its fair share of costs through payment of the Public Facilities Impact Fees, sufficient fire protection services would be available to serve the project. This project would not create the need for expansion to facilities, the implementation of which could create potentially significant impacts. This impact would be **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measure 4.6-7: Increased Demand for Fire Protection Facilities, Systems, Equipment, and Services.

No mitigation is necessary.

IMPACT 4.6-8 **Increased Demand for Police Protection Facilities, Systems, Equipment, and Services.** *Development of the proposed project would result in increased demand for police protection facilities and services. The City would add personnel to the police department on an as-needed basis to meet service goals, and no new police facilities to serve the project would be required. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.*

Development of the proposed project would result in increased demand for police protection facilities and services. The project site is currently served by the Rocklin Police Department located at 4080 Rocklin Road approximately 2.0 miles southwest of the project site. The department currently has a response time of just over four minutes for Priority 1 calls.

The proposed project would result in an estimated residential population of 490 persons. Using the City's ratio of 1.2 officers to 1,000 residents, a minimum of ½ of a police officer would be needed to serve project. The department is currently working on a five-year strategic plan to address additional growth in the City (Nottoli, pers. comm. 2006). Funding for department operations comes from the City's general fund. New police services, including officers and equipment, are funded on an as-needed basis through approval from the City Council. No new police facilities to serve the project would be required. Because the City would add personnel to the police department on an as-needed basis to meet service goals, including serving the project, and because this project would not create the need for expansions to facilities that would create potentially significant impacts, this impact would be **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measure 4.6-8: Increased Demand for Police Protection Facilities, Systems, Equipment, and Services.

No mitigation is necessary.

IMPACT 4.6-9 **Increased Demand for Public School Facilities and Services.** *Development of the proposed project would generate new students in the Loomis Union School District and Placer Union High School District. The project would be subject to development impact fees which would provide the legally maximum required level of funding under State law, and would fully mitigate project-related school impacts. As a result, the project would have in less-than-significant impacts on school services and facilities.*

The proposed project would increase demand for public school facilities and services. The project site is within the Loomis Union School District and Placer Union High School District. The proposed project would construct 179 single-family dwelling units. Based on student-yield generation rates shown in Table 4.6-3, implementation

of the proposed project would generate approximately 61 new elementary school students (grades K–6), 29 middle school students (grades 7–8) and 40 high school students (grades 9–12).

Table 4.6-3 Student-Yield Generation Rates for the Loomis Union School District and Placer Union High School District		
Grade Level	Single-family detached (students per dwelling unit) ¹	Total Students
K–6	0.34	61
7–8	0.16	29
9–12	0.22	40
Total students	--	130

¹ Based on 179 single-family dwelling units.
 Source: Placer County Office of Education 2006

Elementary school students in the project area would attend Franklin Elementary School, which is currently exceeding capacity. High school students in the project area would attend Del Oro High School; however, the district has an open enrollment policy that allows students to request attendance at any district school site, as space is available.

The project would be subject to development impact fees. As allowed by State law, the project applicant would pay the state-mandated school impact fees to the Loomis Union School District and the Placer Union School District. This fee is typically an insufficient amount to fund 100% of new school facility construction. However, the California Legislature has declared that the school impact fee is deemed to be full and adequate mitigation under CEQA (Government Code Section 65996.) Section 65996 does not provide for remediation of existing deficiencies in school services. With payment of the school impact fees, impacts on school services and facilities would be **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measure 4.6-9: Increased Demand for Public School Facilities and Services.

No mitigation is necessary.

IMPACT 4.6-10 **Increased Demand for Parks and Recreation Facilities.** *Development of proposed project with residential uses would increase the demand for parks and recreation facilities in the City. The applicant would pay park and recreation fees as required by the City's subdivision ordinance, and therefore the project would have less-than-significant impacts on parks and recreation facilities.*

The proposed project would increase the demand for park and recreation facilities in Rocklin. As described above, the City General Plan standard for parkland is 5 acres per 1,000 residents. The proposed project would increase the population by an estimated 490 residents. Based on the City's General Plan standard of five acres of park per 1,000 residents, the project would be required to contribute 2.5 acres of park and recreational services to the City.

However, the City's subdivision ordinance (Rocklin Municipal Code Title 16) provides for the collection of park and recreation fees and/or parkland dedication for new residential developments at the time properties are subdivided. The fees are used to fund the acquisition and development of park and recreation facilities commensurate with the established parkland standard. Fees are also collected through an annual tax on each dwelling unit to fund park maintenance. In addition, the proposed project would be annexed into the Park Development and Maintenance District. The proposed project would impact recreation by contributing to the need for additional recreational facilities in the City of Rocklin. Because the applicant would pay park and recreation fees as required by the City's subdivision ordinance, sufficient parks and recreational facilities would be available

to serve the project. Therefore the project would have **less-than-significant** impact on parks and recreational facilities.

Mitigation Measure 4.6-10: Increased Demand for Parks and Recreation Facilities.

No mitigation is necessary.

IMPACT **Increased Demand for Library Services.** *The proposed project would result in increased demand for library services. Because the project applicant would pay the Placer County public facilities fees, impacts on library services would be less than significant.*

4.6-11

The proposed project would result in increased demand for library services. The proposed project area is served through the Auburn-Placer County Library District. The district provides a branch library in Rocklin at 5460 Fifth Street.

Placer County requires payment of a public facilities fee that is applied to new development. This fee is collected by the City of Rocklin at the time of building permit issuance and is transferred back to Placer County. Monies collected under this fee in Rocklin are used expressly for public facilities in Rocklin (Parker pers. comm. 2007). In July 2006 the Board of Supervisors approved a 10-year CIP that includes a new Rocklin Library of 20,000 to 25,500 square feet in size. The City of Rocklin and the County are currently working on an arrangement to provide further library services in Rocklin in a mutual long-term leasing of building space (Parker pers. comm. 2007). Because the applicant would pay the public facilities fee at the time of building permit issuance, sufficient library services would be available to serve the project. Therefore, the project would have **less-than-significant** on increased demand for library services.

Mitigation Measure 4.6-11: Increased Demand for Library Services.

No mitigation is necessary.

