
3.5 VERBAL RESPONSES

Verbal comments on the DEIR were received at the public hearing on February 23, 2006. This subchapter includes the responses to each of the comments included in Chapter 3.4. Each commenter has been assigned a commenter number, each comment made by that commenter is given a secondary number so that Comment 3-4 would be the fourth comment made by the third commenter at the public hearing.

The following is an index of the commenter's and corresponding responses.

<u>Verbal Responses to Comment</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Routen, Monte	3.5-4
2. Yates, Anissa	3.5-5
3. Moran, Kim	3.5-6
4. Kirkish, Louise	3.5-7
5. Kelly, Tom.....	3.5-8
6. O'Deegan, Elaine.....	3.5-9
7. O'Deegan, Meagan.....	3.5-10
8. Rabin, Margo	3.5-11
9. Brewer, Doug.....	3.5-12
10. Ellis, Carol	3.5-13
11. Smeaton, Nancy	3.5-14
12. Miller, Allison	3.5-15
13. Bellinger, Terry	3.5-16
14. Perera, Don	3.5-17
15. Beutz, Jo	3.5-18
16. Briggs, Susan	3.5-19
17. Schimandle, John.....	3.5-20
18. Scott, Robert	3.5-21
19. Taglio, Bud	3.5-22
20. Matkey, Jerry	3.5-23
21. Posnick, Mark.....	3.5-24
22. McKinney, George	3.5-25
23. Sweitzer, Roger	3.5-26
24. Henderson, Roger	3.5-27
25. Wilson, Duane	3.5-28
26. Lohse, Nancy	3.5-29
27. Eldridge, John.....	3.5-30
28. Gawel, Drew	3.5-31
29. Barnickol, Erna.....	3.5-32
30. Loeb, Lisa.....	3.5-33

31.	Loebs, Steve.....	3.5-34
32.	Kizer, Suzanne.....	3.5-35
33.	Haswell, Rob	3.5-36
34.	Rakocija, Tony.....	3.5-37
35.	Baker, David.....	3.5-38
36.	Neinzer, Terry.....	3.5-39
37.	Neumann, Mike	3.5-40
38.	Votaw, Kenneth.....	3.5-41
39.	Johnson, Barbara	3.5-42
40.	Somers, Susan.....	3.5-43
41.	Petersen, J.W.	3.5-45
42.	Pike, Gary	3.5-46
43.	Moore, Murial.....	3.5-47
44.	Verma, Krista.....	3.5-48
45.	Thew, Janet.....	3.5-49
46.	Hunter, Bill	3.5-50
47.	Devine, Jill.....	3.5-51
48.	Huber, John.....	3.5-52
49.	Halldin, Bill	3.5-53
50.	Tahti, Jane.....	3.5-54
51.	Carlson, James	3.5-55
52.	Simpson, Jenny.....	3.5-56
53.	Milldmon, David	3.5-57
54.	Diroll, Anne	3.5-58
55.	Moyles, Doug	3.5-59
56.	Diroll, Daniel	3.5-60
57.	Lanford, Kimberly	3.5-61
58.	Ganoza, Michelle.....	3.5-62
59.	Voris, John.....	3.5-63
60.	Voris, Janet	3.5-64
61.	Nelson, Andrew	3.5-65
62.	Murphy, Mike.....	3.5-66
63.	Chilcott, Ceili.....	3.5-67
64.	Mader, Lothar	3.5-68
65.	Basile, Lori	3.5-70
66.	Marilyn, Jasper	3.5-71
67.	Commissioner Shirhall	3.5-73
68.	Commissioner Menth	3.5-74
69.	Commissioner Weibert.....	3.5-75
70.	Commissioner Coleman	3.5-76
71.	Chairwoman Sully	3.5-77
72.	Councilmember Lund	3.5-78
73.	Councilmember Hill	3.5-79

74. Vice Mayor Yorde 3.5-80

VERBAL COMMENT 1: ROUTEN, MONTE

Response to Comment 1-1

This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

Response to Comment 1-2

This comment pronounces the commenter's support for the proposed project and the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 2: YATES, ANISSA

Response to Comment 2-1

This comment expresses support for the DEIR in general, specifically citing oak tree preservation and flood control methods.

Verbal Comment 3: Moran, Kim

Response to Comment 3-1

This is an introductory comment and does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

Response to Comment 3-2

The commenter states they believe the traffic analysis is inadequate regarding safety in and around the Park Drive ingress and egress for the adult living community at that location. The City has determined that the roadways included in the proposed project abide by safety standards as set forth in the City Of Rocklin Specifications and Improvement Standards.

Response to Comment 3-3

The commenter makes general statements regarding impacts to traffic, noise and air quality. The DEIR notes that several impacts related to these areas would be significant and unavoidable.

The commenter's statement that all traffic would be channeled through Park Drive is not accurate; the traffic will be distributed primarily to Park Drive and Sierra College Blvd., both of which are identified as arterials in the Rocklin General Plan. See Figure 4.4-5 from the Traffic and Circulation chapter of the DEIR for more details regarding trip distribution. See also Response to Comment 28-1.

Response to Comment 3-4

This comment addresses the gate along Park Drive used by Springfield residents and does not directly pertain to the Clover Valley project or address the adequacy of the DEIR.

Response to Comment 3-5

The commenter requests that no construction traffic for the proposed project be permitted to use Park Drive. This comment addresses design features of the proposed project and does not address the adequacy of the DEIR. The comments regarding the design of the project and connection to Park Drive are noted and will be forwarded to the appropriate decision-making bodies.

Verbal Comment 4: Kirkish, Louise

Response to Comment 4-1

This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

Response to Comment 4-2

This comment expresses support for the project, but does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 5: KELLY, TOM

Response to Comment 5-1

The commenter states support for the project as a less-intense alternative to the maximum density that would theoretically be allowed under the current entitlements.

Response to Comment 5-2

The commenter expresses support for the addition of a Fire Station to the proposed project site.

Response to Comment 5-3

The comment supports the proposed access to Sierra College Boulevard that Valley View Parkway would provide.

VERBAL COMMENT 6: O'DEEGAN, ELAINE

Comments from the O'Deegan family were also submitted in a letter received on March 15, 2006. The concerns included in the letter include those made by Elaine O'Deegan at the public meeting. Please see the Response to Comments for letter 148 in the FDEIR for responses to Verbal Comments 6-1 through 6-5.

Response to Comment 6-1

Please see Response to Comment 148-2.

Response to Comment 6-2

Please see Response to Comment 148-5.

Response to Comment 6-3

This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

Response to Comment 6-4

Please see Response to Comment 148-2 and 148-6.

Response to Comment 6-5

Please see Response to Comment 148-3.

VERBAL COMMENT 7: O'DEEGAN, MEAGAN

Response to Comment 7-1

The biological assessment of the proposed project conducted by ECORP found that “given the presence of significant downstream barriers, upstream passage of adult salmonids (including steelhead and Chinook salmon) adjacent to the proposed project site was not possible.” (page 4.8-11 of the Biological Resources chapter of the DEIR). Given this information, the proposed project concluded that salmon and steelhead migration up the river was not possible.

Response to Comment 7-2 and 7-2

See Section 1 of Master Response 2 – Land Use

VERBAL COMMENT 8: RABIN, MARGO

Response to Comment 8-1

This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 9: BREWER, DOUG

Response to Comment 9-1

This is an introductory comment and does not raise any specific concerns regarding the adequacy of the DEIR.

Response to Comment 9-2

Comment noted, additional special status plant species surveys were conducted prior to release of this FDEIR. Please see Section 1 of Master Response 8 - Biological Resources.

Response to Comment 9-3

See Response to Comment 2-9

Response to Comment 9-4

This comment was also sent in the form of a written letter, see Response to Comment 72-9.

Response to Comment 9-5

The commenter's claim that mitigation measures included in the DEIR are invalid and rely upon the Corps of Engineers to supervise implementation does not include any specific citations to validate the comment's claim. A review of mitigation measures regarding stormwater runoff including measures 4.11MM-1(a), 4.11MM-3(a) 4.11MM-3(b), 4.11MM-3(c), 4.11MM-5(a), 4.11MM-5(c), 4.11MM-9(a), and 4.11MM-9(b) did not substantiate the commenter's claim. Implementation of the above measures are dependent upon the City and applicant and do not place undo responsibility on the Corps of Engineers. 4.11MM-9(d) (as amended in the final Mitigation Monitoring Plan) also addresses the commenter's concerns. Commenter may be referring to Mitigation Measure 4.8MM-15(b). The City of Rocklin will replace the Corps as the agency responsible to ensure the Vortech water filtration system is maintained in perpetuity.

Response to Comment 9-6

As stated in the DEIR, specific information regarding the location of existing on-site cultural resources was withheld for the sake of protecting the integrity of those sites. See Master Response 7 – Cultural Resources.

VERBAL COMMENT 10: ELLIS, CAROL

Response to Comment 10-1

This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

Response to Comment 10-2

This comment expresses opposition to the project, but does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 11: SMEATON, NANCY

Response to Comment 11-1

This comment expresses opposition to the project, but does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 12: MILLER, ALLISON

Response to Comment 12-1

This comment expresses opposition to the project, but does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 13: BELLINGER, TERRY

Response to Comment 13-1

The commenter states that the development will disrupt existing cultural resources on the proposed project site, but does not question the adequacy of proposed mitigation measures included in the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 14: PERERA, DON

Response to Comment 14-1

See Master Response 7 – Cultural Resources

Response to Comment 14-2

This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 15: BENTZ, JO

Response to Comment 15-1

The commenter expresses dissatisfaction with the term “vacant” used in the DEIR. In the terms of environmental analysis, the term vacant is a technical term which implies a lack of developments such as buildings and other infrastructure.

Response to Comment 15-2

The DEIR clearly states that there are 20.4 acres of riparian wetlands (see pages 4.8-2 through 4.8-3 of the Biological Resources Chapter) and 21.74 acres of seasonal wetlands (see page 4.8-3) totaling approximately 41.78 acres of wetlands on the project site. Impact statement 4.8I-4 states that “The total loss of wetlands due to project construction is approximately 2.56 acres” (See page 4.8-28).

Response to Comment 15-3

See Section 1 of Master Response 2 - Land Use.

Response to Comment 15-4

See Section 6 of Master Response 8 – Biological Resources.

Response to Comment 15-5

See Impact 4.11I-1 and associated mitigation measures regarding the creation of a master drainage plan. Also see 4.11MM-3(a-c), 4.11MM-4, and 4.11MM-5(a-e) in the DEIR specifying measures to protect water quality and prevent erosion during and after construction.

Response to Comment 15-6

The City Engineer, and associated staff would be responsible for the review of aforementioned plans and monitoring of the referenced mitigation measures. See Impact 4.8MM-10(a) regarding the location of and mitigation for special-status species nests on the proposed project site. Raptor nests are surveyed and researched to the extent feasible within one quarter mile of the project boundaries.

Response to Comment 15-7

The commenter is unclear as to what “constituents” are being referred to; this element of the comment cannot be responded to. However it is assumed they are referring to water quality. Please see Section 2 of Master Response 11 – Hydrology and Water Quality.

VERBAL COMMENT 16: BRIGGS, SUSAN

Response to Comment 16-1

This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 17: SCHIMANDEL, JOHN

Response to Comment 17-1

This is an introductory comment and does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

Response to Comment 17-2

These comments were submitted in written format in letters dated March 6th and March 13th. Responses to these comments are included in the written Responses to Comments 164 and 165.

Response to Comment 17-3

The conclusion of Impact 4.2I-1 addresses the project's Consistency with adopted General Plan and zoning designations and policies. A review of the cited policies 6, 7 and 9 in light of the project's consistency with General plan and zoning designations does not reveal any inconsistencies. The proposed project consists of a residential development, which is consistent with nearby residential developments. Therefore, this impact is less-than-significant (as discussed in the DEIR). See Section 2 of Master Response 2- Land Use.

Response to Comment 17-4

The commenter's assumption that no residents would utilize public transit is speculative. The addition of bus turnouts at the proposed project area (Mitigation Measure 4.5MM-2[a]) is one of a number of mitigation measures, which would contribute to the less-than-significant conclusion for that impact.

Response to Comment 17-5

The commenter's opinions regarding the use of electric alternatives are speculative and unsupported. In addition, the inclusion of electronic outlets as potential measure to reduce the use of gas-powered lawn equipment is one of several mitigations designed to help mitigate impacts to a less-than-significant level and is expected to have an incremental contribution to that mitigation.

VERBAL COMMENT 18: SCOTT, ROBERT

Response to Comment 18-1

This comment expresses support for the proposed project and does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

Response to Comment 18-2

This comment expresses support for the proposed Valley View Parkway and does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

Response to Comment 18-3

This comment expresses support for the access that the proposed project would offer to areas along Clover Valley Creek and does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 19: TAGLIO, BUD

Response to Comment 19-1

This comment expresses support for the proposed project and supports the analysis included in the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 20: MATKEY, JERRY

Response to Comment 20-1

The commenter expresses support for the proposed project and does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 21: POSNICK, MARK

Response to Comment 21-1

The commenter expresses support for the proposed project and does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

Response to Comment 21-2

The commenter states approval for the proposed fire station that would be constructed should the proposed project be approved. This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

Response to Comment 21-3

The commenter expresses support alternative traffic routes included in the proposed project. This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 22: MCKINNEY, GEORGE

Response to Comment 22-1

The commenter supports the DEIR, specifically citing the analysis of flood events downstream of the proposed project.

VERBAL COMMENT 23: SWEITZER, ROGER

Response to Comment 23-1

The commenter expresses support for the proposed project and does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 24: HENDERSON, ROGER

Response to Comment 24-1

The commenter expresses support for the proposed project and the DEIR. However, the commenter stated his agreement with other commenters that the DEIR may need to expand on several points, though he was not specific as to which points deserved additional study.

VERBAL COMMENT 25: WILSON, DUANE

Response to Comment 25-1

This is an introductory comment regarding a point of order in the public meeting and does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

Response to Comment 25-2

The commenter is incorrect as to the nature of the growth inducing impacts discussed in the DEIR. Page 5.2 of the DEIR states the following at the end of the third paragraph:

However, any development would be required to undergo discretionary approval by the City, including but not limited to annexation and tentative maps.

Annexation and the approval of tentative maps for any additional development would require site-specific environmental analysis in conjunction with CEQA Guidelines. The approval of the proposed project would allow for the construction of 558 homes, as stated by the project description.

Response to Comment 25-3

The commenter states that he disagrees with the traffic analysis included in the DEIR and claims that the majority of Rocklin's Citizenry would have no use of the proposed Valley View Parkway. This comment is speculative and contradicted by several citizens who commented at the public hearing. These commenters include, but are not limited to 18, 20 and 21 included above.

Response to Comment 25-4 and 25-5

See Section 1 of Master Response 8 – Biological Resources.

Response to Comment 25-6

See Response to Comment 41-3

Response to Comment 25-7

This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 26: LOHSE, NANCY

Response to Comment 26-1

This comment states that school children do not support the proposed project and does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 27: ELDRIDGE, JOHN

Response to Comment 27-1

This comment expresses support for the proposed project and does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 28: GOWEL, DREW

Response to Comment 28-1 and 28-2

Though microorganisms are not specifically addressed, impacts regarding the degradation of water quality, such as silting, pollutants, and other factors identified by the commenter, are addressed in Impact 4.11I-5. See Section 3 of Master Response 11 – Hydrology and Water Quality.

Response to Comment 28-3

See Impact 4.10I-6 in the Hazards chapter for a discussion of mosquito-related impacts and mitigations and Response to Comment 43-197.

Response to Comment 28-4

See Impact 4.11I-11 for a discussion of the proposed project's cumulative contribution to the Clover Valley Creek's water quality.

VERBAL COMMENT 29: BARNICKOL, ERNA

Response to Comment 29-1

This is an introductory comment that states the commenter's identity and specifies the DEIR concern for deer jumping fences on the proposed project site and does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

Response to Comment 29-2

Native deer are not considered to be special-status species and are not specifically protected under CEQA. However, the points made by this commenter are noted, and the comments will be forwarded to the appropriate decision-making bodies.

VERBAL COMMENT 30: LOEBS, LISA

Response to Comment 30-1

This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 31: LOEBS, STEVE

Response to Comment 31-1

This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 32: KIZER, SUZANNE

Response to Comment 32-1

This is an introductory comment and does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

Response to Comment 32-2

See Section 6 of Master Response 8 – Biological Resources.

Response to Comment 32-3

The sewer extension plans must undergo approval of the South Placer Municipal Utility District (SPMUD). The SPMUD has yet to determine which design plan/alternative would be selected so information in regard to timing and exact layout of the proposal is not available. Impacts related to increased traffic and noise as a result of construction activities, including sewer extensions, are discussed in Impacts 4.4I-4 and 4.6I-5 respectively. Mitigation Measures 4.4MM-4(a-c) and 4.6MM-5(a-b) have been incorporated to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Response to Comment 32-4

This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR. The proposed gate at the end of Rawhide Road will be for emergency and service access only as set forth in General Plan Circulation Policy No. 26.

Response to Comment 32-5

As illustrated in Figures 7, 11, & 13 in Appendix D, Volume 2 of the DEIR traffic volumes on Midas Avenue will be below the 12,000 vehicle per day threshold for collector roadways with residential frontage in the existing plus project and cumulative plus project traffic scenarios.

Response to Comment 32-6

The commenter expresses support for the reduced buildout alternatives included in the DEIR.

Response to Comment 32-7

The commenter expresses support for the reduced buildout alternatives included in the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 33: HASWELL, ROB

Response to Comment 33-1

This comment criticizes the political structure and expresses opposition to the proposed project. This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 34: RAKOCIJA, TONY

Response to Comment 34-1

This comment addresses the development agreement and does not speak to the adequacy of the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 35: BAKER, DAVID

Response to Comment 35-1

The comment supports the DEIR, particularly the discussion of low-impact density features.

Response to Comment 35-2

The commenter states concern regarding sediment deposit into the Clover Valley Creek during the wet season and does not address the adequacy of the DEIR. For a discussion of this and other water quality related impacts, see Impacts 4.11I-3 through 5 and associated mitigation measures in the DEIR.

Response to Comment 35-3

The presence of Mehrten formation is discussed in the discussion of the existing setting on page 4.9-1 and 4.9-2 as well as in Impact 4.9I-4 of the Geological Resource chapter of the DEIR. The *Geotechnical Investigation*, which was prepared by Kleinfelder Inc., included the presence of the Mehrten formation in the DEIR analysis of the proposed project site.

Response to Comment 35-4

The Commenter is expressing concern regarding the stability of the creek crossings during a 100 year flood event. Please refer to Impact 4.11I-1 and associated mitigation measures.

VERBAL COMMENT 36: MEINZER, TERRY

Response to Comment 36-1

This is an introductory comment, which supports the DEIR's analysis of impacts related to property owners adjacent to the commenter's property.

Response to Comment 36-2

The commenter states that they believe the DEIR analysis of traffic related impacts to be adequate.

Response to Comment 36-3

The commenter states that they believe the DEIR analysis of open-space related impacts to be adequate.

VERBAL COMMENT 37: NEUMANN, MIKE

Response to Comment 37-1

This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 38: VOTAW, KENNETH

Response to Comment 38-1

The determination of less-than-significant for Impact 4.3I-5 is based upon the standards of significance set forth on page 4.3-11 and based upon the goals and policies of the City of Rocklin General Plan, included in page 4.3-10 of the DEIR. The conclusion of less-than-significant is consistent with the General Plan goals and policies. Specifically, the proposed project is consistent with the adjacent land uses (see Land use Policy 7 and Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Policy 20). See Master Response 3 – Aesthetics.

Response to Comment 38-2

The cumulative traffic analysis contained within the DEIR includes vehicle trips generated by the Bickford Ranch development. Therefore, the cumulative traffic analysis is adequate. The remainder of this comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 39: JOHNSON, BARBARA

Response to Comment 39-1

See Verbal Response to Comment 3-2.

Response to Comment 39-2

This comment discusses existing sound walls within the City. The DEIR determined that the proposed project would have a less-than-significant contribution in regard to increases in noise levels along Park Drive and that the existing noise barriers would be sufficient. Please see Impact 4.6I-1.

Response to Comment 39-3

Please see Impact 4.6I-1.

VERBAL COMMENT 40: SOMERS, SUSAN

Response to Comment 40-1

The commenter is incorrect in stating that the traffic analysis does not include impacts related to Park Drive and Crest Avenue. This is untrue, as the cumulative traffic analysis utilized a comprehensive traffic model, which takes a large-scale approach to total traffic distribution (and accounts for Crest Avenue.) See Section 1 of Master Response 4 – Traffic.

Response to Comment 40-2

The commenter states that the DEIR does not address the topic of the 50-foot creek setbacks. See page 4.2-10, as well as Impacts 4.8-4 and 4.8-5 and Section 1 of Master Response 2 - Land Use

Response to Comment 40-3

The technical studies conducted for the proposed project determined that, because of downstream features, it would be infeasible for fish such as steelhead to travel upstream to the proposed project area. However, the DEIR does address impacts related to water quality at the bridge crossings, please see impact discussion 4.8I-15 for a discussion of operational impacts to steelhead and other fish species.

For additional information, see Section 6 of Master Response 8 – Biological Resources.

Response to Comment 40-4

For more information regarding the detention basins, see Section 1 of Master Response 11 – Hydrology and Water Quality, for more details related to migratory fish patterns, see Section 6 of Master Response 8 – Biological Resources.

Response to Comment 40-5

The policies regarding open space for the proposed project are in accordance with the goals and policies set forth in the Rocklin General Plan. The comment addresses the adequacy of the General Plan definition of open space and does not address the adequacy of the DEIR itself. See Section 3 of Master Response 2 – Land Use.

Response to Comment 40-6

The applicant would mitigate impacts related to the construction of a new fire station through payment of fair share fees and other provisions included in Impact 4.12I-5. Impacts related to train noise were found to be less-than-significant based upon the ridge that would separate homes within the proposed project from the train tracks. This hill

would mitigate noise impacts to a less-than-significant level. See Impact 4.6I-3 for more information.

VERBAL COMMENT 41: PETERSEN, J.W.

Response to Comment 41-1

The commenter states opposition for the proposed project and does not raise any specific concerns regarding the adequacy of the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 42: PIKE, GARY

Response to Comment 42-1

The commenter states that the impacts related to Midas road were adequately addressed in the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 43: MOORE, MURIAL

Response to Comment 43-1

See Section 6 of Master Response 8 – Biological Resources.

Response to Comment 43-2

For a discussion of the changes to migratory patterns, see Section 6 of Master Response 8 – Biological Resources.

Response to Comment 43-3

See Verbal Response to Comment 3-2 and Section 3 of Master Response 4 – Traffic.

VERBAL COMMENT 44: VERMA, KRISTA

Response to Comment 44-1

See Verbal Response to Comment 3-2 and Section 3 of Master Response 4 – Traffic.

Response to Comment 44-2

See Verbal Response to Comment 3-2 and Section 3 of Master Response 4 – Traffic.

Response to Comment 44-3

See Written Response to Comment 74-4 and Section 3 of Master Response 4 – Traffic.

Response to Comment 44-4

The comment is incorrect that Valley View Parkway would be a direct connection to any development on Highway 65. The comment does not address the adequacy of the RDEIR.

Response to Comment 44-5

This comment state's the commenter's opposition to the proposed project and does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 45: THEW, JANET

Response to Comment 45-1

This comment states that the cumulative impacts included in the DEIR are inadequate; however, the comment does not address any specific points as a basis of response.

Response to Comment 45-2

This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 46: HUNTER, BILL

Response to Comment 46-1

This comment expresses the commenter's opposition to the proposed project and does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 47: DEVINE, JILL

Response to Comment 47-1

This comment expresses the commenter's opposition to the proposed project and does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 48: HUBER, JOHN

Response to Comment 48-1

As discussed on page 5-2 of the DEIR, the 501 dwelling units in question are not part of the proposed project. The off-site sewer extension would be constructed according to the SPMUD Master Plan, this would allow for the possible future inclusion of an additional 501 residences to the north and 23 dwellings to the south. However, these developments are not currently planned and are not part of the proposed project. See Master Response 13 – Growth Inducing Impacts.

Response to Comment 48-2

This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 49: HALLDIN, BILL

Response to Comment 49-1

This is an introductory comment and does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

Response to Comment 49-2

The commenter indicates the development of the proposed project would result in a substantial increase in accessibility to the proposed project site.

Response to Comment 49-3

The commenter indicates that the construction of Valley View Parkway will have the benefit of providing another circulation option into and out of the northeast portion of the City.

Response to Comment 49-4

This comment supports the development of the proposed project in accordance with the existing property rights. This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 50: TAHTI, JANE

Response to Comment 50-1

This comment expresses concern regarding the increase in traffic along Valley View Parkway. The buildout of Valley View Parkway is included in the City of Rocklin General Plan, the impacts associated with the addition of vehicle trips through Clover Valley along Valley View Parkway are anticipated by the General Plan and have been analyzed in the RDEIR.

Response to Comment 50-2 through 50-5

See Section 6 of Master Response 8 – Biological Resources.

Response to Comment 50-6

This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 51: CARLSON, JAMES

Response to Comment 51-1

This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 52: SIMPSON, JENNY

Response to Comment 52-1

This is an introductory comment which states that the commenter plans to submit a more detailed written letter. See written comment number 169.

Response to Comment 52-2

See Section 2 of Master Response 6 – Noise.

Response to Comment 52-3

Impact 4.6I-2, which discusses impacts of the proposed project on the proposed residents within the Clover Valley development found the noise-related impacts to be less-than-significant to future residents to be within the City's established levels.

Response to Comment 52-4

See Section 3 of Master Response 4 - Traffic.

VERBAL COMMENT 53: MILLDON, DAVID

Response to Comment 53-1

This is an introductory comment and does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

Response to Comment 53-2

This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 54: DIROLL, ANNE

Response to Comment 54-1

Air quality pollutants, standards, and associated health effects are discussed within the Environmental Setting section of the Air Quality chapter in the RDEIR (see pages 4.5-2 through 4.5-4). The standards listed in Table 4.5-1 are designed to address health-related impacts. The RDEIR discloses that even with mitigation construction related air quality impacts will be significant and unavoidable. Air quality impacts associated with traffic and residential occupancy of the project has been reduced to less than significant levels with mitigation. Estimates of a project specific link to actual occurrences of illness would be speculative and beyond the scope of a CEQA analysis. The Air Quality section of the RDEIR and the City's General Plan EIR acknowledge and disclose that cumulative impacts on Air Quality will be significant and unavoidable. The City Council will be reviewing all significant and unavoidable impacts and will have to adopt Findings of Fact and Statements of Overriding Considerations prior to certifying the EIR.

Response to Comment 54-2

The impact of future use of pesticides and fertilizers by residents is discussed in Impact 4.11 I-5. This impact was found to be less than significant with mitigation.

VERBAL COMMENT 55: MOYLES, DOUG

Response to Comment 55-1

The commenter's statements regarding the buildout of the proposed project are correct; however, this is not considered to be a significant environmental impact according to CEQA Guidelines.

Response to Comment 55-2

See Written Response to Comment 54-1.

Response to Comment 55-3

Emergency response personnel would have access to the gate at Rawhide Road and be able to open the gate for timely access to the project area in the event of an emergency.

Response to Comment 55-4

Impacts related to flooding are addressed in Impacts 4.11I-2 and 4.11I-10. These impacts were found to be less-than-significant.

Response to Comment 55-5

See Written Response to Comment 54-2.

Response to Comment 55-6

This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 56: DIROLL, DANIEL

Response to Comment 56-1

This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

Response to Comment 56-2

Should the proposed project be approved, the roads in question will still be accessible by bicyclists. Additionally, the proposed project would include a bike trail along the Clover Valley Creek.

Response to Comment 56-3

This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 57: LANFORD, KIMBERLY

Response to Comment 57-1

This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 58: GANOZA, MICHELLE

Response to Comment 58-1

This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 59: VORIS, JOHN

Response to Comment 59-1

The commenter expresses support for the no-development alternative, this comment will be forwarded to the appropriate decision making bodies.

Response to Comment 59-2

This commenter also submitted a written comment letter, which addressed these issues more fully, see Written Response to Comment 183-1.

Response to Comment 59-3

Reconnaissance-level surveys include on-site visits to the project site and first-hand visual survey.

Response to Comment 59-4

This comment addresses the topic of aesthetics but not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

Response to Comment 59-5

This comment does not raise any specific points which the commenter would like to be expanded and is, therefore, difficult to respond to. For additional information related to the inclusion of additional biological surveys on the project site and a discussion of habitat fragmentation, see Master Response 8 – Biological Resources.

VERBAL COMMENT 60: VORIS, JANET

Response to Comment 60-1

This is an introductory comment and does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

Response to Comment 60-2

The development of Bickford Ranch was assumed in the cumulative traffic analysis for the DEIR.

Response to Comment 60-3

A discussion of impacts related to increased air emissions, including fireplaces, is included in Impact 4.5I-2 and addressed in Mitigation Measure 4.5MM-2(e). In addition, because the Sacramento Valley Air Basin is a non-attainment area for the State PM₁₀ standard and the State PM_{2.5} annual standard, only natural gas/propane fireplaces appliances will be allowed within the project.

Response to Comment 60-4

The commenter submitted a comment letter on October 14, 2005. This letter included concerns regarding the release of toxic runoff from residential land uses (addressed in Impact 4.11I-5 of the DEIR.) The comment letter also raised concerns regarding several traffic issues related to Sierra College Boulevard, though issues related to the stoplight were not specifically addressed in the DEIR, design features such as the stoplight are not considered to be hazardous features. Additionally concerns related to roadkill are not considered to be an issue under CEQA, though the commenter's concerns regarding a potential increase in roadkill will be forwarded to the appropriate decision-making bodies. In regard to concerns regarding air quality, see Response to Comment 60-3. Impacts related to cultural resources are addressed in Chapter 4.7 of the DEIR and Master Response 7 – Cultural Resources.

Response to Comment 60-5

See Section 1 of Master Response 2 - Land Use.

Response to Comment 60-6

The commenter indicates that there are a number of comments from the public that have not been addressed, however no specifics are provided. In absence of those details a response cannot be formulated.

VERBAL COMMENT 61: NELSON, ANDREW

Response to Comment 61-1

This is an introductory comment and does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

Response to Comment 61-2

Many of the details associated with the Cultural Resources report are not available for public review, due to the sensitive nature of the cultural sites located within the proposed project area. The commenter's opinion that the cultural resources on the project site are not adequately addressed in the DEIR is noted. See Master Response 7 – Cultural Resources.

Response to Comment 61-3

The commenter's opinion that the cultural resources on the project site are not adequately addressed in the DEIR is noted. However, the City finds the cultural resources report conducted by Peak & Associates to be accurate and adequate. See Section 1 of Master Response 7 – Cultural Resources.

Response to Comment 61-4

This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR, see responses above to 61-2 and 61-3.

VERBAL COMMENT 62: MURPHY, MIKE

Response to Comment 62-1

This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

Response to Comment 62-2

The commenter suggests revisions to the DEIR based upon discussions at the public hearing, this comment does not address any specific issues and, therefore, cannot be responded to directly.

Response to Comment 62-3

This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 63: CHILCOTT, CEILI

Response to Comment 63-1

This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR. See Section 6 of Master Response 8 – Biological Resources.

Response to Comment 63-2

This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 64: MADER, LOTHAR

Response to Comment 64-1

See Section 2 of Master Response 6 - Noise.

Response to Comment 64-2

See Section 3 of Master Response 4 - Traffic.

Response to Comment 64-3

See Master Response 3 – Aesthetics.

Response to Comment 64-4

See Section 6 of Master Response 8 – Biological Resources.

Response to Comment 64-5

Though impacts related to conversion weather are not specifically addressed, the DEIR includes a discussion of operational air quality impacts. As discussed in Impact 4.5I-2, the development of the proposed project would be expected to result in a potentially significant increase in air emissions; however, the mitigation measures associated with Impact 4.5I-2 would be expected to decrease this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Response to Comment 64-6

The commenter is correct that the area up along the ridgelines will be developed. Nature Trailway within the proposed Clover Valley Subdivision would ultimately provide access to the adjacent property to the south known as the Summit. Specific impacts related to development of that site would be addressed separately if and when an application is submitted for that property. Development of that site has been assumed in the cumulative analysis prepared in the RDEIR, since that site is currently land use planned and zoned for residential development.

Response to Comment 64-7

The 2025 cumulative traffic analysis within the RDEIR addressed a scenario with the Summit property having access to Argonaut as identified in the current General Plan and a scenario where the Summit property could only exit through the proposed Clover Valley subdivision as anticipated in the proposed General Plan update. See Impact 4.4I-5 in the RDEIR.

Response to Comment 64-8

The comment is unclear, however the City assumes that the commenter is referring to the increased traffic along Valley View Parkway, which would offer a connection between Park Drive and Sierra College Boulevard. The construction of Valley View Parkway is included in the City of Rocklin General Plan. Traffic impacts associated with this connection were originally addressed in the City of Rocklin General Plan DEIR. Additionally, the DEIR for the proposed project found that traffic volumes on local roadways would result in a less-than-significant impact (see Impact 4.4I-1 of the DEIR.) Additionally, the DEIR for the proposed project found that traffic volumes on local roadways would result in a less than significant impact (see Impact 4.4I-1 and Impact 4.4I-5 of the DEIR).

VERBAL COMMENT 65: BASILE, LORI

Response to Comment 65-1

This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

VERBAL COMMENT 66: JASPER, MARILYN

Response to Comment 66-1

This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

Response to Comment 66-2

This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

Response to Comment 66-3

Prior to the release of this FDEIR an additional study was performed by Jerry Tecklin in July 2006, to determine the presence or absence of Black Rails on the project site. This study located a single instance of a Black Rail on the project site. In light of this additional information the final paragraph on page 4.8-17 of the DEIR is hereby changed as follows:

California Black Rail

California black rail (*Laterallus jamaicensis coturniculus*) is listed as a Threatened species and protected pursuant to the California Endangered Species Act. This species is Fully Protected pursuant to California Fish and Game Code §3511, and is a USFWS Bird of Conservation Concern. Typical habitat for black rail includes coastal saltmarsh, delta emergent marsh, and interior freshwater emergent marsh. California black rail is a year-round resident in the San Francisco Bay region and at inland locations within Placer, Yuba, Butte, and Nevada Counties. Nesting typically occurs from March through July. The marshes on-site represent potentially suitable habitat for California black rail, ~~but none have been observed during prior field surveys.~~ A single instance of a Black Rail on the project site occurred in one of three site visits in July 2006, though follow-up studies were unable to locate the bird on site, the presence of Black Rails on the project site is considered likely.

Though the Black Rail was located, the subsequent site visits were unable to confirm the bird's habitation of the project area. However, Mitigation Measure 4.8MM-13, would ensure pre-construction surveys be conducted to verify the presence or absence of the Black Rail as well as other freshwater marsh-occupying birds. Should the Black Rail or other freshwater marsh-occupying birds be confirmed to be on site, the appropriate mitigation measures would be implemented, as detailed in MM 4.8MM-13.

The above change is for clarification purposes and does not result in any changes in regard to the findings contained within the DEIR.

Response to Comment 66-4

The commentor states her opinion that the noise analysis was not adequate because the 24-hour monitoring was conducted on one day during which it was allegedly raining. The noise analysis was prepared by Bollard Acoustical Consultants, Inc., which is an engineering firm with expertise in such matters. According to its professional judgment, the methodology it employed was adequate to assess the current noise environment. See Response to Comment 43-95.

Response to Comment 66-5

Though the DEIR includes an analysis of impacts related to the buildout of on-site infrastructure, it does not include the specific plans for the on-site sewer. However, plans for the on-site sewer system are included in the tentative maps for the proposed project. See Maps SS-1 through SS-6 in the tentative maps for more details. The DEIR does include the Small Lot Tentative Subdivision Maps (Sheets TS-1 through TS-6) on pages 3-5 through 3-10. These exhibits show the locations of all proposed sewer, water and storm drainage facilities that are located outside of street rights-of-way. Impact statements regarding oak trees and other habitat loss include those which would be impacted as a result of all forms of on-site infrastructure. To be conservative, the DEIR anticipates total loss of habitat within these easements although some trees and other habitat may be able to be preserved during actual design.

Response to Comment 66-6

The Alternative Analysis includes a brief discussion of an Open Space With Some Public/Quasi-Public Uses Alternative. See page 6-5 of the DEIR for more details.

VERBAL COMMENT 67: COMMISSIONER SHIRHALL

Response to Comment 67-1

As stated in Mitigation Measure 4.11MM-3(b), the proposed project would be required to submit a SWPPP for the approval of the City Engineer. The SWPPP would include provisions for the implementation of Best Management Practices to ensure that impacts would be fully mitigated, including impacts related to non-hazardous and hazardous material storage, saw-cutting, and spill prevention and control. See Section 2 of Master Response 11 – Hydrology and Water Quality.

Response to Comment 67-2

A revised drainage plan has been included as part of the FDEIR. See Section 3 of Master Response 11 – Hydrology and Water Quality

Response to Comment 67-3

The commenter raised concerns regarding the need for biological and cultural monitors. The DEIR includes mitigation measures 4.7I-1(a) and 4.7I-1(b) which include provisions to ensure that construction personnel receive sensitivity training regarding how to identify archaeological sites during construction and require that the applicant mark and protect existing cultural sites. The mitigation measures also call for the use of an on-site cultural resources monitor.

The Biological Resources chapter of the DEIR includes a number of mitigation measures which would require the applicant to conduct pre-construction surveys for various species prior to the initiation of construction and grading activities. See mitigation measures: 4.8MM-4(e), 4.8MM-10(a), 4.8MM-10(d), 4.8MM-11(b), 4.8MM-1 and, 4.8MM-13. Considering the extent of required interaction of a qualified biologist to implement the referenced mitigation measures, there is no plan for additional full time biological monitoring.

See Letter 41 for written comments by Commissioner Shirhall.

VERBAL COMMENT 68: COMMISSIONER MENTH

Response to Comment 68-1

As shown in Table 4.7-2, the cultural resources report for the proposed project identified thirty-three sites of cultural importance. This is considered to be an accurate count of existing cultural resources; however, specific information regarding the location of these sites is sensitive information and has not been publicly released for the sake of protecting the on-site resources. See Master Response 7 – Cultural Resources.

Response to Comment 68-2

See Section 3 of Master Response 4 – Traffic.

Response to Comment 68-3

Issues regarding re-paving of Argonaut Avenue and Rawhide Road are addressed in mitigation measure 4.11MM-4(e). The extent of the re-paving would be dictated by the Public Works Director or could be addressed more specifically by the Planning Commission and/or the City Council during project deliberations.

Response to Comment 68-4

The developer would be required to mitigate any loss of oak trees in the park by the standards set forth in the City Of Rocklin Oak Tree Ordinance. All construction impacts would require full restoration to a condition satisfactory to the Director of Community Services and Facilities. Since construction of the off-site sewer through the park is only one of the possible construction options, selecting the option which avoids the park would eliminate impacts to Clover Valley Park.

Response to Comment 68-5

See Section 1 of Master Response 12 – Public Utilities and Services.

See Letter 31 for written comments submitted by Commissioner Menth.

VERBAL COMMENT 69: COMMISSIONER WEIBERT

Response to Comment 69-1

This is a summary comment and does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

Response to Comment 69-2

This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR.

See Letter 49 for written comments submitted by Commissioner Weibert.

VERBAL COMMENT 70: COMMISSIONER COLEMAN

Response to Comment 70-1

The commenter has indicated that he will provide specific comments in written form.

See Letter 25 for written comments submitted by Commissioner Coleman.

VERBAL COMMENT 71: CHAIRWOMAN SULLY

Response to Comment 71-1

See Master Response 7 – Cultural Resources.

See Letter 47 for written comments submitted by Commissioner Sully.

VERBAL COMMENT 72: COUNCILMEMBER LUND

Response to Comment 72-1

See Letter 30 for written comments submitted by Councilmember Lund.

VERBAL COMMENT 73: COUNCILMEMBER HILL

Response to Comment 73-1

The commenter does not address any specific concerns regarding the adequacy of the DEIR.

See Letter 28 for written comments from Councilmember Hill.

VERBAL COMMENT 74: VICE MAYOR YORDE

Response to Comment 74-1

See Response to Verbal Comment 29-2.

Response to Comment 74-2

Impacts related to the creation of flood hazards due to construction of the proposed project site are addressed in Impact 4.11I-2. Impacts related to increases in runoff as a result of project development are addressed in Impact 4.11I-1 and information related to comparisons on pre-project and post-project storm runoff flows are depicted in Table 4.11-2 on page 4.11-12 of the RDEIR.